Fund Distribution Plan Comparison

All Programs

| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|------|------|---|--|--|------|
| | | Reorganization of scoring criteria into three main categories: 1. What: Proposed Project Outcomes, 2. How: Proposed Project Process, and 3. Who: Proposed Project Team. | Project Process criteria would be clarified and scoring values revised to consider variation and context across LCA participating communities. | Staff worked with Metropolitan Council communications staff to ensure language is understandable to a lay audience and that the meaning of scoring criteria is clear. | |

LCDA and TOD

| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Modify eligibility for land acquisition to focus on affordable housing and jobs projects that are accessible to low-income and underserved populations Design and land use combined into one scoring category Elimination of separate threshold criteria for applications as the issues are covered in the project-base scoring Allow development and pre-development projects along D Line and pre-dev along Rush Line to apply Housing projects and jobs projects scored as two distinct categories w same number of points available for each project type | social and human connections Addition of scoring criteria that promotes the evaluation of potential displacement impacts and mitigation strategies if needed Addition of scoring criteria that prioritizes projects that can and will share valuable information learned with the rest of the region More scoring support for project readiness Clearer description of transit-oriented development | Elimination of Demonstration Value, Innovation, and Catalyst criteria from application scoring Substantial changes to equity-derived scoring criteria to ensure it is measurable, clearly connected to a specific inequity, and allows for all types of communities to successfully compete. A minimum score from equity-specific criteria to be considered for funding Double the available funding for LCDA and LCDA-TOD Pre-Development Programs | Preamble to the LCDA and LCDA-TOD scoring provides context for how equity related scoring criteria is considered to provide consistency in language and transparency Added an equity criterion in the Environment and Livability subcategory, which increases the total number of equity-specific points in Step One of the scoring process from 16 to 18. The minimum equity score to move on to Step Two increased from 10 to 12. To address scoring that may have prioritized new over preservation, some connected development and environment criteria were adjusted Jobs scoring criteria expanded consideration | Jobs section criteria was expanded to encompass economic opportunity more broadly and the category title was renamed to reflect this change. Staff updated the scoring to remove a "project team" criterion that proved difficult to score, about partnerships between government, for-profit, and non-profit sectors. This has the effect of slightly decreasing the project team score component within the overall scoring framework for these two programs. | A single step scoring process to ensure that all applications are seen by reviewers external to the Council as well as to reduce the review time. The intended impact is to have a more objective and streamlined scoring process while providing applicants with funding recommendations in a timelier manner. The Project Team and Project Process scoring criteria are being combined into a single Projects Process section for the LCDA and LCDA-TOD programs. To reflect these scoring points have been adjusted. In the new rubric, a minimum equity score (22% of total points, vs. 24% in 2023) |

| Scoring includes level of diverse partnerships, community involvement and planning for continued engagement throughout life of project Refinement of scoring to allow for jobs or housing projects, with additional points given to mixed-use projects; greater emphasis on design and contributions to pedestrian realm; Removal of TOD threshold criteria Double the available funding for the LCDA Refinement of criteria to determine TOD eligible | Elimination of the Project Concept Review phase of the application | of how proposed projects can support economic stability and opportunity. Scoring for projects that reflect and respond to the community the project is intended to serve moved to Step Two Captures a specific goal of the LCA more explicitly: partnerships between government, private for-profit and nonprofit sectors. Creation of Policy Development program | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Double the available funding for the LCDA Refinement of criteria to | | 5 | |
| areas to provide more clarity on the specific | | | |
| point on the corridor development timeline a transit project may be | | | |
| eligible | | | |

LHIA

| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|--|--|---|--|------|--|
| Expanded eligibility for applications that receive Low Income Housing Tax Credits through sub-allocator jurisdictions in addition to those requesting tax credits or deferred funding through the Minnesota Housing RFP process | Addition of scoring criteria that prioritizes a project that provides a new housing type or serves a currently unserved population | Consideration of how the proposed project addresses community specific housing needs | Creation of an LHIA Affordable Homeownership Pilot. | | 50% cap on total development gap, in lieu of match Maximizing the number of awards and the number of homes funded if demand continues to exceed available funds. This recognizes the fact that homeownership projects are often scalable with partial awards. |

| and a minimum overall score (59% of total points, vs. 60% in 2023) are still required. |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

TBRA

| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|--|---|--|--|------|--|
| New cleanup scoring added to encourage adding job opportunities within micro-enterprises or new small businesses Consolidation of TBRA-TOD category into regular TBRA | Removal of freight and green building criteria | Expansion of equity-specific criteria | Where criteria in the LCDA and LCDA-TOD programs is substantially similar to TBRA criteria, TBRA criteria is being updated to match the more recently vetted LCDA and LCDA-TOD criteria. | | Pilot a scattered-site TBRA Site Investigation award option that could be used by an applicant for multiple sites within a Target Area, with a maximum award of up to \$50,000 per project or up to \$250,000 per applicant for multiple scattered sites. To encourage active use of the funds, applicants would be required to expend 80% or more of awarded funds before being eligible to reapply. |

POLICY

| 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|------|------|------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| | | | Creation of Policy Development | Scoring criteria have been | |
| | | | program | adjusted to include a minimum | |
| | | | | overall score necessary for | |
| | | | | funding eligibility and more | |
| | | | | scoring weight on policy | |
| | | | | outcomes rather than | |
| | | | | engagement around policy | |
| | | | | development. | |
| | | | | | |