

1. How we count the financial contributions city residents make that are used by the County vs. cities' use of their own levies or support of projects within their boundaries

Points related to City-specific contributions to affordable housing	
Current Guideline	Proposed Guideline
City policies that supported affordable housing through a rental licensing program, an active code enforcement program, a Fair Housing policy or an ADU policy received 4 points per policy (H9-H11, H13)	City policies that supported affordable housing through a rental licensing program, an active code enforcement program, a Fair Housing policy, an ADU policy, a mixed income or inclusionary housing policy, or a tenant rights policy would receive 4 points per policy
City policies that supported affordable housing through a mixed income or inclusionary housing policy received 8 points (H12)	City policies that supported affordable housing through a mixed income or inclusionary housing policy would only receive 4 points
City-specific support of new construction or preservation projects (points vary, depend on share of city's financial contribution or specific support mechanism) (N1-N6, P1-P6, R1-R6)	No changes proposed

Other policies could be given points at the Council's discretion if included in the survey narrative

Points related to **County HRA/CDA levies** paid by city residents

Current Guideline

Proposed Guideline

<p>Cities received points for meeting their ALHOA requirement (2 points for spending 85%, 3 points for spending 100% or more. County levies used toward affordable housing opportunities were counted toward this criterion. <i>Note: not all counties levy and those that do levy at different percentages up to the maximum allowed by state law</i>) (H4)</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p>Cities received 3 points for being levied by their County HRA/CDA if the HRA/CDA constructs new affordable housing. <i>Note: Ramsey County does not levy, so no Ramsey County cities received these points. The share of the levy used for affordable housing (versus economic development, overhead, or other activities) is not considered.</i> (H14)</p>	<p>Cities would receive <i>no additional points</i> for being levied by their County HRA/CDA if the HRA/CDA constructs new affordable housing. <u><i>See Appendix A for analysis.</i></u></p>
<p>Cities received points for any new affordable housing development or preservation project within their boundaries, including those supported by County HRA/CDA funds and whether or not the city made a financial or policy-related contribution to the project. (N1-N2, P1-P2, R1-R2)</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>

2. Eliminating base points for communities that participate in homeownership programs and increasing points for households actually served under the programs

Points related to homeownership efforts	
Current Guideline	Proposed Guideline
Cities received 3 points each for being a lender/administrator of MN Housing single family programs, successfully receiving a MN Housing Single Family Impact Fund award or preserving unsubsidized affordable housing in a way not captured in the Preservation points criteria.	Cities would receive <i>no base points for participating or administering MN Housing single family housing programs or preserving unsubsidized affordable housing</i> (which largely captured tenant rights policies which would be covered elsewhere).
Cities received an additional 0.1 points for every household served under either of the three programs/practices noted in the previous bullet.	Cities would receive <i>0.2 points for every household</i> served under either of the three programs/practices noted in the previous bullet.

The difference in 2017 Scores as is versus using the proposed criteria related to homeownership efforts is compared in Appendix B. A comment was made at committee about considering the number of households served in the context of total households. An option where points are based on the share of households served by these programs is also provided in Appendix B for consideration.

3. How cities receive points without producing units

Appendix C shows all 2017 scores broken down by 4 categories: Points for New Construction (maximum of 15-35 points), points for Preservation/Rehab (maximum of 15-35 points), points for housing policies and programs (maximum of 25 points), and points for existing housing stock characteristics (maximum of 25 points).

Appendix A

This table shows the impact on 2017 Scores if cities no longer received points for their residents being levied by their County HRA/CDA.

	Published 2017 Score	2017 Score if H14 points were eliminated	Difference
Anoka	83	80	-3
Carver	72	69	-3
Champlin	65	62	-3
Columbia Heights	97	94	-3
Farmington	66	63	-3
Hastings	89	86	-3
Hugo	64	61	-3
Lakeville	80	77	-3
Mahtomedi	58	55	-3
Medina	26	23	-3
Oakdale	91	88	-3
Ramsey	81	78	-3
Rosemount	90	87	-3
Savage	58	55	-3
St. Anthony	78	75	-3
St. Francis	42	39	-3
Stillwater	58	55	-3
West St. Paul	81	78	-3
Prior Lake	92	91	-1

Appendix B

Changes in 2017 Scores if points for H5-H7 (indicating the programs exist) are removed, and points for H8 are doubled (which measures households served):

	Published 2017 Score	2017 Score if proposed changes were implemented	Difference
Oak Grove	33	27	-6
Blaine	83	77	-6
New Germany	51	45	-6
St. Francis	42	36	-6
Oakdale	91	86	-5
Brooklyn Center	100	95	-5
Prior Lake	92	88	-4
North St. Paul	75	72	-3
Corcoran	30	27	-3
Anoka	83	82	-1
Hopkins	90	91	1
Belle Plaine	50	51	1
West St. Paul	81	82	1
Rosemount	90	92	2
White Bear Lake	78	82	4
Inver Grove Heights	79	83	5
Stillwater	58	68	10

In committee, the question was raised about considering the number of households served in the context of total households. An option where points are based on the share of households served by these programs, and the proposed changes below are made, would have played out in 2017 as follows. Specifically, instead of awarding 0.20 points per household served, this shows what would happen if we awarded 1 point for every .0001% of all households were served:

	Published 2017 Score	2017 Score if changes above were implemented	Difference
Edina	91	78	-13
South St. Paul	100	91	-9
Robbinsdale	90	83	-7
Burnsville	98	92	-6
Stillwater	58	54	-4
Eagan	84	80	-4
Apple Valley	94	91	-3

Plymouth	90	87	-3
White Bear Lake	78	76	-2
Rosemount	90	88	-2
North St Paul	75	74	-1
Belle Plaine	50	51	1
Inver Grove Heights	79	80	1
Champlin	65	66	1
Dayton	49	50	1
Golden Valley	90	91	1
Lake Elmo	21	22	1
Lake St. Croix Beach	18	19	1
Lakeville	80	81	1
Lino Lakes	60	61	1
Mahtomedi	58	59	1
Newport	74	75	1
Norwood Young America	66	67	1
Shakopee	68	69	1
St. Francis	42	43	1
Vadnais Heights	60	61	1
Wayzata	76	77	1
Blaine	83	84	1
Anoka	83	85	2
Cottage Grove	72	74	2
Chanhassen	39	41	2
Ramsey	81	83	2
Columbia Heights	97	99	2
West St. Paul	81	83	2
Savage	58	61	3
New Hope	80	83	3
Oakdale	91	95	4
Forest Lake	85	89	4
Little Canada	25	29	4
St. Anthony	78	82	4
Maplewood	85	90	5
Mound	80	84	5
New Brighton	67	72	5
Jordan	78	87	9
St. Paul Park	58	68	10
Arden Hills	57	68	11

Appendix C

How can cities get high scores if they haven't produced lots of new units?

Up to 50 points of the Score come from new or preserved affordable units. A city can get more points for the same number of units if the city's financial contributions or regulatory supports exceeded those of the city it's being compared to.

N1 and N2 contain the portion of the new construction points that are based on number of units alone. N3-N7 contain the portion of the new construction points that are based on the degree of financial or regulatory support from the city. This distribution in 2017 Scores is shown below:

	N1-N2	N3-N7	All N points (capped at max point limit (15-35 points))
Andover	6	0	6
Anoka	0	0	8
Apple Valley	78	49	25
Arden Hills	30	6	15
Bayport	0	0	0
Belle Plaine	12	0	12
Blaine	8	34	30
Bloomington	20	46	15
Brooklyn Center	15	26	15
Brooklyn Park	8	6	25
Burnsville	81	15	15
Carver	105	8	35
Centerville	0	0	0
Champlin	0	0	0
Chanhassen	0	0	0
Chaska	79	74	30
Circle Pines	0	0	0
Cologne	0	0	0
Columbia Heights	69	26	15
Columbus	0	0	0
Coon Rapids	87	39	15
Corcoran	0	0	0
Cottage Grove	123	22	25
Crystal	98	9	15
Dayton	20	5	25
Eagan	61	11	15
East Bethel	0	0	0
Eden Prairie	0	0	21

Edina	47	10	15
Elko New Market	5	7	12
Excelsior	0	0	0
Farmington	37	23	35
Forest Lake	142	20	35
Fridley	29	53	15
Gem Lake	0	0	0
Golden Valley	24	0	15
Greenfield	0	0	0
Hastings	97	12	25
Hilltop	0	0	0
Hopkins	97	19	25
Hugo	19	1	20
Independence	0	0	0
Inver Grove Heights	31	4	25
Jordan	52	31	35
Lake Elmo	0	0	0
Lake St. Croix Beach	0	0	0
Lakeland	0	0	0
Lakeville	52	1	30
Lauderdale	0	0	0
Lexington	0	0	0
Lilydale	0	0	0
Lino Lakes	30	2	30
Little Canada	0	0	0
Loretto	0	0	0
Mahtomedi	56	6	15
Maple Grove	68	14	30
Maplewood	88	24	25
Mayer	0	0	0
Medina	15	0	15
Mendota	0	0	0
Mendota Heights	0	0	0
Minneapolis	167	118	25
Minnetonka	13	35	25
Minnetrista	0	0	0
Mound	4	0	15
Mounds View	0	5	5
New Brighton	60	14	15
New Germany	19	1	20
New Hope	90	0	15

Newport	74	5	25
North Oaks	0	0	0
North St Paul	18	24	15
Norwood Young America	40	10	35
Oak Grove	7	10	17
Oakdale	69	22	15
Orono	0	0	0
Osseo	22	13	30
Plymouth	35	47	15
Prior Lake	48	6	35
Ramsey	87	34	30
Richfield	24	12	15
Robbinsdale	33	29	15
Rosemount	59	26	35
Roseville	26	12	15
Savage	31	7	35
Shakopee	35	12	30
Shoreview	16	5	15
South St. Paul	101	1	15
Spring Lake Park	0	0	0
St. Anthony	110	12	15
St. Bonifacius	0	0	0
St. Francis	0	0	0
St. Louis Park	10	40	15
St. Paul	357	78	25
St. Paul Park	13	2	15
Stillwater	0	0	10
Tonka Bay	0	0	0
Vadnais Heights	29	4	25
Waconia	25	15	35
Wayzata	10	15	30
West St. Paul	98	0	15
White Bear Lake	35	17	15
White Bear Township	0	0	0
Woodbury	95	38	30

P1 and P2 and R1 and R2 contain the portion of the preservation/rehab points that are based on number of units alone. P3-P6 and R3-R6 contain the portion of the preservation/rehab points that are based on the degree of financial or regulatory support from the city. This distribution in 2017 Scores is shown below:

	P1, P2, R1, R2	P3-P6 and R3-R6	Total P and R points (capped at max point limit (15-25 points))
Andover	0	0	0
Anoka	57	0	25
Apple Valley	77	0	25
Arden Hills	0	0	5
Bayport	0	0	0
Belle Plaine	0	0	0
Blaine	103	3	20
Bloomington	3	19	35
Brooklyn Center	245	6	35
Brooklyn Park	100	41	25
Burnsville	38	0	35
Carver	0	0	15
Centerville	0	0	0
Champlin	36	0	35
Chanhassen	10	0	10
Chaska	20	16	20
Circle Pines	0	0	0
Cologne	0	0	0
Columbia Heights	106	5	35
Columbus	0	0	0
Coon Rapids	53	10	35
Corcoran	0	7	7
Cottage Grove	13	12	25
Crystal	6	5	34
Dayton	0	0	0
Eagan	7	0	22
East Bethel	0	0	0
Eden Prairie	87	22	25
Edina	204	6	35
Elko New Market	0	0	0
Excelsior	0	0	0
Farmington	0	0	6
Forest Lake	12	4	15
Fridley	0	0	17

Gem Lake	0	0	0
Golden Valley	178	1	35
Greenfield	0	0	0
Hastings	0	0	21
Hilltop	0	0	0
Hopkins	155	5	25
Hugo	2	7	9
Independence	0	0	0
Inver Grove Heights	6	0	8
Jordan	11	0	15
Lake Elmo	1	0	1
Lake St. Croix Beach	0	0	0
Lakeland	3	0	3
Lakeville	44	0	20
Lauderdale	0	0	0
Lexington	0	0	0
Lilydale	0	0	0
Lino Lakes	0	0	1
Little Canada	0	0	0
Loretto	0	0	0
Mahtomedi	0	0	12
Maple Grove	37	0	20
Maplewood	145	2	25
Mayer	0	0	0
Medina	0	0	0
Mendota	0	0	0
Mendota Heights	1	0	1
Minneapolis	702	27	25
Minnetonka	28	1	25
Minnetrissa	0	0	0
Mound	127	0	35
Mounds View	8	0	7.5
New Brighton	0	0	15
New Germany	0	0	0
New Hope	11	0	30
Newport	0	0	14
North Oaks	0	0	0
North St Paul	0	0	7
Norwood Young America	0	0	4
Oak Grove	0	0	0

Oakdale	28	5	35
Orono	0	0	0
Osseo	0	0	1
Plymouth	28	0	35
Prior Lake	73	1	15
Ramsey	0	0	20
Richfield	1	8	14
Robbinsdale	12	2	25
Rosemount	2	0	14
Roseville	0	5	11
Savage	0	0	0.9
Shakopee	4	0	8
Shoreview	22	7	31
South St. Paul	193	4	35
Spring Lake Park	0	0	0
St. Anthony	0	0	27
St. Bonifacius	0	0	0
St. Francis	0	0	0
St. Louis Park	138	8	35
St. Paul	709	29	25
St. Paul Park	1	4	5
Stillwater	58	2	20
Tonka Bay	0	0	0
Vadnais Heights	0	0	2
Waconia	46	5	15
Wayzata	166	0	20
West St. Paul	0	0	21
White Bear Lake	0	4	14
White Bear Township	0	0	0
Woodbury	1	8	20