

Community Development Committee

Meeting date: May 21, 2018

For the Metropolitan Council meeting of May 23, 2018

Subject: Amend the Guidelines for Housing Policy Performance
District(s), Member(s): All
Policy/Legal Reference: 2040 Housing Policy Plan
Staff Prepared/Presented: Tara Beard, Housing Planning Analyst (651-602-1051)
Division/Department: Community Development / Regional Planning

Proposed Action

That the Metropolitan Council amend its Guidelines for Priority Funding for Housing Policy Performance (“Guidelines”).

Background

Using the Guidelines, Metropolitan Council staff annually calculate Housing Performance Scores (“Scores”) for most of the region’s cities and townships to assess local efforts in developing and maintaining affordable housing and providing housing-related services and programs. The Council uses the Scores to evaluate applications to the Livable Communities Act programs. The Scores also account for 7 percent of proposals’ total score in the Regional Solicitation for federal transportation funding.

In July 2015, the Council adopted [a major revision](#) to the Guidelines that resulted from the development of the 2040 Housing Policy Plan. At that time, the Council committed to reviewing the results of the new Scores after the first year of new scores (2016) and biennially thereafter. This proposed amendment resulting from the 2018 review is the second amendment fulfilling this commitment.

Rationale

With the Scores, Council staff aims for a methodology that both acknowledges the variations in communities across the region and recognizes the breadth of housing activities that support affordable housing options for the region’s residents. Staff’s review of the 2016 Scores, with the assistance of an external advisory work group, identified opportunities to refine the Guidelines and the scoring criteria themselves. See Table 1 for specifics on the changes.

Thrive Lens Analysis

The update to the Housing Performance Scores is consistent with the Council’s efforts to advance equity by creating real choices in where we live for all residents, across race, ethnicity, economic means, and ability.

Funding

Calculating Housing Performance Scores is a regular part of the Community Development Division workplan.

Known Support / Opposition

Staff convened two meetings of representatives from the cities of Brooklyn Park, Chanhassen, Farmington, Minneapolis, and Fridley; Carver County Community Development Authority; Washington County Community Development Authority; Minnesota Housing; Metro Cities; Housing Justice Center; and Minnesota Housing



Partnership. The recommended changes to the Guidelines reflect suggestions and recommendations from the meetings. Some changes were a consensus recommendation; other changes represent Council staff’s efforts to balance divergent views. The guiding framework for the recommendation is to allow all types of communities the opportunity to achieve a high Score, and to balance that with the need for a consistent and clear scoring process.

Table 1: Recommended changes to the Guidelines

Substantive Changes	Rationale	Anticipated Impact
<p>The removal of the “hold harmless” provision that was developed to mitigate adverse impacts to communities’ Scores after major changes to the Guidelines were made in 2015.</p>	<p>The 2016 Guidelines specify revisiting the provision in 2018.</p> <p>Communities have had three years to adjust to new Guidelines and adapt their housing strategies accordingly.</p> <p>In an analysis of 2017 Scores, only five cities would have had a significant reduction (between 10 and 14 points lower) in their Score without the “hold harmless” provision.</p>	<p>A small number of communities may receive a 2018 Score that is lower than what they would have received under the “hold harmless” provision.</p>
<p>All communities will be scored using the same point split (25/25) for new versus preserved affordable units. The rollover provision will continue to allow a portion of excess units in either category to count in the other category if the maximum has not been met.</p>	<p>Assigning a relative value to new versus preserved affordable units by community designation oversimplifies the complexity of addressing affordable housing needs. Cities are in the best position to determine if new construction or preservation should be emphasized. Equalizing the maximum points of both approaches and keeping the rollover provision ensures both types of efforts are given equal credit.</p>	<p>When this change is applied to the 2017 Scores, eight communities showed decreases in their final score of 3 points or more and 17 communities showed increases in their final score of 3 points or more.</p>
<p>Change in requirements for mixed-income projects in N4. There is no minimum or maximum percentage of affordable or market rate units as long as both types of units exist.</p>	<p>With increasing mixed-income policies being passed in cities across the region, more private market housing is including small percentages (such as 10, 15 or 18 percent) of affordable housing. While the number of affordable units may be less than a minimum</p>	<p>This change is likely to allow more cities, especially those who have passed mixed-income housing policies, to gain points in this category.</p>

Substantive Changes	Rationale	Anticipated Impact
	<p>“20% affordable” project, it actually reflects more effort on the part of the city to create affordable units in an largely unsubsidized project.</p>	
<p>Elimination of N5, which addresses a community’s Livable Communities Act (LCA) goal for affordable housing.</p>	<p>As we near the end of the decade for which these goals were negotiated and consider the unforeseen consequences of the Great Recession on the housing market, comparing production to LCA goals for 2011-2020 is not a very accurate measure of city effort. When the Scores are reviewed again in 2020, acknowledging that 2021-2030 LCA goals will have been negotiated, staff will reconsider including LCA goals within the Guidelines.</p>	<p>Communities that had higher LCA goals may see more points because their production will no longer be measured against their goal. Communities with lower LCA goals may see fewer points because their production will no longer be measured against their goal.</p>
<p>Previous categories H5- H8 are reorganized into one category (H6) and focus entirely on households served.</p>	<p>It was hard to interpret the intent of this string of categories as written. New language and organization clarify that cities are receiving points here for proactively funding or administering housing programs that serve households earning low and moderate incomes. Rather than provide points for funding/administering the program and providing additional points for households served, only households served will be counted but at heavier weights.</p>	<p>Cities that serve the most households by funding or administering housing programs will continue to receive the most points from this category.</p>
<p>A suite of existing and new housing policy categories will be counted in a clearer way.</p>	<p>In the past few years many new types of housing policy efforts have become more mainstream in the region. Mixed income housing</p>	<p>Communities with mixed income policies will receive fewer points (these policies have become more common and actual mixed income</p>

Substantive Changes	Rationale	Anticipated Impact
	<p>policies, fair housing policies, zoning allowing accessory dwelling units, tenants' rights policies and other strategies can all be categorized as local policies that encourage affordable housing production. The proposed new Guidelines, consolidate these policies into one category (now H6).</p>	<p>projects also get points in new construction).</p> <p>Communities with tenant rights policies will have access to more points, but primarily the change is for clarity and organization.</p>
<p>Eliminate H14, which provides points for cities that contribute to a County Housing and Redevelopment Authority or Community Development Authority through a county levy.</p>	<p>Contributions toward county levies that create affordable housing opportunities are already calculated and contribute toward points in H4 that measure a city's expenditures toward their affordable or life-cycle housing amount (ALHOA). Eliminating H14 prevents double counting.</p>	<p>Cities that earned points in this category will no longer receive them.</p>

GUIDELINES FOR PRIORITY FUNDING FOR HOUSING PERFORMANCE

Methodology for the Housing Performance Scores



METROPOLITAN
C O U N C I L

Revised May 2018

The Council's mission is to foster efficient and economic growth for a prosperous metropolitan region

Metropolitan Council Members

Alene Tchourumoff	Chair	Edward Reynoso	District 9
Katie Rodriguez	District 1	Marie McCarthy	District 10
Lona Schreiber	District 2	Sandy Rummel	District 11
Jennifer Munt	District 3	Harry Melander	District 12
Deb Barber	District 4	Richard Kramer	District 13
Steve Elkins	District 5	Jon Commers	District 14
Gail Dorfman	District 6	Steven T. Chávez	District 15
Gary L. Cunningham	District 7	Wendy Wulff	District 16
Cara Letofsky	District 8		



The Metropolitan Council is the regional planning organization for the seven-county Twin Cities area. The Council operates the regional bus and rail system, collects and treats wastewater, coordinates regional water resources, plans and helps fund regional parks, and administers federal funds that provide housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families. The 17-member Council board is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the governor.

On request, this publication will be made available in alternative formats to people with disabilities. Call Metropolitan Council information at 651-602-1140 or TTY 651-291-0904.

The *2040 Housing Policy Plan* describes multiple strategies that advance the Metropolitan Council's overarching housing policy priority, which is to **Create housing options that give people in all life stages and of all economic means viable choices for safe, stable and affordable homes**. A range of housing options across the region benefits individuals, families, and local governments. Viable housing choices allow households to find housing affordable to them in the communities where they want to live. Like a diversified investment portfolio, a diversity of housing types can increase local government resiliency through changing economic climates.

The Council uses the Housing Performance Scores to give priority in funding to communities that are maintaining or expanding their supply of affordable housing and using fiscal, planning, and regulatory tools to promote affordable and mixed-income housing. The Council uses the Scores in the Livable Communities Demonstration Account and the Tax Base Revitalization Account to reward communities that have a demonstrable commitment to providing affordable housing options. Housing Performance Scores will also continue to constitute 7% of the total points available in the 2018 Regional Solicitations for Transportation Funding.

At the same time, the Council assists affordable housing development in communities struggling to provide a full range of housing choices. The Council gives preference to communities with lower Housing Performance Scores in funding decisions for the Local Housing Incentives Account, which has funded more than one-third of the affordable units produced through the Livable Communities Act programs.

The following criteria and their relative weight will be used to determine a score of 0 to 100 points, reflecting local effort on housing affordability, including implementing effective housing programs, funding housing development, and creating and preserving housing affordability. For funding evaluation purposes, the Housing Performance Scores will then be converted to a 0 to 10 scale (any score ending in 5 will be rounded upward). The Council will publish scores on both 0 to 100 point and 0 to 10 point scales.

Overall Housing Performance Scores Methodology & Structure

The categories for calculating Housing Performance Scores are:

- New affordable or mixed-income housing completed in the last ten years;
- Preservation projects completed in the last seven years and/or Substantial rehabilitation projects completed in the last three years;
- Housing program participation and production, and housing policies and ordinances
- Characteristics of the existing housing stock.

As outlined in the *2040 Housing Policy Plan*, the Council will review the Housing Performance Scores methodology every two years. This document reflects the outcomes of the second review since the adoption of the amended HPP in 2015.

The Council assembles data for the Housing Performance Scores from sources including Minnesota Housing and county governments. The Council asks local jurisdictions to provide additional information not available from other sources. Local municipalities can also submit an optional narrative describing tools, activities, services, or other housing efforts that they would like the Council to consider but that are not explicitly identified in these guidelines.

Recent New Affordable Housing and Preservation / Substantial Rehabilitation Projects (0-50 points)

To meet its housing need, the Twin Cities region needs both additional affordable housing as well as to preserve and rehabilitate existing affordable housing. The need for additional affordable housing is strongest for lower income households who have fewer housing choices than higher income households.

Overall, 50 points are available in this section: 25 points for new affordable housing and 25 points for investments in the preservation and substantial rehabilitation of existing affordable or mixed-income housing. A community that exceeds available points in one category but does not reach full points under the other receives one-quarter of the difference between the points earned under the former category, to be applied to the latter category (subject to the overall 50-point maximum).

Sample Scoring		Maximum Points	Earned Points	Counted Points	Total
Community A	New Affordable Housing	25	10	10 + $\frac{1}{4}*(43-25)$	25+10+5 = 40
	Preservation and Substantial Rehabilitation	25	43	25	
Community B	New Affordable Housing	25	37	25	50
	Preservation and Substantial Rehabilitation	25	30	25	

The following points will be awarded based on activities for projects over the last 10 years creating new affordable or mixed-income housing (where a city completed more than 10 projects, only the most recent 10 will count):

Table 1: New Affordable and Mixed-Income Housing in last 10 years

Item and description	Points
N1. New units affordable to households at or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI) as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	3 points per percentage point
New units affordable to households earning between 31% and 50% of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	1.5 points per percentage point
New units affordable to households earning between 51% and 80% of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	1 point per percentage point
New owner-occupied units affordable to households between 81% and 115% of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	0.5 point per percentage point
N2. New units affordable to households at or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI)	0.5 points each
New units affordable to households earning between 31% and 50% AMI	0.25 points each
New units affordable to households earning between 51% and 80% AMI	0.15 points each
New owner-occupied units affordable to households between 81% and 115% of AMI	0.10 points each
N3. Each local official control adjusted, waived, or used enabling affordable housing*	0.15 points each
N4. New mixed-income project (affordable units must be income restricted)	7 points
N5. Direct local financial contribution to affordable or mixed-income development, including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	1 point for each percentage point contributed of the Total Development Cost, up to 6 points per project
N6. Issuance of housing revenue bonds for construction of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g., bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits or bonds for age- and income- restricted senior developments	5 points

*See Appendix for full list of eligible points-earning local official controls & financial contribution types

Where applications involving substantial city effort in support of affordable housing are submitted to major funding partners (Minnesota Housing, Metropolitan Council, county governments), but not selected due to factors outside the municipality’s control, up to 25% of points may be awarded at the Council’s discretion.

The rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing is often the most cost-effective approach to addressing affordable housing challenges. As the region’s affordable housing ages, addressing the physical needs of the existing stock becomes critical to avoid unnecessary loss of

affordable units. This category is intended to capture larger scale rehabilitation and preservation projects (and that are typically a single project under common ownership, management, and financing). Single-family rehabilitation loan programs, for example—where each household served represents a unique real estate transaction—are covered in Housing Programs and Policies.

Points will be awarded based on activities involving up to 10 affordable and/or mixed-income projects in the past seven years for preservation and the past three years for substantial rehabilitation. Under either, affordability of subsidized units must generally be secured for at least 15 years.

Preservation activities are rehabilitation efforts that substantially improve the physical asset and:

- Prevent the owner from converting the property to market rate or a different use by providing low-cost public financing (and under certain circumstances allowing for equity take-out), and
- Have as a financing condition that the owner consents to continued participation in a federal project-based rental assistance program, or that otherwise lead to long-term rent and income restrictions (this can include Section 202, Section 515, or Section 811 properties; Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties; or permanent housing for the long-term homeless or other forms of service-intensive supportive housing) for the term of the mortgage or applicable instrument.

Note: While substantial rehabilitation may involve coordinated single family (i.e., scattered site development or redevelopment, or as part of a community revitalization plan) or multifamily efforts, preservation activities are exclusive to multifamily properties with expiring affordability restrictions and/or existing rental assistance or support services contracts.

For these purposes, the threshold for substantial rehabilitation is defined as:

- The cost of repairs, replacements and improvements are equal to or above an average of \$5,000 per dwelling unit (includes improvements to common areas), or
- Two or more major building components are being substantially repaired or replaced.

To receive credit, rehabilitated rental units must have either an income restriction of at least 15 years or a long-term commitment to accept Housing Choice Vouchers or other forms of public rental assistance.

Table 2: Preservation of affordable or mixed-income housing in last 7 years

Item and description	Points
P1. Preserved units serving a household at or below 30% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	1.25 points per percentage point
Preserved units serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	0.75 points per percentage point
Preserved units serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	0.5 point per percentage point
P2. Each preserved unit serving a household at or below 30% of AMI	0.75 points each
Each preserved unit serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI	0.5 points each
Each preserved unit serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI	0.25 points each
P3. Direct local financial contribution to the preservation of affordable or mixed-income housing, including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	1 point for each percentage point contributed of the Total Development Cost, up to 5 points per project

P4.	Each local control adjusted or waived to preserve affordable housing	0.15 points per unit
P5.	Demonstrated local efforts to preserve a manufactured housing park from threat of conversion or closure and loss of affordable units	7 points
P6.	Issuance of housing revenue bonds for preservation of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g. bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits)	7 points

Table 3: Substantial Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing in last 3 years

Item and description	Points	
R1.	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household at or below 30% of AMI	0.5 points per unit
	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI	0.25 points per unit
	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI	0.15 point per unit
	Each rehabilitated owner-occupied unit serving household between 81% and 115% of AMI	0.10 points per unit
R2.	Each acquisition/rehab/resale of an owner-occupied unit affordable at or below 80% AMI that is brought into a Community Land Trust	1.5 points per unit
R3.	Each local official control adjusted or waived to rehabilitate affordable housing	0.15 points per unit
R4.	Direct local financial contribution to affordable or mixed-income development, including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	0.5 points for each percentage point of the Total Development Cost contributed, up to 4 points per project
R5.	Rehabilitation activity that involves conversion of units from a non-restricted status to a rent and income-restricted status (newly built income-restricted units should be counted in N1-N2 above)	5 points
R6.	Issuance of housing revenue bonds for rehabilitation of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g. bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits)	5 points

Housing Programs and Policies (0-25 Points)

This category captures information on housing efforts that may be less direct or less costly than direct support for new development or major rehabilitation projects. Local programs and activities, or participation in other government programs, are important to the degree that the programs are used to benefit low- and moderate-income households.

Table 4: Housing Programs and Policies

Item and description	Points
H1. Each locally funded or administered housing program or service*	
H2. Each housing program operated by a nonprofit organization receiving a local financial contribution (e.g. single family rehab loan programs, rental assistance programs, housing counseling programs or services, etc.)	2 points each
H3. Covering all or a portion of administrative expenses incurred in administering a federal, state, or county housing program (i.e. the difference between costs incurred and administration reimbursement from the federal, state, or county government)	
H4. Local expenditure in the prior year to affordable or life-cycle housing as a share of the municipality's Affordable and Life-Cycle Housing Opportunities Amount	2 points if 85-99% 3 points if 100% or more
H5. Households served under city, county or state homeownership programs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnesota Housing single family rehabilitation loan, emergency loan, and/or community fix-up programs • Foreclosure prevention, down payment assistance programs or homebuyer education 	0.20 points per household
H6. Adopting or administering any of the following programs/policies:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rental licensing program • An active code enforcement program (for rental or owner-occupied) • An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ACU) policy • A mixed-income (inclusionary) housing policy • A local Fair Housing policy that includes enforcement mechanisms • Tenant's rights policy(ies), such as those that prohibit Section 8 discrimination, require notice of sale or right of first refusal, and/or address just-cause eviction 	4 points each

* Locally funded means where the community itself generated funding for the program, or received funding from a higher level of government and had control over its use (i.e. funds are expended by the community and not the higher level of government)

Trying to capture all efforts, tools, and activities to promote housing affordability would be not only challenging but also administratively burdensome. To yet recognize local innovations and initiative, the Council offers communities the option to showcase additional efforts that could merit points but are not otherwise captured in these guidelines. When generating the Scores, Council staff will evaluate how narratives fit into the overarching point structure and provide additional points at its discretion.

Characteristics of the Existing Housing Stock (0-25 Points)

This category recognizes the important role the existing housing stock plays in providing affordable opportunities and reflects the critical role for communities that are home to housing for special and vulnerable populations. Points for the existing housing category are awarded as follows:

Table 5: Characteristics and affordability of the existing housing stock

Item and description	Points
C1. Existing housing stock affordable to households earning 30% of AMI or less:	At least 1%: 2 points At least 3%: 4 points At least 6%: 8 points
C2. Share of existing housing stock affordable to households earning 50% of AMI or less:	At least 7%: 2 points At least 15%: 4 points At least 23%: 8 points
C3. Share of existing housing stock affordable to households earning 80% of AMI or less	At least 20%: 2 points At least 40%: 4 points At least 65%: 8 points
C4. Shelters or transitional housing for people experiencing long-term homelessness or who are at risk of long-term homelessness, or others not able to secure private housing on a permanent basis	1 point each (maximum of 6 points)
C5. Permanent housing serving a vulnerable or special population including:	0.5 points each (maximum of 6 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult offenders or adjudicated delinquents • People with physical disabilities, mental illness, developmental disabilities, or chemical dependency • Victims of sex trafficking or domestic abuse 	

Appendix

Recognized local official controls include the following when used for affordable housing:

- Allowing alternative construction methods or development flexibility
- Development approved at originally proposed development density
- Density bonus or transfer
- Floor Area Ratio (FAR) waiver
- Increased building height flexibility
- Land cleanup or site assembly
- Public land dedication or land cost write-down
- Parking variances
- Private street allowances
- Reduction in lot sizes or widths
- Reduction in street widths or right-of-way
- Setback reductions
- Sewer or water service line size reduction
- Soil correction variance
- Special or conditional use permits
- Tax abatement, reduction, or credit
- Reduction in public improvement and development costs (e.g. curbs, gutters, street lighting) /
- Planned Unit Development (PUD) cluster development
- Local sewer availability charge (SAC) credit or waiver
- Reduced park or impact fees
- On-street parking allowance
- Rezoning to accommodate development

Recognized fiscal/financial tools include the following when used for affordable housing:

- Community Development Block Grant or Home Investment Partnerships funding (when funds are received through entitlement or granted or loaned to the local municipality for use at its discretion)
- Credit enhancements
- Loan guarantees
- General obligation, tax-exempt, mortgage revenue, private activity, or housing revenue bonds when used to create affordable or mixed-income housing
- Land write-downs, sale, public dedication, or acquisitions
- Livable Communities grants
- Fee waivers or reductions
- Tax abatement (full or partial)
- Tax increment financing (TIF)
- Minnesota Housing Impact Fund grants when awarded to the city
- County grants, loans, or bond proceeds when provided to the city for use at its discretion
- Estimated value of local official controls adjusted or waived
- Local sewer or water availability or access charge credit or waiver
- Local property tax levy



390 Robert Street North
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1805

651.602.1000
TTY 651.291.0904
public.info@metc.state.mn.us
metro council.org

Follow us on:
twitter.com/metcouncilnews
facebook.com/MetropolitanCouncil
youtube.com/MetropolitanCouncil

GUIDELINES FOR PRIORITY FUNDING FOR HOUSING PERFORMANCE

Methodology for the Housing Performance Scores



Revised MayJune 20162018

The Council's mission is to foster efficient and economic growth for a prosperous metropolitan region

Metropolitan Council Members

Adam Duinink	<u>Alene Tchourumoff</u>	Edward Reynoso	District 9
	Chair	Marie McCarthy	District 10
Katie Rodriguez	District 1	Sandy Rummel	District 11
Lona Schreiber	District 2	Harry Melander	District 12
Jennifer Munt	District 3	Richard Kramer	District 13
Deb Barber	District 4	Jon Commers	District 14
Steve Elkins	District 5	Steven T. Chávez	District 15
Gail Dorfman	District 6	Wendy Wulff	District 16
Gary L. Cunningham	District 7		
Cara Letofsky	District 8		



The Metropolitan Council is the regional planning organization for the seven-county Twin Cities area. The Council operates the regional bus and rail system, collects and treats wastewater, coordinates regional water resources, plans and helps fund regional parks, and administers federal funds that provide housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families. The 17-member Council board is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the governor.

On request, this publication will be made available in alternative formats to people with disabilities. Call Metropolitan Council information at 651-602-1140 or TTY 651-291-0904.

The *2040 Housing Policy Plan* describes multiple strategies that advance the Metropolitan Council's overarching housing policy priority, which is to **Create housing options that give people in all life stages and of all economic means viable choices for safe, stable and affordable homes.** A range of housing options across the region benefits individuals, families, and local governments. Viable housing choices allow households to find housing affordable to them in the communities where they want to live. Like a diversified investment portfolio, a diversity of housing types can increase local government resiliency through changing economic climates.

The Council uses the Housing Performance Scores to give priority in funding to communities that are maintaining or expanding their supply of affordable housing and using fiscal, planning, and regulatory tools to promote affordable and mixed-income housing. The Council uses the Scores in the Livable Communities Demonstration Account and the Tax Base Revitalization Account to reward communities that have a demonstrable commitment to providing affordable housing options. Housing Performance Scores will also continue to constitute 7% of the total points available in the 2014-2018 and 2016 Regional Solicitations for Transportation Funding. ~~Joint applications for discretionary funding are weighted pursuant to the applicable combination of local city or township scores (no scores will be calculated for communities that have neither Livable Communities goals for affordable and lifecycle housing nor an Allocation of Affordable Housing Need).~~

At the same time, the Council assists affordable housing development in communities struggling ~~with housing performance~~ to provide a full range of housing choices. ~~For example,~~ the Council gives preference to communities with lower Housing Performance Scores in funding decisions for the Local Housing Incentives Account, which has funded more than one-third of the affordable units produced through the Livable Communities Act programs.

The following criteria and their relative weight will be used to determine a score of 0 to 100 points, reflecting local effort on housing affordability, including providing implementing effective housing programs, funding housing development, and creating and preserving housing affordability. For funding evaluation purposes, the Housing Performance Scores will then be converted to a 0 to 10 scale (any score ending in 5 will be rounded upward). The Council will publish scores on both 0 to 100 point and 0 to 10 point scales.

Overall Housing Performance Scores Methodology & Structure

The categories for calculating Housing Performance Scores are:

- New affordable or mixed-income housing completed in the last ten years;
- Preservation projects completed in the last seven years and/or Substantial rehabilitation projects completed in the last three years;
- Housing program participation and production, and housing policies and ordinances
- Characteristics of the existing housing stock.

As outlined in the *2040 Housing Policy Plan*, the Council will review the Housing Performance Scores methodology every two years, ~~beginning with this review in 2016.~~ ~~To recognize the substantial 2015 adjustments to the methodology, the Council is using a "hold harmless" provision, whereby no locality's score will drop below 80% of its average Housing Performance Score over the previous five years (including previous scores that included a "hold harmless" provision).~~ This will be revisited in 2018. document reflects the outcomes of the second review since the adoption of the amended HPP in 2015.

The Council assembles data for the Housing Performance Scores from sources including Minnesota Housing and county governments. The Council asks local jurisdictions to provide additional information not available from other sources. Local municipalities can also submit an optional narrative describing

tools, activities, services, or other housing efforts that they would like the Council to consider but that are not explicitly identified in these guidelines.

Recent New Affordable Housing and Preservation / Substantial Rehabilitation Projects (0-50 points)

To meet its housing need, the Twin Cities region needs both additional affordable housing as well as to preserve and rehabilitate existing affordable housing. The need for additional affordable housing is strongest for lower income households who have fewer housing choices than higher income households.

Overall, 50 points are available in this section; 25 points for new affordable housing and 25 points for investments in the preservation and substantial rehabilitation of existing affordable or mixed-income housing. ~~The specific split in available points between these two activities depends on a community's Community Designation (learn more about Community Designations in Thrive MSP 2040) and forecasted household growth.~~

Community Designation / Household Growth Forecast	Maximum Points for New Affordable Housing	Maximum Points for Preservation / Substantial Rehabilitation
If households forecast to be added in the decade (2010-2020) are 10% or less of 2010 households	15	35
If households forecast to be added in the decade (2010-2020) are 10-15% of 2010 households	25	25
If households forecast to be added in the decade (2010-2020) are 15-20% of 2010 households	30	20
If households forecast to be added in the decade (2010-2020) are 20% or more of 2010 households	35	15

~~Faster-growing communities have a larger relative share of the possible 50 points attributable to efforts in new affordable housing, while older communities with more aging housing have a greater share of the possible 50 points attributable to efforts in preservation and substantial rehabilitation.~~ A community that exceeds available points in one category but does not reach full points under the other receives one-quarter of the difference between the points earned under the former category, to be applied to the latter category (subject to the overall 50-point maximum).

Sample Scoring		Maximum Points	Earned Points	Counted Points	Total
Community A	New Affordable Housing	45 25	10	10 + $\frac{1}{4} * (43 - \del{35}25)$	42 15 + 35 25 = 47 40
	Preservation and Substantial Rehabilitation	35 25	43	35 25	
Community B	New Affordable Housing	25	37	25	50
	Preservation and Substantial Rehabilitation	25	30	25	

The following points will be awarded based on activities for projects over the last 10 years creating new affordable or mixed-income housing (where a city completed more than 10 projects, only the most recent 10 will count ~~for N2, N3, N4, N7 and N8~~):

Table 1: New Affordable and Mixed-Income Housing in last 10 years

Item and description	Points
N1. New units affordable to households at or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI) as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	3 points per percentage point
New units affordable to households earning between 54 <u>31</u> % and 80 <u>50</u> % of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	1.5 points per percentage point
New units affordable to households earning between 51% and 80% of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	1 point per percentage point
New owner-occupied units affordable to households between 81% and 115% of AMI as a share of all housing units built over the last ten years	0.5 point per percentage point
N2. New units affordable to households at or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI)	0.5 points each
New units affordable to households earning between 31% and 50% AMI	0.25 points each
New units affordable to households earning between 51% and 80% AMI	0.15 points each
New owner-occupied units affordable to households between 81% and 115% of AMI	0.10 points each
N3. Each local official control adjusted, waived, or used enabling affordable housing*	0.15 points each
N4. New mixed-income project (at least 20% but not more than 80% market-rate affordable units must be income restricted)	7 points
N5. New units put community on track to meet decade's Livable Communities Act (LCA) goal for new affordable housing (e.g. 40% of goal is met by year 4, or 70% after 7 years)	Up to 10 points 1 point for every 10% for being on track toward decade long goal, prorated by years in decade
N6 <u>N5</u> . Direct local financial contribution to affordable or mixed-income development, including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	1 point for each percentage point contributed of the Total Development Cost, up to 6 points per project
N7 <u>N6</u> . Issuance of housing revenue bonds for construction of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g., bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits or bonds for age- and income- restricted senior developments)	5 points

*See Appendix for full list of eligible points-earning local official controls & financial contribution types

Where applications involving substantial city effort in support of affordable housing are submitted to major funding partners (Minnesota Housing, Metropolitan Council, county governments), but not selected due to factors outside the municipality's control, up to 25% of points may be awarded at the Council's discretion.

The rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing is often the most cost-effective approach to addressing affordable housing challenges. As the region's affordable housing ages, addressing the physical needs of the existing stock becomes critical to avoid unnecessary loss of

affordable units. This category is intended to capture larger scale rehabilitation and preservation projects (and that are typically a single project under common ownership, management, and financing). Single-family rehabilitation loan programs, for example—where each household served represents a unique real estate transaction—are covered in Housing Programs and Policies.

Points will be awarded based on activities involving up to 10 affordable and/or mixed-income projects in the past seven years for preservation and the past three years for substantial rehabilitation. Under either, affordability of subsidized units must generally be secured for at least 15 years.

Preservation activities are rehabilitation efforts that substantially improve the physical asset and:

- Prevent the owner from converting the property to market rate or a different use by providing low-cost public financing (and under certain circumstances allowing for equity take-out), and
- Have as a financing condition that the owner consents to continued participation in a federal project-based rental assistance program, or that otherwise lead to long-term rent and income restrictions (this can include Section 202, Section 515, or Section 811 properties; Low-Income Housing Tax Credit properties; or permanent housing for the long-term homeless or other forms of service-intensive supportive housing) for the term of the mortgage or applicable instrument.

Note: While substantial rehabilitation may involve coordinated single family (i.e., scattered site development or redevelopment, or as part of a community revitalization plan) or multifamily efforts, preservation activities are exclusive to multifamily properties with expiring affordability restrictions and/or existing rental assistance or support services contracts.

For these purposes, the threshold for substantial rehabilitation is defined as:

- The cost of repairs, replacements and improvements are equal to or above an average of \$5,000 per dwelling unit (includes improvements to common areas), or
- Two or more major building components are being substantially repaired or replaced.

To receive credit, rehabilitated rental units must have either an income restriction of at least 15 years or a long-term commitment to accept Housing Choice Vouchers or other forms of public rental assistance.

Table 2: Preservation of affordable or mixed-income housing in last 7 years

Item and description	Points
P1. Preserved units serving a household at or below 30% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	1.25 points per percentage point
Preserved units serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	0.75 points per percentage point
Preserved units serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI as a share of existing housing units using state or federal project-based assistance	0.5 point per percentage point
P2. Each preserved unit serving a household at or below 30% of AMI	0.75 points each
Each preserved unit serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI	0.5 points each
Each preserved unit serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI	0.25 points each
P3. Direct local financial contribution to <u>to the preservation of</u> affordable or mixed-income development <u>housing</u> , including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	1 point for each percentage point contributed of the Total Development Cost, up to 5 points per project

P4.	Each local control adjusted or waived to preserve affordable housing	0.15 points per unit
P5.	Demonstrated local efforts to preserve a manufactured housing park from threat of conversion or closure and loss of affordable units	7 points
P6.	Issuance of housing revenue bonds for preservation of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g. bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits)	7 points

Table 3: Substantial Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing in last 3 years

Item and description	Points	
R1.	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household at or below 30% of AMI	0.5 points per unit
	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household between 31% and 50% of AMI	0.25 points per unit
	Each rehabilitated unit serving a household between 51% and 80% of AMI	0.15 point per unit
	Each rehabilitated owner-occupied unit serving household between 81% and 115% of AMI	0.10 points per unit
R2.	Each acquisition/rehab/resale of an owner-occupied unit affordable at or below 80% AMI that is brought into a Community Land Trust	1.5 points per unit
R3.	Each local official control adjusted or waived to rehabilitate affordable housing	0.15 points per unit
R4.	Direct local financial contribution to affordable or mixed-income development, including the estimated value of local controls waived or adjusted	0.5 points for each percentage point of the Total Development Cost contributed, up to 4 points per project
R5.	Rehabilitation activity that involves conversion of units from a non-restricted status to a rent and income-restricted status (newly built income-restricted units should be counted in N1-N2 above)	5 points
R6.	Issuance of housing revenue bonds for rehabilitation of affordable or mixed-income housing (e.g. bonds to be paired with 4% tax credits)	5 points

Housing Programs and Policies (0-25 Points)

This category captures information on housing efforts that may be less direct or less costly than direct support for new development or major rehabilitation projects. Local programs and activities, or participation in other government programs, are important to the degree that the programs are used to benefit low- and moderate-income households.

Table 4: Housing Programs and Policies

Item and description	Points
H1. Each locally funded or administered housing program or service*	
H2. Each housing program operated by a nonprofit organization receiving a local financial contribution (e.g. single family rehab loan programs, rental assistance programs, housing counseling programs or services, etc.)	2 points each
H3. Covering all or a portion of administrative expenses incurred in administering a federal, state, or county housing program (i.e. the difference between costs incurred and administration reimbursement from the federal, state, or county government)	
H4. Local expenditure in the prior year to affordable or life-cycle housing as a share of the municipality's Affordable and Life-Cycle Housing Opportunities Amount	2 points if 85-99% 3 points if 100% or more
H5. Demonstrated efforts to improve/preserve unsubsidized affordable housing (if not claimed under item R5)	
H6H5. Participation (as a lender or administrator) in the Minnesota Housing single-family Rehabilitation Loan, Emergency Loan, and/or Community Fix-Up Programs. Households served under city, county or state homeownership programs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnesota Housing single family rehabilitation loan, emergency loan, and/or community fix-up programs • Foreclosure prevention, down payment assistance programs or homebuyer education 	3-0.20 points each
H7. Successful/funded application to the Minnesota Housing Single Family Impact Fund for activities other than new construction or rehabilitation	
H8. Households served under city, county, or state housing programs above	0.10 points each
H9H6. Adopting or administering a rental licensing program any of the following programs/policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rental licensing program • An active code enforcement program (for rental or owner-occupied) • An Accessory Dwelling Unit (ACU) policy • A mixed-income (inclusionary) housing policy • A local Fair Housing policy that includes enforcement mechanisms • Tenants rights policy(ies), such as those that prohibit Section 8 discrimination, require notice of sale or right of first refusal, and/or address just-cause eviction 	4 points each
H10. Administering an active code enforcement program (for rental or owner-occupied)	
H11. Adopting an ordinance or policy that allows Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)	4 points
H12. Adopting or administering a mixed-income (inclusionary) housing policy	8 points

H13. Adopting a local Fair Housing policy that includes enforcement mechanisms	4 points
H14. County levies local households for a county Housing and Redevelopment Authority or a county Community Development Authority that constructs new-affordable housing	3 points

** Locally funded means where the community itself generated funding for the program, or received funding from a higher level of government and had control over its use (i.e. funds are expended by the community and not the higher level of government)*

Trying to capture all efforts, tools, and activities to promote housing affordability would be not only challenging but also administratively burdensome. To yet recognize local innovations and initiative, the Council offers communities the option to showcase additional efforts that could merit points but are not otherwise captured in these guidelines. When generating the Scores, Council staff will evaluate how narratives fit into the overarching point structure and provide additional points at its discretion.

Characteristics of the Existing Housing Stock (0-25 Points)

This category recognizes the important role the existing housing stock plays in providing affordable opportunities and reflects the critical role for communities that are home to housing for special and vulnerable populations. Points for the existing housing category are awarded as follows:

Table 5: Characteristics and affordability of the existing housing stock

Item and description	Points
C1. Existing housing stock affordable to households earning 30% of AMI or less:	At least 21 %: 2 points At least 43 %: 4 points At least 68 %: 8 points
C2. Share of existing housing stock affordable to households earning 50% of AMI or less:	At least 7%: 2 points At least 15%: 4 points At least 30 23 %: 8 points
C3. Share of existing housing stock affordable to households earning 80% of AMI or less	At least 30 20 %: 2 points At least 50 40 %: 4 points At least 80 65 %: 8 points
C4. Shelters or transitional housing for people experiencing long-term homelessness or who are at risk of long-term homelessness, or others not able to secure private housing on a permanent basis	1 point each (maximum of 6 points)
C5. Permanent housing serving a vulnerable or special population including:	0.5 points each (maximum of 6 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult offenders or adjudicated delinquents • People with physical disabilities, mental illness, developmental disabilities, or chemical dependency • Victims of sex trafficking or domestic abuse 	

Appendix

Recognized local official controls include the following when used for affordable housing:

- Allowing alternative construction methods or development flexibility
- Development approved at originally proposed development density
- Density bonus or transfer
- Floor Area Ratio (FAR) waiver
- Increased building height flexibility
- Land cleanup or site assembly
- Public land dedication or land cost write-down
- Parking variances
- Private street allowances
- Reduction in lot sizes or widths
- Reduction in street widths or right-of-way
- Setback reductions
- Sewer or water service line size reduction
- Soil correction variance
- Special or conditional use permits
- Tax abatement, reduction, or credit
- Reduction in public improvement and development costs (e.g. curbs, gutters, street lighting) /
- Planned Unit Development (PUD) cluster development
- Local sewer availability charge (SAC) credit or waiver
- Reduced park or impact fees
- On-street parking allowance
- Rezoning to accommodate development

Recognized fiscal/financial tools include the following when used for affordable housing:

- Community Development Block Grant or Home Investment Partnerships funding (when funds are received through entitlement or granted or loaned to the local municipality for use at its discretion)
- Credit enhancements
- Loan guarantees
- General obligation, tax-exempt, mortgage revenue, private activity, or housing revenue bonds when used to create affordable or mixed-income housing
- Land write-downs, sale, public dedication, or acquisitions
- Livable Communities grants
- Fee waivers or reductions
- Tax abatement (full or partial)
- Tax increment financing (TIF)
- Minnesota Housing Impact Fund grants when awarded to the city
- County grants, loans, or bond proceeds when provided to the city for use at its discretion
- Estimated value of local official controls adjusted or waived
- Local sewer or water availability or access charge credit or waiver
- Local property tax levy



390 Robert Street North
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1805

651.602.1000
TTY 651.291.0904
public.info@metc.state.mn.us
metro council.org

Follow us on:
twitter.com/metcouncilnews
facebook.com/MetropolitanCouncil
youtube.com/MetropolitanCouncil