

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 1. Regional, Rural, and Urban Funding Amounts

The table below shows the allocation of funds to the 13 State Service Regions and the

1	Lubbock	\$1,767,334	5.2%	\$1,766,998	100.0%	\$337	0.0%
2	Abilene	\$1,226,328	3.6%	\$1,202,475	98.1%	\$23,852	1.9%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$7,337,601	21.6%	\$2,668,075	36.4%	\$4,669,525	63.6%
4	Tyler	\$4,042,030	11.9%	\$3,579,279	88.6%	\$462,751	11.4%
5	Beaumont	\$2,180,976	6.4%	\$1,814,741	83.2%	\$366,235	16.8%
6	Houston	\$1,696,435	5.0%	\$718,469	42.4%	\$977,966	57.6%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$600,730	1.8%	\$217,953	36.3%	\$382,777	63.7%
8	Waco	\$873,439	2.6%	\$545,540	62.5%	\$327,899	37.5%
9	San Antonio	\$1,858,342	5.5%	\$1,367,606	73.6%	\$490,737	26.4%
10	Corpus Christi	\$2,718,160	8.0%	\$1,675,580	61.6%	\$1,042,580	38.4%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$8,032,661	23.6%	\$3,643,854	45.4%	\$4,388,807	54.6%
12	San Angelo	\$1,644,450	4.8%	\$991,705	60.3%	\$652,746	39.7%
13	El Paso	\$31,328	0.1%	\$22,499	71.8%	\$8,829	28.2%
Total		\$34,009,814	100.0%	\$20,214,773	59.4%	\$13,795,041	40.6%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 2. Regional Measures of Affordable Housing Need

Total RAF Funding: **\$ 34,009,814**

Region	Poverty			Rental Cost Burden			Overcrowding			Substandard Housing			Combined Need Measures	
	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount		
	50%		\$ 17,004,907	36%		\$ 12,243,533	12%		\$ 4,081,178	2%		\$ 680,196		
	# of Persons	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Need Based %
1	50,196	5%	\$ 823,148	18,473	4%	\$ 484,844	5,377	4%	\$ 178,210	791	3%	\$ 19,907	\$ 1,506,110	4.4%
2	44,239	4%	\$ 725,461	16,432	4%	\$ 431,297	2,409	2%	\$ 79,829	736	3%	\$ 18,514	\$ 1,255,102	3.7%
3	146,400	14%	\$ 2,400,767	122,983	26%	\$ 3,227,899	21,890	18%	\$ 725,536	3,580	13%	\$ 90,072	\$ 6,444,274	18.9%
4	120,697	12%	\$ 1,979,272	49,593	11%	\$ 1,301,659	8,368	7%	\$ 277,357	2,548	9%	\$ 64,105	\$ 3,622,392	10.7%
5	67,976	7%	\$ 1,114,717	25,520	5%	\$ 669,825	4,358	4%	\$ 144,447	1,394	5%	\$ 35,076	\$ 1,964,065	5.8%
6	132,272	13%	\$ 2,169,086	54,816	12%	\$ 1,438,743	14,861	12%	\$ 492,542	2,307	9%	\$ 58,036	\$ 4,158,407	12.2%
7	16,900	2%	\$ 277,138	53,564	11%	\$ 1,405,869	9,861	8%	\$ 326,827	1,848	7%	\$ 46,506	\$ 2,056,340	6.0%
8	43,630	4%	\$ 715,474	23,182	5%	\$ 608,442	4,695	4%	\$ 155,602	984	4%	\$ 24,752	\$ 1,504,270	4.4%
9	53,089	5%	\$ 870,590	25,324	5%	\$ 664,672	5,555	5%	\$ 184,100	1,488	6%	\$ 37,447	\$ 1,756,809	5.2%
10	79,406	8%	\$ 1,302,154	22,185	5%	\$ 582,285	6,809	6%	\$ 225,667	1,663	6%	\$ 41,832	\$ 2,151,937	6.3%
11	213,493	21%	\$ 3,501,004	30,798	7%	\$ 808,354	29,451	24%	\$ 976,144	7,371	27%	\$ 185,458	\$ 5,470,960	16.1%
12	54,788	5%	\$ 898,451	16,163	3%	\$ 424,232	4,580	4%	\$ 151,786	893	3%	\$ 22,457	\$ 1,496,925	4.4%
13	13,882	1%	\$ 227,646	7,445	2%	\$ 195,411	4,922	4%	\$ 163,129	1,432	5%	\$ 36,034	\$ 622,221	1.8%
Ttl.	1,036,968	100%	\$ 17,004,907	466,480	100%	\$ 12,243,533	123,134	100%	\$ 4,081,178	27,036	100%	\$ 680,196	\$ 34,009,814	100%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 3. Regional Distribution of Available Housing Resources

Region	HTF	HOPWA	PHA Capital	S8	USDA MF	USDA RA	HTC	MF Bond	HTC w/ Bond	USDA SF	SF Bond	HOME	Region's Resource Total	Region's Resource %
1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,348,088	\$ 1,848,605	\$ -	\$ 253,334	\$ 6,086,720	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,003,528	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 3,696,200	\$ 20,236,475	3.7%
2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,629,560	\$ 2,666,574	\$ -	\$ 285,852	\$ 6,931,568	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,913,536	\$ -	\$ 3,443,200	\$ 20,870,290	3.8%
3	\$ 226,250	\$ -	\$ 3,397,462	\$ 24,245,225	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 474,283	\$ 33,330,864	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,781,024	\$ 19,046,433	\$ 1,232,995	\$ 90,234,536	16.3%
4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,652,691	\$ 8,210,199	\$ -	\$ 423,650	\$ 23,241,112	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,256,750	\$ 157,490	\$ 6,121,120	\$ 52,063,012	9.4%
5	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ 2,215,919	\$ 6,170,028	\$ -	\$ 233,723	\$ 14,998,384	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,902,956	\$ 930,343	\$ 1,859,853	\$ 28,401,206	5.1%
6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 909,218	\$ 17,498,196	\$ -	\$ 314,258	\$ 40,113,736	\$ 13,320,665	\$ -	\$ 1,333,544	\$ 29,298,525	\$ 4,830,760	\$ 107,618,902	19.5%
7	\$ 144,000	\$ -	\$ 1,899,042	\$ 6,505,919	\$ -	\$ 166,402	\$ 16,193,112	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,390,171	\$ 27,990,551	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 57,089,197	10.3%
8	\$ 4,502	\$ -	\$ 2,325,379	\$ 14,045,257	\$ -	\$ 330,742	\$ 15,276,864	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,121,376	\$ 1,603,447	\$ -	\$ 34,707,567	6.3%
9	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,070,020	\$ 5,224,541	\$ -	\$ 121,174	\$ 8,588,056	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,880,837	\$ 3,490,752	\$ 4,532,299	\$ 26,907,679	4.9%
10	\$ 54,000	\$ -	\$ 2,951,691	\$ 10,528,274	\$ -	\$ 204,752	\$ 5,461,456	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,725,069	\$ 836,860	\$ 3,014,800	\$ 25,776,902	4.7%
11	\$ 74,500	\$ -	\$ 4,509,923	\$ 18,675,292	\$ -	\$ 216,121	\$ 8,081,088	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,770,525	\$ 2,451,791	\$ 2,512,797	\$ 47,292,037	8.6%
12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,139,267	\$ 846,572	\$ -	\$ 88,053	\$ 15,694,888	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,001,864	\$ -	\$ 2,164,800	\$ 21,935,444	4.0%
13	\$ 434,985	\$ -	\$ 344,966	\$ 3,776,799	\$ -	\$ 35,073	\$ 8,449,744	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,238,448	\$ 3,440,012	\$ -	\$ 19,720,028	3.6%
Total	\$ 1,028,237	\$ -	\$ 29,393,226	\$ 120,241,481	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 3,147,419	\$ 202,447,592	\$ 13,320,665	\$ -	\$ 52,319,628	\$ 94,246,204	\$ 35,208,824	\$ 552,853,275	100%
% of Total Resources	0.2%	0.0%	5.3%	21.7%	0.3%	0.6%	36.6%	2.4%	0.0%	9.5%	17.0%	6.4%		

% of Resources not Regionally Allocated: 100.0%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 4. Regional Available Housing Resources Funding Adjustment

Region	Difference between Resources and Need			Over Allocated Regional Resource Differences						Under Allocated Regional Resource Differences				
	Region's Resource %	Region's Need Based %	Resource Difference	Over Allocated Resource Differences	Over Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Under Allocated Resource Differences	Under Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	3.7%	4.4%	-0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,506,110	-	-	-1%	-5%	261,225	\$ 1,506,110	\$ 261,225
2	3.8%	3.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	(28,774)	1,255,102	(1,255,102)	(28,774)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
3	16.3%	18.9%	-2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-	6,444,274	-	-	-3%	-17%	893,326	\$ 6,444,274	\$ 893,326
4	9.4%	10.7%	-1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	3,622,392	-	-	-1%	-8%	419,638	\$ 3,622,392	\$ 419,638
5	5.1%	5.8%	-0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,964,065	-	-	-1%	-4%	216,911	\$ 1,964,065	\$ 216,911
6	19.5%	12.2%	7.2%	7.2%	47.6%	(2,461,973)	4,158,407	(4,158,407)	(2,461,973)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
7	10.3%	6.0%	4.3%	4.3%	28.2%	(1,455,610)	2,056,340	(2,056,340)	(1,455,610)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
8	6.3%	4.4%	1.9%	1.9%	12.2%	(630,831)	1,504,270	(1,504,270)	(630,831)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
9	4.9%	5.2%	-0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,756,809	-	-	0%	-2%	101,533	\$ 1,756,809	\$ 101,533
10	4.7%	6.3%	-1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-	2,151,937	-	-	-2%	-11%	566,223	\$ 2,151,937	\$ 566,223
11	8.6%	16.1%	-7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	-	5,470,960	-	-	-8%	-50%	2,561,701	\$ 5,470,960	\$ 2,561,701
12	4.0%	4.4%	-0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,496,925	-	-	0%	-3%	147,525	\$ 1,496,925	\$ 147,525
13	3.6%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	11.4%	(590,894)	622,221	(622,221)	(590,894)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
Ttl.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	15.2%	100.0%	(5,168,081)	34,009,814	(9,596,341)	(5,168,081)	-15%	-100%	5,168,081	\$ 34,009,814	\$ 5,168,081

State Resource Difference: 15.2%
 Total RAF Funding: 34,009,814
 State Over Allocated Resource Amount: (5,168,081)
 Regional Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 100.0%

State Under Allocated Resource Amount

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 5. Regional Funding Amounts

Region	Place for Geographic Reference	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Funding Amount	Region's Funding Percentage
1	Lubbock	\$ 1,506,110	\$ 261,225	\$ 1,767,334	5.2%
2	Abilene	\$ 1,255,102	\$ (28,774)	\$ 1,226,328	3.6%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$ 6,444,274	\$ 893,326	\$ 7,337,601	21.6%
4	Tyler	\$ 3,622,392	\$ 419,638	\$ 4,042,030	11.9%
5	Beaumont	\$ 1,964,065	\$ 216,911	\$ 2,180,976	6.4%
6	Houston	\$ 4,158,407	\$ (2,461,973)	\$ 1,696,435	5.0%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$ 2,056,340	\$ (1,455,610)	\$ 600,730	1.8%
8	Waco	\$ 1,504,270	\$ (630,831)	\$ 873,439	2.6%
9	San Antonio	\$ 1,756,809	\$ 101,533	\$ 1,858,342	5.5%
10	Corpus Christi	\$ 2,151,937	\$ 566,223	\$ 2,718,160	8.0%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$ 5,470,960	\$ 2,561,701	\$ 8,032,661	23.6%
12	San Angelo	\$ 1,496,925	\$ 147,525	\$ 1,644,450	4.8%
13	El Paso	\$ 622,221	\$ (590,894)	\$ 31,328	0.1%
Ttl.		\$ 34,009,814	\$ -	\$ 34,009,814	100%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

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

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight: 50%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Persons	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Persons	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,767,334	\$ 883,667	49,785	100%	\$ 883,667	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 1,226,328	\$ 613,164	37,625	99%	\$ 608,137	311	1%	\$ 5,027
3	\$ 7,337,601	\$ 3,668,800	71,913	41%	\$ 1,503,347	103585	59%	\$ 2,165,453
4	\$ 4,042,030	\$ 2,021,015	61,119	87%	\$ 1,758,802	9112	13%	\$ 262,213
5	\$ 2,180,976	\$ 1,090,488	39,909	92%	\$ 998,859	3661	8%	\$ 91,629
6	\$ 1,696,435	\$ 848,217	42,548	33%	\$ 283,001	84978	67%	\$ 565,217
7	\$ 600,730	\$ 300,365	22,730	38%	\$ 114,156	37077	62%	\$ 186,210
8	\$ 873,439	\$ 436,720	25,960	47%	\$ 206,714	28885	53%	\$ 230,005
9	\$ 1,858,342	\$ 929,171	28,955	77%	\$ 716,870	8575	23%	\$ 212,301
10	\$ 2,718,160	\$ 1,359,080	49,255	79%	\$ 1,074,278	13058	21%	\$ 284,802
11	\$ 8,032,661	\$ 4,016,330	119,057	54%	\$ 2,185,261	99760	46%	\$ 1,831,069
12	\$ 1,644,450	\$ 822,225	23,944	59%	\$ 488,593	16350	41%	\$ 333,632
13	\$ 31,328	\$ 15,664	17,796	47%	\$ 7,432	19711	53%	\$ 8,232
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	\$ 17,004,907	590,596	100%	\$ 10,829,117	-	0%	\$ 6,175,790

Cost Burden Measure

Measure Weight: 36%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,767,334	\$ 636,240	13,694	100%	\$ 636,071	86363636364	0%	\$ 169
2	\$ 1,226,328	\$ 441,478	11,613	99%	\$ 435,686	99003061894	1%	\$ 5,792
3	\$ 7,337,601	\$ 2,641,536	27,162	30%	\$ 792,619	10066727674	70%	\$ 1,848,917
4	\$ 4,042,030	\$ 1,455,131	21,882	86%	\$ 1,252,767	75373145508	14%	\$ 202,364
5	\$ 2,180,976	\$ 785,151	13,102	88%	\$ 692,527	33751994814	12%	\$ 92,624
6	\$ 1,696,435	\$ 610,717	13,371	27%	\$ 163,429	3988358379	73%	\$ 447,287
7	\$ 600,730	\$ 216,263	9,695	29%	\$ 63,413	11677462207	71%	\$ 152,850
8	\$ 873,439	\$ 314,438	7,231	43%	\$ 135,730	33560107639	57%	\$ 178,709
9	\$ 1,858,342	\$ 669,003	11,122	67%	\$ 448,818	37575625234	33%	\$ 220,185
10	\$ 2,718,160	\$ 978,538	12,066	70%	\$ 684,321	67116624197	30%	\$ 294,217
11	\$ 8,032,661	\$ 2,891,758	14,043	53%	\$ 1,523,915	15591559325	47%	\$ 1,367,843
12	\$ 1,644,450	\$ 592,002	6,324	51%	\$ 299,765	66133227141	49%	\$ 292,237
13	\$ 31,328	\$ 11,278	3,019	54%	\$ 6,034	48340924226	46%	\$ 5,244
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	\$ 12,243,533	164,325	100%	\$ 7,135,095	-	0%	\$ 5,108,438

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight: 50%

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

Over Crowding Measure

Measure Weight: 12%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,767,334	\$ 212,080	4,210	100%	\$ 212,080	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 1,226,328	\$ 147,159	1,783	99%	\$ 146,032	01880877743	1%	\$ 1,127
3	\$ 7,337,601	\$ 880,512	5,501	32%	\$ 278,521	2376861225	68%	\$ 601,991
4	\$ 4,042,030	\$ 485,044	3,865	88%	\$ 425,504	21323058438	12%	\$ 59,540
5	\$ 2,180,976	\$ 261,717	2,262	93%	\$ 243,544	57094713668	7%	\$ 18,173
6	\$ 1,696,435	\$ 203,572	3,517	26%	\$ 52,025	4726127428	74%	\$ 151,547
7	\$ 600,730	\$ 72,088	2,242	44%	\$ 31,785	93176320984	56%	\$ 40,302
8	\$ 873,439	\$ 104,813	1,621	45%	\$ 47,132	05533605553	55%	\$ 57,681
9	\$ 1,858,342	\$ 223,001	2,659	77%	\$ 171,133	94113618604	23%	\$ 51,868
10	\$ 2,718,160	\$ 326,179	4,127	80%	\$ 259,438	68885368279	20%	\$ 66,741
11	\$ 8,032,661	\$ 963,919	13,620	53%	\$ 512,643	4570012235	47%	\$ 451,276
12	\$ 1,644,450	\$ 197,334	1,935	56%	\$ 110,077	58121730507	44%	\$ 87,257
13	\$ 31,328	\$ 3,759	1,640	43%	\$ 1,607	51410030464	57%	\$ 2,152
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	\$ 4,081,178	48,981	100%	\$ 2,491,521	-	0%	\$ 1,589,656

Substandard Measure

Measure Weight: 2%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,767,334	\$ 35,347	542	100%	\$ 35,347	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 1,226,328	\$ 24,527	450	98%	\$ 24,026	77586206896	2%	\$ 501
3	\$ 7,337,601	\$ 146,752	1,164	46%	\$ 68,065	8938456212	54%	\$ 78,687
4	\$ 4,042,030	\$ 80,841	857	89%	\$ 71,910	99580338554	11%	\$ 8,931
5	\$ 2,180,976	\$ 43,620	474	91%	\$ 39,713	72230672633	9%	\$ 3,906
6	\$ 1,696,435	\$ 33,929	598	32%	\$ 10,940	3389898778	68%	\$ 22,989
7	\$ 600,730	\$ 12,015	484	63%	\$ 7,528	95086765968	37%	\$ 4,486
8	\$ 873,439	\$ 17,469	292	53%	\$ 9,343	03260576008	47%	\$ 8,125
9	\$ 1,858,342	\$ 37,167	527	77%	\$ 28,795	23397345591	23%	\$ 8,372
10	\$ 2,718,160	\$ 54,363	812	79%	\$ 42,876	57486035774	21%	\$ 11,487
11	\$ 8,032,661	\$ 160,653	3,911	64%	\$ 102,261	12438404167	36%	\$ 58,393
12	\$ 1,644,450	\$ 32,889	298	53%	\$ 17,278	93548284541	47%	\$ 15,611
13	\$ 31,328	\$ 627	458	45%	\$ 280	89695202491	55%	\$ 347
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	\$ 680,196	10,869	100%	\$ 458,362	-	0%	\$ 221,835

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight:

50%

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

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight:

50%

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

Overall Measure of Affordable Housing Need

Region	Region's Funding Amount				Rural Need Based Funding Amount	Rural Need Based %		Urban Need Based Funding Amount	Urban Need Based %
1	\$ 1,767,334				\$ 1,767,166	100.0%		\$ 169	0.0%
2	\$ 1,226,328				\$ 1,213,881	99.0%		\$ 12,447	1.0%
3	\$ 7,337,601				\$ 2,642,552	36.0%		\$ 4,695,049	64.0%
4	\$ 4,042,030				\$ 3,508,983	86.8%		\$ 533,048	13.2%
5	\$ 2,180,976				\$ 1,974,644	90.5%		\$ 206,332	9.5%
6	\$ 1,696,435				\$ 509,395	30.0%		\$ 1,187,040	70.0%
7	\$ 600,730				\$ 216,882	36.1%		\$ 383,848	63.9%
8	\$ 873,439				\$ 398,919	45.7%		\$ 474,520	54.3%
9	\$ 1,858,342				\$ 1,365,616	73.5%		\$ 492,726	26.5%
10	\$ 2,718,160				\$ 2,060,913	75.8%		\$ 657,247	24.2%
11	\$ 8,032,661				\$ 4,324,080	53.8%		\$ 3,708,580	46.2%
12	\$ 1,644,450				\$ 915,713	55.7%		\$ 728,738	44.3%
13	\$ 31,328				\$ 15,353	49.0%		\$ 15,974	51.0%
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814				\$ 20,914,096	61.5%		\$ 13,095,718	38.5%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

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

Region	Reg All Res Rur	Reg All Res Urb	Reg All Res	Rural Resource %	Urban Resource %
1	\$ 20,236,463	\$ 12	\$ 20,236,475	100.0%	0.0%
2	\$ 20,852,556	\$ 17,735	\$ 20,870,290	99.9%	0.1%
3	\$ 32,183,048	\$ 58,051,489	\$ 90,234,536	35.7%	64.3%
4	\$ 33,291,630	\$ 18,771,382	\$ 52,063,012	63.9%	36.1%
5	\$ 27,796,594	\$ 604,612	\$ 28,401,206	97.9%	2.1%
6	\$ 19,051,825	\$ 88,567,077	\$ 107,618,902	17.7%	82.3%
7	\$ 20,509,207	\$ 36,579,990	\$ 57,089,197	35.9%	64.1%
8	\$ 10,025,486	\$ 24,682,081	\$ 34,707,567	28.9%	71.1%
9	\$ 19,744,503	\$ 7,163,176	\$ 26,907,679	73.4%	26.6%
10	\$ 23,198,282	\$ 2,578,619	\$ 25,776,902	90.0%	10.0%
11	\$ 29,462,700	\$ 17,829,337	\$ 47,292,037	62.3%	37.7%
12	\$ 11,201,089	\$ 10,734,355	\$ 21,935,444	51.1%	48.9%
13	\$ 5,166,658	\$ 14,553,370	\$ 19,720,028	26.2%	73.8%
Ttl.	\$ 272,720,041	\$ 280,133,233	\$ 552,853,275	49.3%	50.7%

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 8. Rural and Urban Resource Adjustment

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas								Urban Areas					
		Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	\$ 1,767,334	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	\$ (168)	\$ 1,767,166	\$ (1,767,166)	\$ (168)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	\$ 1,226,328	99.9%	99.0%	0.9%	\$ (11,405)	\$ 1,213,881	\$ (1,213,881)	\$ (11,405)	0.1%	1.0%	-0.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	\$ 7,337,601	35.7%	36.0%	-0.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	64.3%	64.0%	0.3%	\$ (25,523)	\$ 4,695,049	\$ (3,004,181)	\$ (25,523)
4	\$ 4,042,030	63.9%	86.8%	-22.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	36.1%	13.2%	22.9%	\$ (924,311)	\$ 533,048	\$ (70,296)	\$ (70,296)
5	\$ 2,180,976	97.9%	90.5%	7.3%	\$ (159,903)	\$ 1,974,644	\$ (1,974,644)	\$ (159,903)	2.1%	9.5%	-7.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	\$ 1,696,435	17.7%	30.0%	-12.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	82.3%	70.0%	12.3%	\$ (209,074)	\$ 1,187,040	\$ (830,603)	\$ (209,074)
7	\$ 600,730	35.9%	36.1%	-0.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	64.1%	63.9%	0.2%	\$ (1,071)	\$ 383,848	\$ (245,267)	\$ (1,071)
8	\$ 873,439	28.9%	45.7%	-16.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	71.1%	54.3%	16.8%	\$ (146,621)	\$ 474,520	\$ (257,796)	\$ (146,621)
9	\$ 1,858,342	73.4%	73.5%	-0.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	26.6%	26.5%	0.1%	\$ (1,989)	\$ 492,726	\$ (130,643)	\$ (1,989)
10	\$ 2,718,160	90.0%	75.8%	14.2%	\$ (385,333)	\$ 2,060,913	\$ (2,060,913)	\$ (385,333)	10.0%	24.2%	-14.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	\$ 8,032,661	62.3%	53.8%	8.5%	\$ (680,227)	\$ 4,324,080	\$ (4,324,080)	\$ (680,227)	37.7%	46.2%	-8.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	\$ 1,644,450	51.1%	55.7%	-4.6%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	48.9%	44.3%	4.6%	\$ (75,992)	\$ 728,738	\$ (322,940)	\$ (75,992)
13	\$ 31,328	26.2%	49.0%	-22.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	73.8%	51.0%	22.8%	\$ (7,146)	\$ 15,974	\$ (8,145)	\$ (7,146)
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	49.3%	61.5%	-12.2%	(1,237,036)	11,340,683	(11,340,683)	(1,237,036)	50.7%	38.5%	12.2%	(1,391,728)	\$ 8,510,942	\$ (4,869,872)	(537,713)

Resource Funding Adjustment Limit:

2012 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 9. Rural and Urban Area Funding Amount

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas					Urban Areas				
		Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban
1	\$ 1,767,334	100.0%	1,767,166	\$ (168)	\$ 1,766,998	100.0%	0.0%	\$ 169	\$ 168	\$ 337	0.0%
2	\$ 1,226,328	99.0%	1,213,881	\$ (11,405)	\$ 1,202,475	98.1%	1.0%	\$ 12,447	\$ 11,405	\$ 23,852	1.9%
3	\$ 7,337,601	36.0%	2,642,552	\$ 25,523	\$ 2,668,075	36.4%	64.0%	\$ 4,695,049	\$ (25,523)	\$ 4,669,525	63.6%
4	\$ 4,042,030	86.8%	3,508,983	\$ 70,296	\$ 3,579,279	88.6%	13.2%	\$ 533,048	\$ (70,296)	\$ 462,751	11.4%
5	\$ 2,180,976	90.5%	1,974,644	\$ (159,903)	\$ 1,814,741	83.2%	9.5%	\$ 206,332	\$ 159,903	\$ 366,235	16.8%
6	\$ 1,696,435	30.0%	509,395	\$ 209,074	\$ 718,469	42.4%	70.0%	\$ 1,187,040	\$ (209,074)	\$ 977,966	57.6%
7	\$ 600,730	36.1%	216,882	\$ 1,071	\$ 217,953	36.3%	63.9%	\$ 383,848	\$ (1,071)	\$ 382,777	63.7%
8	\$ 873,439	45.7%	398,919	\$ 146,621	\$ 545,540	62.5%	54.3%	\$ 474,520	\$ (146,621)	\$ 327,899	37.5%
9	\$ 1,858,342	73.5%	1,365,616	\$ 1,989	\$ 1,367,606	73.6%	26.5%	\$ 492,726	\$ (1,989)	\$ 490,737	26.4%
10	\$ 2,718,160	75.8%	2,060,913	\$ (385,333)	\$ 1,675,580	61.6%	24.2%	\$ 657,247	\$ 385,333	\$ 1,042,580	38.4%
11	\$ 8,032,661	53.8%	4,324,080	\$ (680,227)	\$ 3,643,854	45.4%	46.2%	\$ 3,708,580	\$ 680,227	\$ 4,388,807	54.6%
12	\$ 1,644,450	55.7%	915,713	\$ 75,992	\$ 991,705	60.3%	44.3%	\$ 728,738	\$ (75,992)	\$ 652,746	39.7%
13	\$ 31,328	49.0%	15,353	\$ 7,146	\$ 22,499	71.8%	51.0%	\$ 15,974	\$ (7,146)	\$ 8,829	28.2%
Ttl.	\$ 34,009,814	61.5%	20,914,096	\$ (699,323)	\$ 20,214,773	59.4%	38.5%	\$ 13,095,718	\$ 699,323	\$ 13,795,041	40.6%