I, Katy Wyerman, hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of: Master of Community Planning in: the College of Design, Architecture, Art & Planning

It is entitled:
The Low Income Housing Tax Credit: A Spatial Analysis of Ohio Projects

This work and its defense approved by:

Chair: David P. Varady, PhD
Charlotte Thompson, MCP
Elizabeth Brown, JD
The Low Income Housing Tax Credit: A Spatial Analysis of Ohio Projects

A thesis submitted to
Division of Research and Advanced Studies
of the University of Cincinnati
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
in the School of Planning
of the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning

2007

By
Katy Wyerman
B.S. Economics, University of Michigan, 2005

Committee:
Chair: David P. Varady, Ph.D.
Faculty Member: Charlotte Thompson, M.C.P
Reader: Elizabeth Brown, J.D.
Abstract

In a 2006 Housing Policy Debate article, Kirk McClure asserted that the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program is going mainstream and moving to the suburbs. This is an important finding, as it suggests that the nation’s leading program for providing affordable housing is penetrating areas that typically have lower rates of poverty.

This thesis tests whether McClure’s assertion – that the LIHTC program is moving from urban to suburban areas – holds true for the State of Ohio. The research also investigates whether a disproportionate number of suburban LIHTC projects are targeted for the elderly. Subsidized housing for the elderly receives less community opposition than housing projects for families, which may be an explanation for the LIHTC program’s presumed movement to the suburbs.

A spatial analysis showed that Ohio’s LIHTC program is not moving to the suburbs. Furthermore — and in support of my hypothesis — the proportion of LIHTC projects targeted for the elderly was higher in suburban than urban areas, and within recent years, the proportion of elderly projects in the suburbs has increased dramatically. Interviews with key informants indicated that the increasing attention to elderly LIHTC projects is as expected partly attributable to a desire to avoid the community opposition that is often associated with family LIHTC projects. However, in addition, I found that developers prefer elderly projects because they are a better financial investment, score more points on the tax credit application, and support a growing demand for senior housing.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

To meet the national housing goal of deconcentrating poverty and providing affordable housing opportunities in lower-poverty areas, planners, developers, and housing officials must utilize programs that increase housing choice opportunities for all income levels. One tool used to provide affordable housing is the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program. Administered through the Internal Revenue Service, the LIHTC program encourages private investors to provide the funds needed to create affordable housing in exchange for breaks on their federal tax returns. For every dollar of tax credit received, investors can reduce their federal income taxes by $1 (Schwartz 2006, 83). As this program continues to increase in popularity, it is worthwhile to look into where LIHTC projects are being developed on a local level and why they are being developed in certain communities.

This paper will focus on Ohio LIHTC projects developed for people aged 55 and over for two reasons. One reason is the growth of the senior population in Ohio metropolitan areas. From the time period of 1970 to 2000, Franklin County’s population group aged 18 and under dropped by 6.7 percent, while the population group aged 65 and older increased by 62.5 percent (Community Research Partners 2007). Other metropolitan areas across the State of Ohio are also seeing an increase in their senior population. Providing enough adequate affordable housing for this age group is likely to be an increasing concern.

The second reason for the focus on elderly LIHTC projects is in response to an article written by housing researcher, Kirk McClure. McClure stated that the LIHTC program was going mainstream and moving to the suburbs (McClure 2006). However,
little was said about the types of LIHTC projects that are being developed in the suburbs. It is possible that a large proportion of suburban LIHTC projects are elderly projects because elderly affordable housing typically causes less community opposition than a family affordable housing development might in suburban communities.

1.1 Background

Created by the 1986 Tax Reform Act, the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program provides affordable housing to low-income people. The program offers tax credit incentives to affordable housing investors and has become the principal program for funding low-income housing construction (Hoch 2000). Between 1987 and 2002, the LIHTC program placed over 1,141,000 affordable housing units in service across the country (Climaco 2004).

As the program turns 20 years old, many housing scholars are evaluating the success of the program in terms of affordable housing production and the integration of low-income households into lower-poverty areas. Kirk McClure’s recent Housing Policy Debate article, “The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program Goes Mainstream and Moves to the Suburbs”, examined the program’s maturation in financial and spatial terms. He found that the program has become more popular with developers as the investment risk has decreased. He also asserted that the LIHTC program is exceeding the performance of the Housing Choice Voucher Program in offering housing opportunities for low-income renters in low-poverty areas. On a national level, McClure found a relatively steady production of LIHTC units in central city and non-metropolitan tracts. However, he also found that suburban production is up three- to fourfold over the life of
McClure (2006) indicates that the LIHTC program’s shift to the suburbs is a positive step for subsidized housing projects penetrating lower-poverty neighborhoods, which tend to offer better job and educational opportunities as well as reduced rates of crime. However, a recent study looked at the relationship between subsidized housing and employment opportunities in Southern California and found that the “LIHTC program has not been successful in bringing people closer to jobs and out of distressed neighborhoods” (Joassart-Marcelli 2007, 138). The author offers the disproportionate participation of non-profits and community development organizations (which tend to serve low-income populations) and zoning regulations which allow high-density developments to be rejected as explanations for the failures of the LIHTC program to deconcentrate subsidized housing (Joassart-Marcelli 2007, 138).

While McClure highlights the success of the LIHTC in placing affordable housing in lower-poverty areas on a national level, some states have been far more successful than others in penetrating the suburbs (Rengert 2006, 481). A state level analysis of the LIHTC program’s success in placing subsidized housing in suburban census tracts can provide more insight on why the program has been successful in that state and what types of LIHTC projects are located in suburban areas.

McClure’s analysis looked at the LIHTC program as a whole, but there may be different location trends for projects designated for families, seniors, and mentally ill or disabled persons. The LIHTC program in Ohio has seen an increased proportion of tax credit allocations to senior/elderly projects within the last six years. As seen in figure 1, 18.75 percent of the LIHTC projects were elderly projects in 2000. In 2006, this figure

1 For the purpose of this paper, I will use the terms “senior” and “elderly” interchangeably.
increased to 40.38 percent\(^2\). The competitive nature of Ohio’s LIHTC program may be causing developers to shift their focus to elderly developments as some application requirements, such as proof of community support or at least no opposition, is generally easier to obtain for elderly projects than family projects (Varady 2006, 467). If it is true that elderly housing is more readily accepted in lower-poverty suburban areas, we should expect to see a disproportionate amount of elderly LIHTC projects in the suburbs.

Figure 1: Proportion of Ohio Elderly LIHTC Projects

![Figure 1: Proportion of Ohio Elderly LIHTC Projects](image)

Source: Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) 2006

The increasing senior population may be another reason that Ohio’s LIHTC program has seen an increase in the proportion of elderly developments. Looking at the counties that house Columbus, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, and Toledo provides some insight into the growing senior population in Ohio. As seen in figure 2, Franklin, Hamilton, Cuyahoga, Montgomery, and Lucas counties all show a projected growth of at least 6 percent in the proportion of the 55 and older age group over the next twenty years (Ohio Department of Development 2006).

\(^2\) This paper will investigate why Ohio has observed this increase of elderly LIHTC projects.
Figure 2: Projected Proportion of 55 and Older Population in Ohio

Figure 3: Projection of Number of Residents Aged 55 and Older in Ohio

Source: Ohio Department of Development 2006
Similarly, the sheer number of Ohio residents who will be in the 55 or older age group is increasing. Figure 3 shows the 55 and older population in Hamilton, Montgomery, and Lucas counties steadily increasing over time. The older population in Cuyahoga and Franklin counties is projected to increase at a sharper rate. In 2005, Cuyahoga had 339,380 residents over the age of 55, and this group is projected to increase by nearly 69,000 people to an estimated 408,120 in 2025. Franklin county should expect an even bigger increase in the senior population. In 2005, the county had 207,830 seniors, and it is projected that the county will have 318,750 seniors by 2025 (Ohio Department of Development 2006). This is a 53 percent increase over twenty years.

1.2 Problem Statement

Some housing scholars assert that LIHTC developments are increasingly moving to suburban areas (McClure 2006). However, we don’t know very much about what types of LIHTC projects are moving to the suburbs. Are a disproportionate amount of LIHTC projects located in the suburbs designated for elderly persons? LIHTC projects in the State of Ohio will be examined to determine the trends in spatial locations for elderly LIHTC developments in comparison to non-elderly projects. Secondly, I will investigate why developers choose to locate projects in certain communities. Are the location decisions driven by the need for affordable senior housing or by developers’ belief that family developments are more likely to be resisted by suburban residents than elderly developments?
1.3 Research Questions

1. Is the LIHTC program moving to the suburbs in Ohio?

2. What proportion of suburban LIHTC projects are elderly projects?

3. What proportion of projects located in lower-poverty census tracts are targeted for elderly persons?

4. What are the issues that affect developers’ decisions to locate elderly projects in certain communities?
   4a. Do developers choose to locate elderly developments in communities because of the amount of community need or the amount of community support?
   4b. Are developers developing elderly projects as a substitute to family projects due to reduced community opposition to elderly projects?

1.4 Hypothesis

McClure asserted that the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program is moving to the suburbs due to the maturation of the program, which leads to a reduced financial risk to investors and an increased incentive to place projects in lower-poverty areas (McClure 2006). Ohio has been using the tax credit program since 1989, and I expect to see a higher proportion of projects located in urban areas in the earlier years of the program and a higher proportion of projects located in suburban areas in the later years of the program.

I speculate that more elderly LIHTC projects are now being developed in suburban areas than urban areas for two reasons. First, the negative publicity associated with subsidized housing, such as crime and other social problems, may produce more

---

3 I looked at poverty rates to further investigate what types of census tracts were housing elderly and non-elderly LIHTC projects. This analysis should help to clarify if the LIHTC program is successful in penetrating lower-poverty areas, as not all suburban census tracts have low-poverty rates. Considering race was outside the scope of this research project.
opposition to family projects than elderly projects, since elderly populations are more mature and display more civil behavior than younger populations. Secondly, in order to receive a tax credit allocation, developers must show that the LIHTC project is endorsed by the community. This endorsement is likely to be easier to obtain for elderly projects because of the reduced risk of social problems for this age group.

Lastly, I suspect that developers may be focusing on elderly projects over family projects more because of the reduced opposition for this population than the need for affordable senior housing. While developers must show OHFA that there is a need for affordable housing within the community targeted for a LIHTC project, I presume that providing this evidence is not very difficult, as most communities have some type of need for affordable housing. As the LIHTC program continues to evolve and becomes more competitive, making sure there is as little opposition as possible may be a high goal for developers, and they may be shifting to elderly developments to achieve this goal.

1.5 Likely Benefits for Planners

One lesson to be learned from this research is the success or failure of Ohio’s LIHTC program in deconcentrating subsidized housing from higher-poverty urban areas to lower-poverty suburban areas. Also, understanding developers’ reasons for choosing to develop elderly projects and the reasons behind choosing a location for these projects will help to explain why elderly projects are typically less resisted by more affluent communities. This explanation could help to increase the amount of affordable housing options for lower-income households of all types in lower-poverty areas.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 The Low Income Housing Tax Credit

2.1.1 Program Overview

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 created the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Program through Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code. The tax credit program utilizes funds from the private sector by providing a dollar for dollar deduction in federal tax liabilities over a ten year period to affordable housing investors. From 1995 to 2002, the LIHTC program played an integral part in creating over 1.1 million low-income rental units (Schwartz 2006). It is the nation’s leading program for supplying affordable housing to low-income households.

State financing agencies, such as the Ohio Housing Finance Agency, are the entities that distribute tax credits. The amount of tax credit allocated is based on the cost to develop the project and the proportion of low-income units in the development. First, the costs associated with the development of the project are totaled. This cost figure is called the “eligible basis”. Then, the percentage of low-income units within the project is multiplied by the eligible basis to get a new figure, called the “qualified basis”. Next, the qualified basis may receive a “basis boost” if the project is located in a difficult development area (where the cost of housing is high relative to the median area income) or if it is located in a qualified census tract (where at least half of all households have incomes below 60 percent of the median family income for the metropolitan area). Finally, the qualified basis is multiplied by a predetermined credit rate (usually 9 percent for new construction and 4 percent for rehabilitation) to determine the amount of tax credit the developer may receive over a ten year period (Schwartz 2006, 84).
For example, a developer proposes a new construction project with 100 units (all designated for low-income renters) in an affluent suburban community. The estimated cost to develop the project is $10 million. About $1.6 million of the cost is associated with land acquisition and permanent financing fees. So, the $1.6 million must be subtracted from the total cost figure to arrive at an eligible basis of $8.4 million. Because 100 percent of the units are designated for low-income households, 100 percent is then multiplied by $8.4 million to get a qualified basis of $8.4 million. Since the project is located in a difficult to develop area that has high housing costs relative to the median income, the qualified basis would receive a 130 percent boost up to $10.92 million. The final step is to multiply the qualified basis of $10.92 by a credit rate of 9 percent to get a tax credit of $982,800 each year for ten years (Schwartz 2006, 85).

In general, the LIHTC program has been an effective tool for providing low-income housing units, but the program is not perfect. Some argue that tax credits are inefficient due to the high costs associated with financing and underwriting. Also, because developers receive the most credit when the project has 100 percent low-income units, the program does little to promote mixed-income housing (Schwartz 2006, 96). Another issue is that the funds from the LIHTC program rarely cover the entire cost of the project. It is typical that even when developers sell the tax credits to a syndicator, the equity is not sufficient, and developers must seek other funding sources from state and local governments, community and non-profit groups, or low-interest loans to fill the financing gap (Schwartz 2006, 06).
2.1.2 National Location Trends of LIHTC Projects

Kirk McClure stated that the LIHTC program is going mainstream and moving to the suburbs (McClure 2006). According to HUD’s LIHTC database (Table 1), of the LIHTC projects developed from 1995 to 2004, 43.7 percent were located in the central city, 31.3 percent were located in the suburbs, and 25 percent were located in rural (non-metro) areas. In 1995, about 28 percent of LIHTC projects were located in the suburbs, and in 2004 this percentage increased to 32 percent. The proportion of LIHTC units in central city locations floated around 43 percent from 1995 to 2004, and projects developed in non-metro areas started out at 29.1 percent in 1995, but decreased to 24.1 percent in 2004. By looking at the ten years from 1995 to 2004, we can see that LIHTC projects have remained stable in central cities, increased in suburban areas, and have decreased in non-metro areas (Climaco 2004).

Table 1: Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type, 1995-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metro</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>77,309</td>
<td>77,897</td>
<td>83,739</td>
<td>86,392</td>
<td>102,805</td>
<td>92,866</td>
<td>94,589</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>114,181</td>
<td>104,972</td>
<td>932,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metro</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Climaco 2004

Table 2 shows the poverty and minority characteristics of the census tracts that LIHTC projects are located in. Of the LIHTC projects located in the central city, 33.5 percent of them are located in census tracts that have 30 percent or more households living below the poverty line. In comparison, only 5.6 percent of suburban LIHTC
12 projects are located in such higher poverty census tracts (Climaco 2004). This is probably due to the fact that suburban areas typically do not have as much poverty as central city areas. A similar trend is seen with respect to minority concentrations. Almost 60 percent of central city LIHTC projects are located in census tracts with over half the population being a member of a minority group, while the percentage of suburban projects being placed into census tracts with a majority of a minority population is only about 30 percent (Climaco 2004).

HUD’s LIHTC database updates describe the characteristics and location trends of LIHTC projects and units. While these updates are useful for making generalizations on a national scale, they do not provide detailed information at the state or metropolitan level. Because the LIHTC program is administered through state housing finance agencies, it would be useful to understand the LIHTC program on a state level to help understand how state housing finance agencies affect location trends. Finally, HUD’s LIHTC database looks at the LIHTC program as a whole, and does not provide detailed analysis on the different types of projects. Projects designated for families, seniors, or mentally ill persons may have very different characteristics, and it is important to understand how the subsets of the program are performing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract Characteristic</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Non-Metro Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Units</td>
<td>All Rental Units</td>
<td>LIHTC Units</td>
<td>All Rental Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 Percent Minority Population</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Climaco 2004
2.2 Ohio Housing Finance Agency

Since 1989, the State of Ohio has used the tax credit program to build 1,030 projects, which provide over 76,000 units of housing for low-income residents (Ohio Housing Finance Agency [OHFA] 2006). The Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) is the organization responsible for administering tax credits to Ohio LIHTC applicants. OHFA, like all other state housing finance agencies, publishes an annual Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP). This document guides the scoring criteria for LIHTC projects. Recently, OHFA has shifted to a more subjective scoring process. The 2007 Qualified Allocation Plan outlines three phases of the application process: (1) experience and capacity review, (2) site and market evaluation, and (3) a formal competitive scoring.

The purpose of the experience review is to determine the eligibility and the amount of tax credit the applicant may be able to receive. The applicant must submit the following: information regarding their organization’s subsidized and affordable housing experience, a summary of the organization’s projects under construction, and resumes of key development staff within the organization (OHFA QAP 2006, 12). After OHFA reviews the organization’s experience and evaluates its capacity to develop and finance affordable housing, OHFA will place the applicant into one of four tiers, which designates the number of projects and amount of tax credits (if any) the organization may be eligible to receive for the application year.

The second phase of the application process involves a review of the preliminary aspects for the project to determine how competitive the application will be within the application pool. Here, OHFA will review the preliminary details of the project. They will look at the market study, a mini environmental site assessment, the proposed supportive
services plan, and evidence that the public and local government has been notified. The vacancy rates in the market, growth rate for qualified households, project design, and quality of the site will be assessed during this phase and the applicant will receive a score. If the applicant feels that the application received a competitive score, then he/she will submit a complete application for formal consideration in the third stage of the application process (OHFA QAP 2006, 15-23).

In the third and final phase of the application process, the application receives a formal competitive score. There are two parts to this phase in which an application can score a maximum of 80 points in Part 1 and a maximum of 10 points in Part 2. The scores from Part 1, Part 2, and the preliminary score from phase two are then added together for a final project score (OHFA QAP 2006).

As seen in table 3, an application’s competitive score is derived from a number of criteria. Applications receive 25 points for providing 60 or 40 percent of units for households with incomes at or below 50 percent of the area’s median gross income. The points for local government support are awarded based on a resolution of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Rent Restrictions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Support</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Support</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Design</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Income Targeting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Lease Purchase</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Supportive Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Units</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability or Mental Illness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficient Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OHFA QAP 2006
from the local government or council, a letter of support by the president of the city council, or an affirmative letter from the highest-elected community official (OHFA QAP 2006, 35). Points for additional local support are based on letters from a neighborhood association, local social service agency, or state representative or senator (OHFA QAP 2006, 36). Additional points are awarded based on the population the project will aim to serve (seniors, persons with a mental illness or disability, or specific income levels⁴), the project’s design in terms of accessibility, energy efficiency, and the use of historic buildings (OHFA QAP 2006)⁵.

Each category in Part 2 has a maximum of 2 points. Most of these categories award points based on characteristics of the development team or general partners. The development team scores well if they have a presence in the State of Ohio and have had experience with the following elements: product type, location type, and affordable housing. For example, if the development organization has had experience building senior housing developments or has had experience developing housing projects in a particular city or county, OHFA may award extra points to the organization. Also, the application will score points if the organizations involved in the project have worked together previously and if the project has a local ownership entity (OHFA QAP 2006, 41-42).

---

⁴ Senior projects receive an additional five points, projects for persons with a mental illness or disability receive an additional five points, and ten points are awarded to projects that reserve a percentage of the units for households with incomes less than 35 percent of the area median gross income.

⁵ The point allocations refer only to the 2006 Qualified Allocation Plan. I did not have access to QAPs from previous years, so I don’t know when OHFA started allocating points to senior developments. This should be investigated further.
2.3 Elderly Housing

2.3.1 Defining Elderly Persons

Different agencies provide different age minimums. The American Association for Retired Persons (AARP) defines older Americans as persons older than 50. However, the U.S. Bureau of the Census defines older Americans as persons older than 65. The Ohio Housing Finance Agency defines “senior” as persons over the age of 55. Finally, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development uses the age of 62 as their age minimum for their elderly programs.

Although the exact age used to describe elderly or senior populations can be debated, no one can dismiss the fact that the senior population is growing and is expected to continue growing. Projections administered by the U.S. Department of Health and

Figure 4: Number of Persons in the U.S. 65 and Older, 1900 - 2030, in millions

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2004

As stated earlier, I will use the terms “elderly” and “senior” interchangeably. Since OHFA defines senior projects as those designated toward persons over the age of 55, the minimum age for an “elderly” or “senior” person will be 55.
Human Services’ Administration of Aging show the older population more than doubling by 2030. This would increase the proportion of older persons as a total of U.S. population from 12.4 percent in 2000 to about 20 percent in 2030 (Kastenburg 2004). Figure 4 (above) shows the projection of the nation’s older population through year 2030.

The median income for older Americans in 2004 was $21,102 for males and $12,080 for females. Since most older people are retired from work, their incomes consist mainly of social security payments, income from assets, and pensions. Almost 10 percent of older people live below the poverty level. As of 2004, the State of Ohio had 1,524,916 residents aged over 65 (Administration on Aging 2005). This is 13.3 percent of the total population. As the U.S. population ages, planning efforts should take into account the needs of elderly residents. One of the most important needs is housing.

2.3.2 Elderly Housing Options

Housing trends for the elderly are diverse. Many seniors are “aging in place” and remaining in their homes until their late 70’s or 80’s. For seniors that choose to relocate, some prefer to stay close to their families and familiar neighborhood, but downsize to a smaller home, condominium, or apartment. Others relocate to sunny states such as Florida and Arizona in their retirement years. Many empty nesters choose to live downtown as the quality of the school system is no longer a priority and the proximity to restaurants and entertainment is attractive. Other seniors choose to move to senior communities that offer a golf resort-like experience or retirement communities that offer healthcare amenities (Kastenburg 2004).
For those that are physically able, aging in place is an attractive living option. However, as people age, the basic functions of household maintenance, getting to a grocery store and medical services, and accessing transportation becomes more difficult and living independently may not be the best option. At this point, other housing options for seniors must be considered.

Active adult communities (retirement communities) target seniors who are able to live independently but may want to minimize home maintenance obligations. These communities usually have recreational and social amenities such as golf and tennis facilities. Continuing care retirement communities offer a range of living options so that residents can stay on the same campus but progress from independent living to assisted living to a nursing facility as their needs change. Assisted living targets people that cannot live on their own, but require some type of assistance. These residents do not need twenty-four hour a day care, but may want to take advantage of recreational activities or socialization with other seniors. Finally, skilled nursing facilities offer full service assistance for those seniors who can no longer live an independent lifestyle. Professional staff assist residents with daily activities such as bathing, dressing, eating, and taking medications (Senior Outlook 2007).

For persons age 65 and older, housing costs are the single largest expenditure category, exceeding transportation cost and medical expenses combined. About 47 percent of renters in Ohio who are older than 50 years old have a housing cost burden, which means they are paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing7 (Kochera 2006). To support low-income seniors with their household needs, there are two main

---

7 This statistic refers to renters only. The financial situation is likely to be less dire for seniors who have paid off their home mortgages.
programs funded by the federal government: the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program and HUD’s Section 202 program.

2.3.3 Section 202: Supportive Housing for the Elderly

The Section 202 Program (Supportive Housing for the Elderly) is administered through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development as a method to provide funds for non-profit organizations to develop and subsidize affordable senior housing. To be eligible for Section 202 projects, householders must be at least 62 years old and must have low incomes. These projects are often coupled with supportive senior services, as they are developed by a non-profit organization (HUD Section 202 2005).

This program subsidizes housing in two ways: (1) by providing capital grant funds for the construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of projects and (2) through a rental assistance subsidy. If the project stays affordable for 40 years, the capital grant does not have to be paid back. Also, the rental subsidy comes in the form of a project rental assistance contract, similar to a Section 8 voucher, that covers the difference between 30 percent of the tenant’s adjusted income and the total operating cost. By providing this subsidy, Section 202 projects are able to offer a deeper subsidy to very low-income seniors than LIHTC projects can (Schwartz 2006, 207).
2.4 Subsidized Housing in Suburban Areas

It is widely believed that all communities should provide a choice of housing options for all residents, including low-income households. Some affluent communities, such as Montgomery County, Maryland (Brunick 2004) and Highland Park, IL (Prince 2002) have developed innovative strategies for providing affordable housing. These are the exceptions rather than the norm.

The acronym, NIMBY, stands for “Not In My Backyard”. The nature of this attitude stems from the conventional wisdom that “it probably is not good for me, my property values, and my neighborhood” (Galster 2003, 10). The reasons for NIMBY attitudes include the possibility of: reduced property values, unwanted noise and congestion, an introduction of different racial and ethnic groups into neighborhoods, increased crime and drug levels, and poorer upkeep of apartment buildings (Galster 2003, 10). Prime examples of NIMBY attitudes in opposition to subsidized housing have shown up in suburban Denver, Baltimore, and Minneapolis.

2.4.1 Suburban Minneapolis’s Opposition to Affordable Housing

Minneapolis Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton said “We know that poverty by itself doesn’t cause urban problems. It’s the concentration… that eventually strangles those neighborhoods economically, making it impossible for residents to have access to jobs, good schools, health care, transportation” (Belton 1995, quoted in Goetz 2003). Minneapolis, like many other American cities, had a number or neighborhoods with high proportions of poor households. These neighborhoods also had high instances of school dropouts, teen pregnancies, crime, and drug use, making it difficult for residents to escape
poverty and the associated social ills (Goetz 2003, 2).

Moving lower income households to more affluent areas should enable them to live in neighborhoods that are safer, healthier, and have better access to education and employment. However, middle-income residents are usually not very anxious to receive low-income households fearing crime and delinquency (as discussed above) will spill over into their neighborhood from the inner city (Goetz 2003, 83).

Maple Grove is an affluent suburban community located northwest of Minneapolis. Because of the community’s notable aggressive opposition to affordable housing, the term “Maple Groved” was coined by affordable housing activists to describe situations in which affordable housing projects were kept out of an affluent neighborhood (Goetz 2003, 103). The Maple Grove Community Council rejected an affordable-housing project that would have rented for $550 a month. Angry residents protested the project saying it would attract “undesirable elements” (Goetz 2003, 102).

Maple Grove also objected to the proposal of a 16 to 20 unit Habitat for Humanity project. Eventually, four single-family Habitat homes were built on city-owned land behind a fire station. This opposition was especially bold since Habitat for Humanity is generally perceived to be a “feel-good” operation with projects that are small in scale, involve volunteer work and contributions from the future residents. Nonetheless, Habitat was told to “get the hell out of our neighborhood” by some Maple Grove residents in 1997 (Goetz 2003, 102).

Eagan, a suburban community located southeast of Minneapolis, is not as affluent as Maple Grove, but residents had similar attitudes toward affordable housing in the 1990s. In 1994, the residents and city council opposed a low- and moderate-income
townhouse development that would have accepted households with incomes up to $30,000. The city rejected the project, refusing to downzone the land from high-density to medium-density to accommodate the project. However, the county sued the city, and Eagan was ordered to change the zoning and permit the project. The councilwoman who led the opposition was later elected mayor. This election reflected the community’s stance on affordable housing (Goetz 2003, 104).

Eagan declined state development funds in 1999 because they were attached to affordable housing requirements. The Metropolitan Council (Met Council) then rejected the community’s comprehensive plan because it did not set aside enough high-density land for affordable housing. The Council also stipulated that Eagan would not be eligible to receive regional grants or financial aid for public infrastructure improvements unless it produced more affordable housing. The Mayor scoffed at the ultimatum, saying that the “city had not benefited from Met Council funding in the past and would not need it in the future”. According to her, people “move here from the inner city because they want to live on a safe cul-de-sac”. She also claimed that Eagan had enough affordable rental housing and that “density breeds problems” (Goetz 2003, 104). Eagan is a clear example of a community that did not want to house low-income families.

2.4.2 Suburban Denver’s Opposition to Affordable Housing

Denver attempted to implement two programs to deconcentrate assisted housing within the downtown. The scattered site program was initiated in 1989 with the intent of demolishing 400 units of public housing located in some of the city’s oldest and densest housing projects. The Denver Housing Authority (DHA) planned to replace
the demolished units and relocate the displaced persons by acquiring existing single-family units, duplexes, condominiums, townhouses, and other multifamily unit clusters throughout Denver (Galster 2003, 32). DHA’s initiative ultimately survived community opposition, but not without significant restrictions and changes to the original plans (Galster 2003, 21).

The Denver dispersed housing program met intense political opposition in the late 1980s. One of the major concerns for white homeowners was where, exactly, the displaced DHA residents would be relocated. This was especially prevalent since Denver had been in an economic downturn and the DHA could now afford purchasing housing units in more affluent neighborhoods because the deterioration of the local housing market made housing units more affordable (Galster 2003, 33).

The major problem with the Denver initiative to scatter DHA housing was that the DHA was not prepared to deal with the community backlash, as they were surprised by the negative reactions to the program (Galster 2003, 35). Proper site selection, neighborhood outreach, and tenant selection were three areas of adaptation that ultimately restructured the program into a successful one (Galster 2003, 36). Following strict site restrictions such as purchasing units in lower-poverty census tracts, a minimum distance of 950 feet between other DHA properties, and a threshold percentage of DHA units in a census tract helped ease resident fears that their neighborhood would not become over concentrated with low-income households. Increased communication and a tighter screening process led residents to decrease their opposition (Galster 2003, 39).
2.4.3 Baltimore Opposition: Dundalk and Essex

Baltimore was one of five cities selected to participate in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program. The program evaluated three groups: a control group living in concentrated public housing, a group of former public housing residents who received Section 8 vouchers, and an experimental group of former public housing residents who were allowed to use their Section 8 vouchers only in census tracts that had less than a 10 percent poverty rate. The latter group was also given mobility assistance from a non-profit organization. It was expected that the experimental group would move to non-poverty areas of the Baltimore suburbs (Galster 2003, 61).

Dundalk and Essex were two Baltimore County communities that opposed the MTO program. Both were older, blue collar, ethnic suburban communities that were experiencing economic decline after manufacturing firms left the area. During the Summer of 1994, “Say No to MTO” was plastered on billboards and placards throughout suburban Baltimore (Galster 2003, 65-66). Seeing their community in decline, residents were adamant about keeping crime and other social negatives associated with low-income housing out of the neighborhood.

Opposition stemmed from racial and class prejudices, concerns about poverty concentration, and expectations concerning poor housing management (Galster 2003, 66). The residents of Dundalk and Essex opposed MTO because they saw assisted housing as another threat to the stability of their already declining community (Galster 2003, 71). Ultimately, due to intense political opposition, the Baltimore MTO program was discontinued after the first wave of participation (Galster 2003, 71).
Providing affordable housing options for low-income residents was not an easy task in the Baltimore, Denver, and Minneapolis suburban communities discussed above. The intention was to deconcentrate subsidized housing from the urban core where poverty rates were high and opportunities to break out of poverty were low to suburban communities that had better schools, more job opportunities, and a healthier environment. However, the schemes to do this in all three areas were heavily opposed by residents who were concerned about low-income households penetrating their affluent neighborhoods and bringing the social ills that are commonly associated with poverty.

2.4.4 Montgomery County, MD

Montgomery County is an affluent county located north of Washington, D.C. The median annual household income increased from $71,551 in 2000 to $79,115 in 2003. To afford an apartment at the fair market price\(^8\) of $1,187 would require an income of $47,480, or an hourly wage of $23.74. In 2004, the median sales price for a single-family home was $320,645. For newly constructed homes, the price was $590,760. To afford this median home price would require an annual salary of at least $77,000. However, nearly 30 percent of households in Montgomery County had incomes below $50,000 (HOCMC Strategic Plan).

The county does not have enough affordable housing to meet the demand. Also, affordable housing units are not distributed evenly throughout the county. In other words, affordable housing options are only available in certain areas within the county, which limits the housing choices for low and moderate income (Affordable Housing in

---

\(^8\) The fair market price is defined as the price consumers are willing to pay based on the area’s supply and demand for housing.
Montgomery County 2000). To address the affordable housing issue, the county uses an inclusionary zoning program which requires developers to set aside a certain percentage of new developments to be affordable.

The County Council passed the Moderately Priced Housing (MPH) Law in 1974. This law requires that between 12.5 and 15 percent of the houses in new subdivisions of 20 units or more must be moderately priced dwelling units (MPDUs). Priority to live in a MPDU is given to persons who work in Montgomery County. The program also offers a density bonus to developers as an incentive, which means that they are able to build more units if they build more affordable housing units. This is attractive to developers as the additional revenues received from the market rate units outweighs the cost of developing affordable units. Currently, the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County finances, manages, owns, or administers about 22,000 housing units throughout the county (HOCMC Fact Sheet 2007).

2.4.5 Highland Park, IL

The city of Highland Park is an affluent suburban community located on Chicago’s North Shore. The community has been recognized for having some of the best schools in the State of Illinois, sprawling homes, upscale shopping, and low crime rates (Prince 2002). However, many people who work in Highland Park cannot afford to live in the community. In 2006, Highland Park received the American Planning Association Award for Housing Choice and Affordability in recognition of the city’s efforts to address their affordable housing crisis (Kimura 2006).
Newly constructed single-family homes are selling for around $1 million, and existing single-family homes are selling for about $400,000 (Ross 2003). The median household income is $157,861, but 80 percent of local service and retail workers have an annual salary of less than $35,000 (Ross 2003). “Apartments… go for $1,315 per month… there are few realistic [housing] options for young single people” said Matt Patterson, a 24 year old employee at an upscale Highland Park restaurant (Prince 2002).

The city’s need for affordable housing over the last decade is due to three main factors. First, there has been a nearly 20 percent increase in housing values. Second, the city has lost at least 324 affordable housing units through demolitions and conversions to condominiums. In 2001, the city implemented an Affordable Housing Needs and Implementation Plan as part of the City’s Master Plan. This plan includes four main strategies to increase affordable housing opportunities: (1) a demolition tax, (2) a housing trust fund, (3) a land trust, and (4) an inclusionary zoning ordinance (City of Highland Park 2001).

The demolition tax requires developers to pay $10,000 for a single-family unit and the greater amount of $10,000 or $3,000 per unit for a multifamily building. The funds from the demolition tax go to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund which is then used to preserve and create affordable housing as well as provide gap financing for affordable housing developments. In addition to the demolition tax and trust fund, a private non-profit organization obtains land for affordable housing construction and holds it in the Highland Park Illinois Community Land Trust (Kimura 2006).

The inclusionary zoning ordinance requires residential developments located on sites with more than 10 acres and/or include 50 or more units to set aside 20% of the units
to be affordable<sup>9</sup> (City of Highland Park 2001). While the city prefers affordable units to be on-site, there is an option for developers to pay $100,000 per unit to the Highland Park Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The single family units must stay affordable indefinitely and the rental units must stay affordable for twenty-five years. In exchange for participation, there are incentives for developers such as impact and permit fee waivers and density bonuses, where the developer can provide an extra market rate unit for every affordable housing unit (Ross 2003).

Highland Park’s affordable housing plan seeks to provide housing opportunities to current residents, and gives preference in the housing application process to municipal workers (e.g. firemen, policemen, and teachers), seniors living on limited incomes, and young professionals that grew up in the community. Some criticize Highland Park’s affordable housing plan for focusing their strategies primarily on existing residents and doing little to bring low-income households from the City of Chicago to the suburban community (Prince 2002). However, the methods used by Highland Park serve as an example of what communities can do to solve local affordable housing shortages.

2.5 Conclusion

The reviewed literature shows that the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program is shifting from the central city to suburban and non-metropolitan areas. However, it is unknown if this shift of LIHTC project developments to suburban areas has been driven by an increased acceptance of elderly developments over family developments in the suburbs.

---

<sup>9</sup> The set aside must include affordable housing for households at 50% or less of the area median income and for households that make 80 percent or less of area median income.
We have seen examples in Baltimore, Denver, and Minneapolis suburban areas where residents adamantly opposed subsidized housing entering their communities. The public often assumes that subsidized housing will lead to neighborhood change and decline, such as decreases in property values and increases in the negative social ills associated with concentrated poverty (Freeman 2002, 375). However, it is perceived that subsidized housing for elderly persons generates less community opposition than subsidized housing for families or mentally ill persons, and this is a possible explanation for why the LIHTC program is moving to the suburbs.

This thesis will analyze the State of Ohio’s LIHTC projects to answer important questions about the LIHTC program. It will focus on the distribution of elderly projects in urban and suburban areas, as little research has analyzed the elderly subset of LIHTC projects. This is an important issue for two reasons: (1) the elderly population is growing and will continue to need affordable housing and (2) it is likely that elderly LIHTC projects do a better job in penetrating low-poverty suburban areas than family projects as suburban residents tend to be less concerned about subsidized senior housing coming into their neighborhoods.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This research project consisted of two phases: (1) using Geographic Information Systems software (ArcGIS) to map LIHTC projects in Ohio for visual understanding and (2) conducting interviews with key informants to answer questions regarding their location decisions made for elderly LIHTC developments.

3.1 Phase One

The first step in the mapping process was to obtain Ohio LIHTC project data. I downloaded most of the files from the Ohio Housing Finance Agency’s (OHFA) website. These files provided information regarding the project’s address, owning entity, year of tax credit allocation, and special needs population, if appropriate. From 2000 to 2006, the projects were identified by project type, i.e., Family, Senior, Permanent Supportive Housing, or Mental Illness. A staff member at OHFA provided information that distinguished which projects were allocated for seniors from 1989 to 2000, since this information was not available on OHFA’s website.

The next step was to geocode the project locations in order to import the projects as points on an Ohio map in ArcGIS. An OHFA staff member provided most of the geocodes for project locations, and I used an online service to geocode the missing projects. I then had x- and y- latitudinal and longitudinal data to use in ArcGIS. I plotted the x- and y- points to represent the locations of LIHTC projects across the State of Ohio.

I downloaded shapefiles from the US Census Bureau Geography website that contain city boundary, Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundary, and census tract information. I classified geographic areas within the five largest Ohio MSAs (Columbus,
Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, and Dayton) as either urban or suburban. For the purpose of this research project, I defined urban areas as the areas within the central city limits and suburban areas as the areas outside the central city limits but within the MSA boundary. To use the Cincinnati area as an example (Figure 5), any LIHTC project located within the dark gray area (Cincinnati’s city boundary) is classified as an urban project. Any LIHTC project located outside of the dark gray area, but within the dotted MSA boundary line is considered a suburban project. (See section 3.3 of this chapter for further explanation on the urban and suburban definition).

I also classified census tracts by poverty level. To do this, I used a tool in ArcGIS to compute the percentage of households that were living below the poverty level in 2000. I divided the number of households living below the poverty line (found in the “BPOVHH: 2000 HHs w/ Income in 1999 Below Poverty Level” field) by the total number of households (found in the “TOTHH00: 2000 Total Households” field), giving
me a new field that represented the proportion of households living in poverty for each census tract. I was then able to organize the census tracts into three categories: (1) low poverty - less than 10 percent of households living below the poverty line, (2) moderate poverty - 10 to 30 percent of households living below poverty, and (3) high poverty - more than 30 percent of households living below the poverty line. Figures 6 and 7 show census tracts classified by poverty level in the Cincinnati area, with the lightest shaded census tracts having the lowest proportion of households living in poverty and the darkest shaded census tracts having higher poverty levels.

Figure 6: Census Tracts by Poverty Level, Cincinnati Metropolitan Area

Figure 7: Zoomed View of Census Tracts by Poverty Level, Cincinnati

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000

10 Eleven of the 3020 total census tracts (0.36 percent) did not have data for BPOVHH or TOTHH00 and therefore were not placed in any of the three categories.
After classifying the census tracts, I selected elderly and non-elderly projects by location, downloaded the data into Excel files, and made tables and graphs to summarize trends. I also made meaningful maps to visually explain the spatial distribution of elderly and non-elderly LIHTC projects in Ohio.

3.2 Phase Two

The second part of the project involved interviewing LIHTC developers that have been involved in elderly LIHTC tax credit projects, city council members that have had elderly LIHTC projects placed in their community, an Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) official, a HUD Section 202 official, and a representative from the Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing. Each conversation was unique, but the intention of the interviews was to determine the driving factors behind elderly LIHTC developments so all of the conversations covered common themes.

To find appropriate key informants for interviews, I used a multitude of resources. The major resource for finding developers to interview was the reservation spreadsheets published on OHFA’s website. These worksheets show which projects were allocated tax credits each year as well as contact information for the owners and developers of the projects. I was referred to other key informants by my committee members. Finally, I also utilized websites and word of mouth recommendations to find appropriate key informants.

I contacted the proposed interviewees via email. In the email I informed them about my study, indicated that participation in my research project was voluntary, and asked them to respond with a time for me to contact them if they were willing to grant
me an interview. Once, the interview was scheduled, I called at the appropriate time, and asked the informant 6 to 7 questions. The interview questions sought to gain information regarding the motivation to develop elderly LIHTC projects, factors affecting site selection decisions, community need versus community support, community opposition issues, the reasons behind choosing the LIHTC program for financing, and the role that OHFA plays in guiding project types and locations. A complete list of questions can be found in the appendix. With permission from the interviewees, I audio recorded the interviews and then transcribed the conversations into Word documents. Most of the interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes. The interviews centered around specific LIHTC projects that the key informant had experienced with, but I used the interview questions to guide the conversations and consequently dealt with broader issues as well.

To analyze the interviews, I used a social research analysis software program called NVivo7. First, I imported the transcribed interviews into the program. Then, I ran queries within NVivo7 to determine themes throughout the interviews. The seven identified themes were: (1) motivation to develop an elderly LIHTC project, (2) site selection criteria, (3) role of community need, (4) role of community support, (5) community opposition issues, (6) financing program selection, and (7) the role of OHFA’s Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) in guiding development decisions.

Once I had identified all of the themes, I looked for “nodes” or categories of responses for each theme. I used the NVivo7 software to search for nodes, and I also reviewed the interviews myself to identify any nodes that may have been missed by the

---

11 Each participant was asked to sign a consent form that affirmed his/her voluntary participation in the study, his/her willingness to have the interview recorded, and authorized use of his/her name in the final report. A few participants did not send back the consent forms, but agreed to an interview via email correspondence. In these instances, I did not record the conversation but took notes during the interview.
software. For each theme, three to six nodes were identified. Then, responses were tallied for each node and charts were made to show the distribution of nodes for each theme.

For example, the theme of how a developer selects a site for an elderly LIHTC development was present throughout most of the interviews. When asked about the site selection process, the developers responded with a variety of reasons based on the situation they experienced with developing the elderly LIHTC project. Many pointed out, in some fashion or another, that making sure the site has the proper zoning in place is a factor when deciding where to locate a project. Others cited the importance of the site being located near amenities, such as grocery stores and pharmacies. Consequently, “Zoning” would be one node, and “proximity to amenities” would be another node. After all the relevant nodes were identified, then the responses were assigned a node, and the number of responses in each node was tallied. This provided a way to analyze the content of the interviews in a systematic manner.

3.3 Assumptions and Limitations

3.3.1 Urban and Suburban Definitions

For the purposes of this study, I defined urban areas as the central city limits and suburban areas as the areas outside the central city limits but inside the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) boundary. (See figure 5 on page 31). Due to time constraints and because my focus was on the LIHTC shift from urban to suburban areas, I excluded rural areas from the study. Therefore, the analyzed database does not contain any LIHTC projects located outside of the five metropolitan areas of Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Toledo, and Dayton.
3.3.2 Data Quality

Of Ohio’s 1,030 LIHTC projects placed in service from 1989 to 2006, I was able to accurately geocode 994 of them. This is a 96.5 percent rate. I was not able to geocode the remaining 3.5 percent of LIHTC projects because either the listed address was incorrect, there was no listed address, the project had scattered sites, or the geocoding program failed to find an x- and y- value for the inputted address.

I doubt that the number of LIHTC projects noted as elderly or senior projects is 100 percent accurate. The Ohio Housing Finance Agency’s reservation records do not begin to indicate which projects are designated for elderly persons until 2000. An OHFA staff member went back to the reservation lists prior to 2000 to indicate which projects were developed for elderly persons. I noticed a few discrepancies, such as projects that had the word “Senior” in the project title, but were not classified as elderly projects. I did my best to research the true targeted population for any ambiguous projects, but there may be a few projects that should have been designated as elderly, but were not due to the system of not indicating them until years past.

3.3.3 Interview Responses

It is possible that some key informant interviews did not answer questions completely accurately in order to uphold the image of their organization. NIMBY issues are sensitive in nature, and some interviewees may have chosen to protect their image instead of telling the whole story.

The results of the analysis can be found in chapters 4 and 5.
Chapter 4: Where are Ohio LIHTC Developments Located?

To analyze where elderly projects are located, I produced maps, tables, and charts for the five largest metropolitan areas in the State of Ohio: Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Toledo, and Dayton. Figure 8 shows the spatial distribution of elderly projects (stars) and non-elderly projects (squares) throughout Ohio\(^\text{12}\). The five metro areas of focus are highlighted in dark gray. Detailed maps and tables for each metro area can be found in the appendix.

Figure 8: Ohio LIHTC Projects, 1989-2006

Source: OHFA 2006

\(^{12}\) The LIHTC projects represented by squares and stars in the lighter gray (rural) areas were not included in the analysis.
The mapping analysis within this thesis seeks to answer three questions:

(1) Has there been a shift of LIHTC projects from Ohio’s central cities to the suburbs over time?

(2) Has the proportion of suburban LIHTC projects targeting the elderly increased over time?

(3) Has the proportion of elderly projects in low-poverty areas increased over time?

The first question was answered by tracking the number of projects located in urban areas and suburban areas through the early, middle, and later years of the program\textsuperscript{13} to see if LIHTC projects shifted from urban to suburban areas as the program matured. The second question was answered by looking at how many projects were elderly projects in the suburbs (and compare that same proportion to urban projects) to see if there was a disproportionate amount of elderly projects in the suburbs. Lastly, I tracked the proportion of elderly LIHTC developments out of the total LIHTC developments in low-, moderate-, and high-poverty census tracts to see if elderly projects were increasingly penetrating lower-poverty areas.\textsuperscript{14}

4.1 Has there been a shift of LIHTC projects from central cities to the suburbs?

Of the LIHTC projects developed within the boundaries of Ohio’s five largest metropolitan areas, there does not appear to be a shift from urban to suburban areas. In fact, the situation appears to follow the opposite trend. All five metropolitan areas showed

---

\textsuperscript{13} Early years are from 1989 to 1994, mid years are from 1995 to 2000, and later years are from 2001 to 2006.

\textsuperscript{14} I wanted to look at poverty rates, because suburban is too broad of a term, and doesn’t completely answer the question of subsidized housing penetrating suburban areas. Suburban areas typically have lower poverty rates than urban areas, but this is not the unilateral case.
a higher percentage of projects located in suburban areas in the earlier years of the program than in the later years, as seen in table 4.

Table 4: Percentage of LIHTC projects located in the suburbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>All 5 Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1994</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td>50.98%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 - 2000</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>60.47%</td>
<td>39.53%</td>
<td>68.89%</td>
<td>31.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2006</td>
<td>62.26%</td>
<td>37.74%</td>
<td>54.05%</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
<td>70.91%</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Years</td>
<td>56.89%</td>
<td>43.11%</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
<td>45.80%</td>
<td>68.97%</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OHFA 2006

Dayton is the only metropolitan area that had a higher proportion of suburban projects than urban projects throughout all years of the LIHTC program. However, the proportion of projects developed in suburban Dayton decreased from 70 percent in the early years of the program to 53 percent in the later years, which is consistent with the trend found in the other four metropolitan areas.

The Columbus, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Toledo areas all show a decrease in the proportion of suburban LIHTC production as OHFA’s LIHTC program matures. In the Toledo area, the percentage of LIHTC developments produced in suburban areas was almost 60 percent in the early 1990s, then plummeted to only 5 percent in the mid to late 1990s, and most recently climbed up to 28 percent. Similarly, the three lightest gray shaded bars in figure 9 show that in Columbus, Cincinnati, and Cleveland, the proportion of LIHTC projects developed in suburban areas has decreased over time.

The evidence presented here does not support the theory that the LIHTC program is moving to the suburbs in Ohio. The aggregated data for all five metro areas studied show that the production of LIHTC developments was split almost evenly in urban and suburban areas in the early years of the program. However, as time progressed, the proportion of projects developed in suburban areas decreased.
4.2 Has there been an increase in the proportion of suburban LIHTC projects targeting the elderly?

The percentage of suburban projects designated for elderly persons over the life of the LIHTC program is 22 percent for all five metropolitan areas, with a minimum of 17 percent in Cincinnati and maximum of 28 percent in Dayton. In urban areas, the proportion of elderly developments is 8 percent lower (14 percent) for all five areas, with a minimum and maximum of 7 and 26 percent in Cincinnati and Dayton, respectively.

Table 5: Proportion of Elderly Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Columbus Urban</th>
<th>Columbus Suburban</th>
<th>Cincinnati Urban</th>
<th>Cincinnati Suburban</th>
<th>Cleveland Urban</th>
<th>Cleveland Suburban</th>
<th>Toledo Urban</th>
<th>Toledo Suburban</th>
<th>Dayton Urban</th>
<th>Dayton Suburban</th>
<th>All Five Regions Urban</th>
<th>All Five Regions Suburban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1994</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 - 2000</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2006</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>37.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Years</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
<td>28.30%</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
<td>22.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OHFA 2006
This shows that elderly developments are more prevalent in suburban areas than urban areas. More interesting trends arose when the data was analyzed as time progressed.

Table 5 (above) shows a definite increase in the proportion of suburban projects targeted for elderly persons as the LIHTC program matures. In Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Dayton the proportions of elderly projects in suburban areas were less than 10 percent during the early 1990s. However, in the later years of the program (early 2000s), the proportions were between 30 and 40 percent for the three areas. Similarly, the Columbus area had only 11 percent of elderly projects in the suburbs in the early years, but this statistic rose to 45 percent in the most recent years. Lastly, in Toledo, the proportion doubled from 20 to 40 percent as time increased. Figure 10 clearly shows this trend of increasing proportions of elderly developments in the suburbs as the tax credit program matures. With the exception of the spike in Dayton’s middle year period, the graph shows

Figure 10: Proportion of Elderly Projects in the Suburbs

Source: OHFA 2006
a substantial increase in the percentages of elderly projects in the suburbs in the later years of the program compared to the early years of the program.

It is important to point out that the proportion of projects targeted for elderly persons also increased over time in urban areas. In the early years of the LIHTC program, the amount of elderly developments was less than 10 percent of the total projects developed in both urban and suburban areas. Figure 11 shows this that the proportion of projects targeted for elderly persons increased with time in both central cities and suburban areas. However, the proportion increased more significantly in suburban areas. For the projects developed in the later years of the program (2001 to 2006), 38 percent of suburban projects were targeted for the elderly whereas only 20 percent of urban projects were targeted for the elderly.

Figure 11: Proportion of Elderly LIHTC Projects in Urban and Suburban Areas

Source: OHFA 2006
4.3 Has the proportion of elderly projects in low-poverty areas increased?

To say that a LIHTC project is located in a suburban area does not necessarily prove that the project is in a low-poverty area. One of the nation’s housing goals is to locate subsidized housing away from areas with high poverty rates, as history has shown that concentrating poverty turns into a breeding ground for crime and violence with little chance of breaking that cycle. This section investigates if elderly LIHTC projects are more successful in penetrating low-poverty areas.

Table 6: Proportion of Elderly Projects in Low Poverty Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>All 5 Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1994</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 - 2000</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2006</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Years</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>18.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OHFA 2006

Figure 12: Proportion of Elderly LIHTC Projects in Low Poverty Census Tracts

Source: OHFA 2006

15 Low-poverty census tracts are those with less than 10 percent of households living below the poverty line.
The aggregated data for all five study areas shows that of the LIHTC projects located in low-poverty census tracts, almost 19 percent of them are targeted for the elderly. As the LIHTC program matured, the proportion of elderly projects in low-poverty areas increased from 8 to 33 percent. This increase could be explained by the increase in elderly projects over all or an increased acceptance of projects targeted for elderly persons by lower-poverty communities.

Throughout the life of the LIHTC program, the proportion of elderly projects in low-poverty census tracts ranges from 8 percent (in Cincinnati) to 25 percent (in Cleveland). Table 6 shows that from 2001 to 2006, in Columbus and Cleveland, over half of the projects placed in low-poverty census tracts were targeted for elderly persons, while Cincinnati, Toledo and Dayton show much lower proportions.

Table 7 shows the proportions of LIHTC projects targeted for elderly persons by census tract. For high-poverty census tracts (more than 30 percent of households living below the poverty line), only 13 percent of LIHTC projects are targeted for elderly persons, which means that 87 percent are targeted for populations such as families, mentally ill persons, or formerly homeless persons. About 21 percent of LIHTC projects located in moderate-poverty census tracts (10 to 30 percent of households living below poverty line) are elderly projects, and about 19 percent of LIHTC projects located in low-poverty census tracts are elderly projects. Table 7 also shows that the proportion of elderly projects (out of all LIHTC projects) in low-, moderate-, and high-poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;10% Poverty</th>
<th>10-30% Poverty</th>
<th>&gt;30% Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1994</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 - 2000</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>29.23%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2006</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
<td>25.27%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Years</td>
<td>18.63%</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OHFA 2006
census tracts increases as the program matures. For example, in the early years of the program (1989-1994), only 8 percent of LIHTC projects in low-poverty census tracts are designated for elderly populations. However, in the later years of the program (2001-2006), of all LIHTC projects in low-poverty census tracts, 33 percent of them are elderly projects. The proportion of elderly projects in all three types of census tracts has grown with time, showing an increasing attention to elderly LIHTC projects.

4.4 Conclusion

Kirk McClure (2006) asserted that the LIHTC program was moving to the suburbs. However, my findings for the State of Ohio refute McClure’s thesis. In fact, it appears that LIHTC projects are shifting from the suburbs to urban areas. In four out of the five metropolitan areas studied, the proportion of LIHTC projects located in suburban areas has decreased over the life of the LIHTC program. It is possible that Kirk McClure and I used different methods of investigation. Our definitions of “suburban” or data sets could have varied, which would have altered the results. Another explanation for the differing results is that McClure’s scale was national, and the scale of my study was the State of Ohio. This is important because each State Housing Finance Agency runs its LIHTC program differently, so this may account for the differences between Ohio’s LIHTC program and the program nationally.

This analysis also showed that the proportion of LIHTC projects targeted for elderly persons was higher in suburban areas than urban areas. Also significant is the fact that the proportion of elderly LIHTC developments in the suburbs was much higher in the most recent years of the program. It is possible that this increase reflects OHFA’s QAP
and the assignment of points in the application process for elderly projects. Or, it could be
due to an increasing acceptance of elderly projects in suburban areas.

The proportion of LIHTC projects targeted for the elderly was higher in low-and
moderate-poverty level census tracts than high-poverty census tracts. Also, the proportion
of elderly projects grew in all three types of census tracts with time, but grew most
dramatically in low-poverty areas. The increasing proportion of elderly projects in low-
and moderate-poverty areas could be due to an increasing willingness to accept elderly
projects over family projects in these lower-poverty areas.
Chapter 5: Locating LIHTC Elderly Developments – The Key Actors Speak Out

The intent of the interviews was to determine the motivation behind locating elderly Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) projects in particular areas and how community need, support, and opposition relate when trying to place a project in a community. I wanted to find out if the increasing attention to developing LIHTC projects targeted to elderly persons (as seen in Chapter 4) is due to the increased need for affordable elderly housing, the perceived reduced community opposition to elderly projects over family projects, or some combination of these reasons.

I interviewed 16 people (developers, community council members, and program officials from the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA), the Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Each conversation was unique, but eight themes were extracted from the interviews. The themes are: (1) motivation behind developing an elderly LIHTC project, (2) site selection, (3) the role of community need, (4) the role of community support, (5) community opposition issues, (6) the choice of LIHTC financing over a Section 202 grant, (7) the role of OHFA’s point system in location decisions, and (8) if elderly developments were replacing family developments because of the perceived reduced community opposition. Responses to these themes were categorized into nodes, with each node representing a type of response. The figures in this chapter summarize the node distribution for each theme. The results follow.
5.1 Motivation: “Why do you develop elderly LIHTC projects?”

Nine of the eleven developers interviewed cited their organization’s mission statement or strategic plan as a reason for why they develop elderly LIHTC projects. Developers that worked for a non-profits, such as the Columbus Housing Partnership or the Famicos Foundation, said they provide affordable housing for seniors because that is the mission of the organization. Examples of mission statements follow below.

Columbus Housing Partnership is a private, nonprofit organization founded in the belief that a decent and affordable home is the cornerstone of family life and a healthy community. Columbus Housing Partnership provides quality, affordable housing and related services to low to moderate income households in Columbus and the surrounding area. Through its activities, Columbus Housing Partnership is a partner in building communities and enhancing the lives of its residents (Columbus Housing Partnership 2007).

Mission Statement: To improve the quality of life with in Cuyahoga County through neighborhood revitalization, affordable housing and integrated social services (Famicos Foundation 2005).

Source: Author 2007

16 This question was asked to developers only.
Developers that worked for for-profit development companies cited the organization’s strategic plan as a reason for developing elderly affordable housing projects. Companies such as the Woda Group, the NRP Group, and Miller-Valentine invest in affordable housing projects as part of a strategic approach to target certain housing markets (Pechota 2007). These for-profit companies and organizations develop properties to add investments to the company’s portfolio, so the decision is profit driven.

Seven of the eleven developers (64 percent) said they develop elderly LIHTC projects based on a recognition of a need for affordable housing. This need is usually identified by a market study, but some developers said they recognized the need from their professional experience in the affordable housing community or from knowing the supply and demand in the community. Another developer (who works for a private development company) said that his reasoning for developing LIHTC projects is directed by OHFA’s market study, which outlines where housing is needed and what types of housing is needed.

“We just know there’s a need out there based on our wait list and how long we keep things [rental units] rented up” (Sutherland 2007).

“When we go into a community that we don’t know very well, we will hire someone to do a market study. This study shows the demographics, absorption rates, etc. And based on that, we can see if the project will be supported” (Sheridan 2007).

“As a developer, you are driven by OHFA’s market study and Qualified Allocation Plan” (Ludlow 2007).

Finally, a request from a community group to provide affordable housing in a specific area, was highlighted by three developers. Michelle Norris of National Church Residences said, “We’re well known in town [Columbus] and we have a lot of friends in town… people start talking years in advance and say, ‘wow, this area needs housing’, and you start putting together a plan” (Norris 2007). It is common for non-profit and
for-profit organizations to work together on a LIHTC project. This partnership allows the non-profit to help identify community needs and issues while the development and financing expertise is handled by the for-profit organization.

5.2 Site Selection: “How did you choose locations for elderly LIHTC projects?”

The responses to the question concerning the site selection criteria were categorized into six nodes. This shows that there is a variety of reasons that lead developers to choose a specific site. Key informants mentioned six criteria for locating elderly LIHTC projects: (Node 1) obtaining permission to locate a multifamily building in a particular zone, (Node 2) proximity to amenities, (Node 3) based on the market study, (Node 4) availability and control of the site, (Node 5) price of land acquisition and development, and (Node 6) fit into the neighborhood. Nodes 1, 2, and 3 received 5 responses each, and nodes 4, 5, and 6 received 3 responses each.

Figure 14: Theme 2 - Site Selection

Source: Author 2007

This question was asked to developers only.
Securing a piece of land that has the proper zoning for an apartment building or making sure that changing the zoning will not be a problem is an integral part of selecting a site for an elderly LIHTC project. Without proper zoning, the project can not legally locate in a specific area.

“Getting zoning change is very cumbersome and can be very expensive and unpredictable” (Norris 2007).

Proximity to amenities is also a crucial factor in choosing a location for an elderly LIHTC project. The amenities that developers try to locate projects near include grocery stores, pharmacies, and medical services such as doctors’ offices or clinics. Developers also try to locate projects near bus lines or other appropriate transportation routes to make sure seniors have accessibility to daily activities. It is also important to point out that developers consider different amenities for different populations. For example, locating close to a playground or a school may be an important factor for family affordable housing, but locating near pharmacies, medical centers, or senior centers is a priority for senior housing projects.

“We looked at several sites as far as geographic proximity to services, [public] transportation” (Cutcher 2007).

“We try to locate a project so that is in close proximity to amenities such as a bus stop, shopping, [a] grocery store, [a] pharmacy” (Pechota 2007).

Developers also cited the analysis of the market as a reason to develop in certain locations. A market study provides information regarding vacancy rates, market rents, the number or income-eligible renter households, and comparable rental developments in the market area\(^\text{18}\). Developers use this market analysis to identify areas that have a demand and lack of supply [for affordable senior housing] that they may able to fill (Woda 2007).

\(^{18}\) I was unable to find a definition for market area. Market study professionals may have the authority to delineate the area considered for the study.
In order to be able to provide affordable rents, developers can only spend a limited amount of funds on land acquisition and development. Sometimes a developer may select a site that may not be the most desirable [for a market rate project], but the developer simply can’t afford to spend a large amount of money on the purchase and improvement of land (Ludlow 2007). Because land costs are not calculated into the qualified basis of the tax credit amount, the more money a developer spends on land, the more he will have to cover through higher rents or additional gap financing.

Site availability and neighborhood fit are two other factors for site selections. For-profit developers may choose a site because a local non-profit group either had the site in their possession or point out the potential availability of a site. Also, making sure the project will fit into the neighborhood is important because if the project integrates into the community well, neighbors will have less opposition to the project (Glover 2007). The issue of community opposition is further investigated on page 56.

5.3 Community Need: “What role does community need for senior affordable housing play in placing projects?”

Responses associated with the community’s need for affordable senior housing were classified into three nodes. Node 1 responses reflected the notion that the community need is based on the market study or analysis, which shows the vacancy and absorption rates in order to determine if there is a potential market or “need” in the area. Node 2 was closely related to Node 1, but focused more on the need being based on the population and demographic in the area. Many communities are seeing a large increase in the baby boomer population groups and developers see an opportunity to fill the need based on the growth of the senior population. Node 3 responses concerned the changing
needs in senior affordable housing, such as the type of housing that seniors desire.

Nine interviewees mentioned the analysis of the market as an important factor in identifying the community’s need for affordable housing. If you build a project and no one rents it, there is a problem (Sheridan 2007). There must be a market for the project in order for the project to be successful financially. When asked why OHFA has been putting an emphasis on senior LIHTC projects recently, Kevin Clark cited the market as a factor. The market for affordable senior housing is really good, based on the need and low vacancy rates (Clark 2007).

Node 2, area demographics, was the second most popular node with 5 responses. Many communities across Ohio are seeing an increase in the senior population, and this trend does not seem to be slowing down (Clark 2007). Both developers and community
representatives are recognizing the growing baby boomer population and the need to provide affordable housing for this group.

“Of the 13 applications I submitted this year, 7 of them were elderly projects. This is due to the growing senior demographic that supports the need” (Pechota 2007).

Two interviewees, a developer and a program official, mentioned the need for [types of] affordable senior housing is changing. For example, one- or two-bedroom ranch style units with an attached garage have been very popular with the “young old” population (Keller 2007). There is a “new generation of seniors who are looking for a different type of housing” (Glover 2007). One informant said that in Tiffin, Ohio, the senior buildings with one-bedroom units and efficiencies built in the 1940s are not serving the seniors’ housing need very well as seniors now want the two- and three-bedroom units (Glover 2007). While it doesn’t seem likely that low-income seniors would be able to afford a three-bedroom apartment, I think the point is that seniors are downsizing from larger homes or apartments, and it is an easier transition if the housing space is similar to what they have been accustomed to.

5.4 Community Support: “What role does community support for the project play in the development process?”

Showing OHFA that the project has support from the community is a necessary step in the application process. It is perceived that community support is easier to get with an elderly project than a family project, so this question was asked to understand how much of the location decision relies on getting the support from the community.

Responses to the role of community support in the development process were grouped into four nodes. Node 1 responses highlighted OHFA requirements, such as a
resolutions or letters of support from the local government and local service providers, as community support factors. Responses that dealt with understanding the community opposition and evaluating if the support could be gained were grouped into Node 2. It is common for non-profit service providers and for-profit developers to partner on LIHTC projects. The for-profit organization’s relationship to the local non-profit group helps them to get additional community support. This active seeking of local ties was highlighted in Node 3 responses. Finally, the fourth node points out the role of community support in helping to get extra funding from local resources.

Node 1 responses show that getting evidence of community support is crucial for projects to score well in OHFA’s competitive application process. Six interviewees mentioned the importance of getting community support as a requirement for the project to have a successful application. This evidence of support is shown through resolutions

Figure 16: Theme 4 - Community Support
from the community council or letters of support from local officials and organizations.

“It [community support] is a strong, competitive factor. We require resolutions from the community council and letters of support from other local organizations as we want to fund the best projects” (Clark 2007).

Four interviewees cited the process of estimating potential opposition from the community and the likelihood of resolving tensions and concerns (Node 2) when talking about local support for projects. A developer will speak to local key informants to get a feel for the temperature of the opposition to an affordable housing project. Then, if the developer thinks there is a possibility to take some of the heat off of the opposition issues, he will try to work with the community through meetings with local officials and public hearings to take the opposition from “hot” to “cool” (Pechota 2007).

“Talking with the public officials gives us an idea of how they feel about the deal. If there is opposition, you meet with the groups to figure out what the opposition is about (population, design, location) and how you may resolve it” (Cutcher 2007).

Node 3 responses involved getting local support by working with a local organization. Non-profit service providers that are partners on LIHTC deals can help the for-profit developer get resolutions and letters from the community council as non-profit groups often have strong ties and relationships to the community (Glover 2007). The partnership with a local service provider not only helps the project’s quality by adding a needed service or amenity, but the relationship can serve as a gateway to contacting local public officials (Cutcher 2007). This partnership is very common in LIHTC projects as it provides an easy way to get more points.

A developer’s reputation and willingness to work with the community plays a key role in gaining community support for an affordable housing project. Responses in Node
4 highlighted cases where a project was better received because of the positive experience a developer had within the community and cases where the community was weary of the project due to the developer’s poor reputation. One case involved a well-known developer pulling out of a project due to the turmoil it was causing in the community. The community council member said that this action spoke very highly of the developer as the organization showed its sensitivity to the community’s concerns. Because of this withdrawal, the community was willing to reconsider a project from this developer that addressed concerns about the location and design of the project, as the community appreciated the developer’s willingness to work with the community, not against it (Boroff 2007). Finally, the response in Node 5 mentioned the importance of getting community support in a financial aspect.

Most LIHTC projects involve multiple layers of funding, and it is important to have the support of the community in order to secure additional funds from local resources (Norris 2007).

5.5 Community Opposition: “What extent of community opposition to projects do you experience?”

The biggest issue that interviewees cited in terms of community opposition was the general not in my backyard (NIMBY) attitude and the fear that negative externalities such as increased noise, congestion, and crime would spill over into current residents’ neighborhood. A number of key informants also noted that the misconception and stereotypes about the type of affordable housing project and the residents the project would serve produces community opposition. Lastly, some community members argue that the community has enough rental housing and they don’t see a need to add more. Similarly, landlords oppose new affordable housing projects as they don’t want their old apartment buildings to have to compete with the new ones.
NIMBY attitudes usually stem from people not wanting something in their backyard because of the negative externalities associated with it. In the past, subsidized housing projects have been associated with increased levels of noise, congestion, and crime. So, it is natural that residents oppose subsidized housing coming into their neighborhood to try to keep the crime and violence out of their backyards. However, one interviewee reported that actual amount of crime does not increase with the addition of subsidized housing projects, but it appears that way due to the concentration of households.

“There were concerns from existing families about the added crime, congestion, and noise on the streets. However, my conversations with the police show that they don’t see any higher concentration of problems. For example, if you put 100 single-family units on 100 acres, you may have 3 crime reports. But, put those 100 families on 10 acres, and if you have those 3 crime reports, it sounds worse” (Boroff 2007).
People’s stereotypical ideas about what affordable housing projects are and who lives in those projects often lead to community opposition issues. When some people here the term “subsidized housing”, they think of a high-rise building filled with drugs and violence. The term “low-income” household conjures up images of drug abuse, criminal activity, and welfare. However, these notions are often inaccurate as low-income residents have full-time jobs but cannot afford to spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing and subsidized housing does not always equal “the projects”.

My interviews with developers and community council members pointed out that community residents often have misconceptions about targeted populations and affordable housing projects. Given the opportunity to explain the truths regarding the population to be served, and the project, developers are often successful in relieving the concerns of the community.

“The people that are opposing affordable rental projects … don’t see low-income people as police officers, school teachers, or public service workers. The ironic thing is that the people that are complaining about “those people” would actually qualify to be one of “those people” that live in an affordable housing project” (Stands 2007).

“We still experience opposition … but when we explain the population that will live in the project, people can usually identify and aunt, uncle, or friend that would qualify to live in the project, which makes them more comfortable with the idea of affordable senior housing. The other thing is that they realize that the project is serving their community and not necessarily bringing in new people to the community” (Terlecki 2007).

Landlords often oppose new affordable rental housing projects as they don’t want the competition. In order to stay competitive in the rental market, landlords may have to fix up their deteriorating housing, which costs time and money. They especially oppose the new affordable housing developments if they are having trouble renting and maintaining their properties (Glover 2007). Some residents cite vacancy rates in existing
rental units as a reason to oppose new affordable housing projects. They say that they “have enough rental” housing in their community and don’t need any more.

5.5.a. Ease in Senior Placement

Many interviewees agreed that elderly housing is an easier sell to communities when trying to place LIHTC developments. The reasons given for elderly housing being more desirable than family housing are: performance level, lack of children, and an acceptance or understanding of the need to house the community’s older residents.

“Elderly developments are much more well-received by communities than family developments. But, we’ve seen certain communities that are just opposed to affordable housing” (Woda 2007).

First of all, elderly LIHTC developments outperform family LIHTC developments. There is a better market for elderly projects in terms of vacancy rates and need, and elderly projects are a more stable investment as the projects don’t have as much wear and tear due to a more mature tenant. “In our portfolio, our occupancy rates and debt coverage ratios for our elderly projects far out perform our family projects and we see this consistently. It takes a bit longer to lease up elderly projects, but once they are leased, they stay leased pretty well” (Keller 2007).

Typically, elderly projects present less of a burden to a community than family projects. Obviously, households with children bring some congestion and noise, but the more pressing issue with family housing for communities is the potential strain on the school system. While it is a great opportunity for a low-income family to attend a

19 The reduced amount of crime and uncivil behavior associated with elderly projects was surprisingly not mentioned in the interviews. However, I assume this is also a reason for reduced opposition towards elderly projects over family projects.
school in a more affluent community, the school district may struggle to integrate low-income students and provide additional supportive services for a population that is not bringing additional tax revenue to the community to help pay for the school system. In the Cleveland area, a community opposed a family affordable housing project because the Mayor said that he did not want the school system to suffer due to an influx of poor families moving to the area (Anoliefo 2007).

Existing residents seem to understand the need to provide affordable housing to the older population. Most people can identify with getting older and living on a reduced income, as it will likely happen to them. One developer said that when the targeted population is explained, many people reduce their opposing attitudes as they can think of a neighbor, friend, or aunt that would fit the income-level qualifications to live in the housing project.

5.6 Financing Selection: “Why did you choose to finance the project with the LIHTC tax credit program over a Section 202 grant?”

Both the LIHTC program and the HUD Section 202 program serve as mechanisms to help finance subsidized affordable housing. However, the LIHTC program is investor driven with income limitations, while the Section 202 program is developed by non-profit entities and provides a project based rental subsidy (Wilson 2007). When asked why the LIHTC program is utilized to fund affordable housing projects (as opposed to applying for a Section 202 grant), respondents cited a variety of factors, which were categorized into 3 nodes: (Node 1) the flexibility and additional equity offered in the LIHTC program, (Node 2) comfort and knowledge with the tax credit program, and (Node 3) that LIHTC funding was just one of many layers in funding a project.
Ten responses dealt with the LIHTC program offering more funds and more project flexibility than the Section 202 program. Some developers don’t apply for 202 grants because the can get more funds with the tax credit program. One developer noted that the 202 program is extremely competitive and short on funds, with only 2 or 3 buildings in the state per year (Norris 2007). Also, the LIHTC program allows developments more flexibility in location, design, and project type. State housing finance agencies have the discretion to distribute tax credits, but the types of projects developed is left up to the private sector.

“…tax credit program has more fund availability and the program is more flexible so you are able to do more different kinds of projects” (Norris 2007).

“The tax credit allows us to put more money into our projects” (Terlecki 2007).

---

20 This statement was inaccurate. Eight to ten buildings per year utilize 202 funds.
The next most popular response was Node 2, which was that the developer was comfortable with the complexity of the tax credit or the organization specialized in using the tax credit to finance projects. Some organizations specialize in Section 202 grants and others specialize in tax credits because of the complexity of the programs (Sutherland 2007). It takes time and skill to become comfortable with the LIHTC program, so it makes sense to stick to a program that a developer knows fairly well (Ludlow 2007).

Finally, Node 3 represents an identification of the tax credit being just one layer in the total financing package of projects. Chapter two touched on the issue of the tax credit not covering the total cost of the project, creating a need to pursue additional funding to cover the gap in financing layers. In many cases, the LIHTC funds are not enough, and other funds must be pursued to cover the project’s expenses (Ludlow 2007).

“Most of these deals have many layers of funding. They are very sophisticated” (Cutcher 2007).

5.7 OHFA Structure: “How does OHFA’s Qualified Allocation Plan guide the location decisions behind the project?”

The objective of OHFA’s Qualified Allocation Plan is to outline what criteria OHFA will score on project applications. When asked about the extent of OHFA’s role in guiding development decisions, interviewees offered two types of responses. Node 1 responses emphasized the need to maximize the QAP points in order to have a competitive chance of receiving tax credits. Five respondents said they decided to forgo the competitive points in favor of the quality of the project or mentioned that OHFA was moving to a more subjective application process to consider projects that may not score well by QAP standards but are viable affordable housing projects.
Thirteen key informants indicated the need to maximize the point score on their application. If an application cannot score all of the points, it will not be competitive with the others (Sutherland 2007). The tax credit program is very competitive, so applicants, of course, want to maximize their chances for consideration.

“We, like all our competitors, are trying to maximize all the points in order to maximize the chances of getting our projects funded” (Woda 2007).

“It’s a very competitive program, so every point counts” (Anoliefo 2007).

Key informants said that OHFA definitely has the capacity to entice certain types of projects in certain types of areas. If there are points allocated in the application process for certain populations to serve or project characteristics, developers will make every attempt to secure those points to maximize the chance of funding (Terlecki 2007). The state housing finance agencies have the capacity to direct LIHTC development by
changing the point scoring system in their Qualified Allocation Plans according to the state’s political climate. For example, if the hot issue is immigrant housing in Arizona, the state agency will do something to address this need (Norris 2007). OHFA’s last QAP included 5 out of 80 points for senior housing (OHFA QAP 2007), which shows OHFA wants developers to satisfy the need for senior housing.

OHFA, like many other state housing finance agencies, continues to evolve their scoring system (Anoliefo 2007). For the 2006 program year, OHFA specifically stated in the Qualified Allocation Plan that it would be allocating tax credits on a more discretionary level (OHFA QAP 2006), which would allow more flexibility in project development.

Sometimes developers will forgo maximizing the points on the application in favor of maintaining the quality or purpose of the project. In one case, a non-profit organization decided to submit an application for a project that was located in an area that OHFA would not be scoring high, based on their market study results. The organization was successful in arguing that the neighborhood the project was targeted for had a need for affordable housing, but was not quantified by OHFA as the market study was based on a larger scale (Cutcher 2007).

“If you have a compelling project that doesn’t get funded, there is an avenue by which they [OHFA] have hearings where you can try to get OHFA to change their scoring criteria to get projects that are not competitive under the current scoring system a chance for funding the next year” (Norris 2007).

5.8 Replacing family projects with elderly projects?

Six respondents agreed with the notion that elderly projects are being developed more and more because they receive less opposition than family projects. Showing OHFA
that the project is supported by the community is an important step in obtaining the tax credits. So, if a developer thinks that the support will be very difficult to obtain, he may choose to develop another project in a different community where he is sure to satisfy that requirement.

“In the 2007 QAP to gain maximum points you needed to obtain certain letters of support. Obviously, these letters from officials are easier to obtain if they are supporting housing for the elderly” (Terlecki 2007).

“I have had discussions with developers who indicated they had proposed senior housing in certain communities because locally-elected officials would offer their support, and would not support family housing” (Clark 2007).

However, the reduced amount of opposition is not the only factor in deciding to develop elderly projects. Five respondents noted that elderly developments are increasingly being developed in response to a low supply and a high demand for senior
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housing. The elderly population (including a lower-income segment) is growing faster than the population as a whole (Keller 2007), so there is a need to house this population. Also, there is a need to supply seniors with the types (newer and larger units) of housing that they desire.

“...If you look at the growth rates provided in the statewide market study done for OHFA, few if any counties or markets have an increased rate of growth on the family side. In contrast, due in large part to the baby boom generation, 55+ growth rates are increasing in almost all of the same counties and markets. Further, on the supply side, current apartments in all areas of Ohio lack the accommodation and amenities seniors are seeking. The lack of supply and high demand is the driver for us” (Pechota 2007).

“We typically choose our housing type based on the market demand. We have not shifted our focus due to this perceived ‘ease in placement’” (Woda 2007).

“The driving force behind senior projects is related to supply and demand. We have 98 senior units located in two separate projects. All units are occupied and we have a waiting list of 250 households wanting a unit. Demographic realities and the lack of senior housing in a condominium style product is driving this trend [of increased attention to elderly projects over family projects]” (Knapp 2007).

Other responses highlighted that elderly projects are easier to manage and perform better financially. First of all, there is generally less wear and tear on senior properties due to a more mature tenant (Sheridan 2007). Secondly, seniors generally have a more stable income than a young family with children, so the income stream from elderly persons is more reliable.

Some developers choose to develop elderly projects over family projects due to the additional points score they receive (5 additional points out of 80 points for an elderly project (OHFA QAP 2006, 37)) on their application. The State’s Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP) is designed to attract certain types of development in which OHFA recognizes a need, and developers want to get all the points possible (Norris 2007).
Lastly, two developers disagreed with the notion that elderly projects are being
developed in place of family developments because of reduced community opposition.
One interviewee said that he had to attend seventeen community meetings to gain support
for a senior housing project (Knapp 2007),21 which shows that in some communities,
obtaining support can be an uphill battle, even for elderly projects. Contrasting that
statement was a response by a for-profit developer saying that community opposition (for
families or elderly persons) could be overcome given the chance to show the quality of
the project to those who are opposed to it.

“We have found that if we have a good development (elderly or family) in a market
with a demand, we can always get support and approval for the development
irrespective of the location in a city or suburban area” (Pechota 2007).

5.9 Conclusions

From these interviews, I would conclude, first and foremost, that OHFA has a
very strong role in guiding the types and locations of LIHTC projects to be developed
in Ohio. The scoring criterion is a driving force in preparing an application for LIHTC
funding. OHFA receives triple the amount of applications that they have funds to allocate
credit for, so they have the luxury of looking for projects that score well on a variety of
factors, including community need and community support (Clark 2007).

Community need and community support work together in the development of
LIHTC projects. Without a market or a tenant base, the project will not be able to fare
well financially. If the developer is unable to get community support, it will be difficult
to maximize the application’s score, and it will be an uphill battle to ward off community

21 But he might never have succeeded despite the number of meetings if it were a family
development.
opposition. However, most developers agreed that community support is easier to obtain for elderly projects than for family projects.

While the idea that elderly LIHTC projects receive less community opposition than family projects was supported, this was not the only factor causing developers to become involved in elderly LIHTC projects. Elderly projects are a better financial investment as there is less wear and tear than family projects and they stay rented up for a longer period of time due to the high demand for senior affordable housing. The senior population is growing at a rapid rate, and developers can capitalize on this demographic. Thus, three factors promote elderly LIHTC developments: (1) the expected growth of the elderly population and the housing demand associated with it, (2) community support is relatively easy to obtain, and (3) there is less financial risk for this type of project.
Chapter 6: The Future of Ohio’s LIHTC Program

In a *Housing Policy Debate* article, Kirk McClure asserted that the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program was going mainstream and moving to the suburbs. However, nothing was said about the proportion of elderly projects in suburban areas. Subsidized housing for the elderly typically receives less community opposition than family housing projects, so the increasing acceptance of elderly LIHTC projects in the suburbs may be an explanation for the observed shift. This thesis investigated if elderly LIHTC projects were increasingly being developed in an attempt to avoid the community opposition that is associated with family subsidized housing or in response to a growing need for affordable senior housing.

6.1 Conclusions

I first wanted to investigate if the tax credit program was following the national trend and moving to the suburbs in the State of Ohio. I then wanted to find out if there was a disproportionate representation of elderly projects in the suburbs. Since subsidized housing targeted for elderly persons is generally more welcomed than non-elderly projects such as families and mentally ill persons, I suspected that this would explain why the LIHTC program is moving to the suburbs nationally.

Through mapping analysis, I found that the Low Income Housing Tax Credit is not moving from urban to suburban areas in Ohio. In fact, the proportion of LIHTC projects developed in urban areas has increased over the 18 year life span of the program. For the five metropolitan areas studied (Columbus, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, and Dayton), LIHTC production was split fairly evenly in the suburbs and central cities in
the early years of the program (early 1990s). However, in the later years of the program (early 2000s), about 62 percent of LIHTC projects were placed in urban areas and 38 percent were placed in suburban areas. This shows that in Ohio, the LIHTC program is not shifting to the suburbs. It is important to note that each state housing finance agency has the authority to allocate tax credits in the manner it chooses. So, it may be the case that OHFA distributes its tax credits through a different scoring process than other states, which would explain why Ohio differs from the national trend found by Kirk McClure.

Furthermore, the proportion of suburban elderly projects has increased as the LIHTC program has matured. In the early years of the program, about 8 percent of LIHTC projects located in suburban areas were targeted for the elderly. However, this proportion rose to 38 percent in the most recent years of the program. Some metropolitan areas saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of suburban projects targeted for the elderly. For example, in the earlier years of Ohio’s LIHTC program, only 11 and 7 percent of suburban LIHTC projects were elderly projects in the Columbus and Cleveland areas. However, this statistic rose to 45 and 44 percent, respectively, in the most recent years of the program.

To understand why elderly LIHTC developments in the suburbs has increased, I interviewed 16 housing and planning officials and asked: Was this increase in suburban LIHTC development due to an increased need for affordable housing or because neighbors are generally less opposed to elderly subsidized housing than family subsidized housing? I found that while developers must show the Ohio Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) that the project satisfies a need for affordable housing in the area through a formal market study and that the project is supported by the locality through letters of

---

22 These statistics refer to the aggregated data for the five metropolitan areas studied.
support from the local government, elected officials, or local social services agencies, obtaining the support is much more of a decision factor when deciding where to locate elderly LIHTC projects.

Elderly developments are increasingly popular with developers. However, the notion that elderly subsidized housing generally receives less opposition than family subsidized housing is not the only reason for the increasing attention to these projects. They are also a better financial investment for developers. Elderly developments are relatively risk free because the senior population continues to grow, and advocacy groups actively support the need for affordable housing developments for the elderly.

6.2 Recommendations

I advocate for more research on state housing finance agencies. This thesis shows that Ohio’s Qualified Allocation Plan rewards project proposals that are targeted for elderly persons (through additional points) and requires proof of support from the community. This support is easier to get for elderly projects than family projects, so elderly projects are increasingly being developed. It would be useful to understand how other states develop their Qualified Allocation Plans to address certain housing needs in different regions and how the features of the application process affect funding for elderly versus family developments.

I recommend a more subjective scoring process for state housing finance agencies. This could be done either through local level input or a two-part scoring system. Some developers noted that the state level market studies carried out to identify areas of housing need were too broad and did not focus on local housing issues (e.g. the need for
senior housing in certain neighborhoods or seniors’ desire for two-bedroom units instead of efficiencies). Key informants from different cities and regions could provide the state with useful local information regarding the supply and demand of affordable housing in that region. They could also serve as the initial screen to either weed out projects that are not viable for particular areas or could help in prioritizing projects. It may be beneficial to first rank projects based on scoring criteria and then allocate tax credits based on a subjective review of highly-ranked projects. This would allow a chance of funding for LIHTC projects that may not score well on paper, but may be innovative or satisfy some need that OHFA failed to recognize.

Lastly, I encourage housing researchers and policy makers to identify “best practice” examples where affordable housing is accepted into communities and then has beneficial impacts in both LIHTC residents and neighbors. Much research highlights the wrongs of subsidized housing and why communities try to keep out affordable housing, but what about communities, policy makers, and housing developers who are trying to improve the quality of subsidized housing, including its image? It is important to identify the innovative techniques or strategies in successfully providing affordable housing options in suburban as well as urban locations. Such research could go a long way toward providing decent, safe, and affordable housing for all.
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Appendices

1. Interview Questions

Questions for OHFA Key Informants
1. Why has there been an increase in elderly LIHTC in the past few years?
2. Have there been changes in OHFA policies or formulas that encourage elderly LIHTC developments in general? What about in certain areas?
3. What types of organizations (non-profit, for-profit, joint venture) seek to develop elderly LIHTC?
4. What factor does community need for affordable housing play in the likelihood of an application being accepted?
5. What factor does community support for a project play in the likelihood of an application being accepted?

Questions for Section 202 Key Informant
1. How many Section 202 grants get distributed throughout Ohio per year?
2. In what types of areas do Section 202 projects get developed? Urban, Suburban?
3. What factor does community need for affordable housing play in the likelihood of granting a Section 202? (How important is this requirement in the application process?)
4. What factor does community support for a project play in the likelihood of granting a Section 202?
5. Have any projects been rejected due to a lack of either community support or community need?
6. Are there any recent changes or phenomena in Section 202s in Ohio? Such as the community support resolution requirements?
7. Is there competition with LIHTC? What are the major differences of the Section 202 program?

Questions for Developers
1. Why do you develop affordable housing projects? Where does the initiative to develop projects come from?
2. What were the reasons behind the site selection?
3. Did you consider other locations? Why were those sites not chosen (What do you look for or try to avoid when choosing a site)?
4. What role did community acceptance/rejection play in the location decision?
5. If there was community opposition, what were the complaints?
6. Have you experienced any problems with other projects being unsuccessful due to lack of community support? For elderly?
7. What role did community need of affordable elderly housing did play in the location decision?
8. Why did you choose LIHTC financing over Section 202?
9. How did OHFA policies (point system, formulas) affect your location decision or the decision to designate the project for elderly person?

Questions for Local Government Officials (Housing Authority/City Council Member)
1. How great is the need for affordable housing for the elderly in your community?
2. How has the community reacted to LIHTC projects in general?
3. How has the community reacted to elderly LIHTC projects?
2. Summary Tables

2.1 Columbus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Total Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Elderly</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10: low</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>90.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>76.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30: mod</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>93.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
<td>84.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>88.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+: high</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
<td>84.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Cincinnati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Total</th>
<th>Elderly Total</th>
<th>Suburban Elderly</th>
<th>Suburban Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Urban Elderly</th>
<th>Urban Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Elderly</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Poverty Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10: low</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30: mod</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+: high</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 15 | 116 | 131 | 11.45% | 88.55% |
## 2.3 Cleveland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Total Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Elderly</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89-94 | 29 | 1 | 30 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 43 | 2 | 45 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Total Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Elderly</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95-00 | 26 | 5 | 31 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 39 | 6 | 45 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Total Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total Elderly</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

01-06 | 27 | 12 | 39 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 36 | 19 | 55 |

Sums | 82 | 18 | 100 | 36 | 9 | 45 | 118 | 27 | 145 |

### Poverty Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>78.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
<td>75.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 0-10: low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL | 27      | 118         | 145   | 18.62%    | 81.38%        |
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## 2.4 Toledo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Total</th>
<th>Elderly Total</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10: low</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30: mod</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+: high</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>78.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82
2.5 Dayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Elderly Urban</th>
<th>Total Urban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Elderly Suburban</th>
<th>Total Suburban</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Total Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elderly</th>
<th>Non-Elderly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Elderly</th>
<th>% Non-Elderly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10: low</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>80.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30: mod</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+: high</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>72.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Maps
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