

EXPANDED LIVABLE COMMUNITIES GRANT PROGRAM

POLICY &

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The Policy & Program Development grant program expands upon the earlier “Policy Development” program to provide support to cities to develop locally adopted policies, programs, or partnerships that influence physical development and further both Livable Communities Act (LCA) and Imagine 2050 goals, with an emphasis on reducing the barriers to producing and preserving affordable housing.

Funding

Available Funding: \$800,000*; at least \$200,000 of total available funding will be awarded to cities in Hennepin and Ramsey Counties

Award Limits: \$50,000 per city

Application Limit: One per city

Local Match: None

Grant Term: Two years (up to one year extension possible)

Key Dates

Application Portal Opens: May 21, 2025

Application Due: July 21, 2025 at 3PM

Decision: September 2025

Eligibility

All cities and townships in the seven-county Twin Cities region that are consistent with comprehensive plan requirements are eligible to apply. Cities and townships that are not currently enrolled in the Livable Communities Act programs, must [enroll](#) if awarded funds.

Eligible projects include:

- Develop an enforceable policy or ordinance that influences the built environment as a means to achieve one or more of the following outcomes:
 - Remove barriers to producing or preserving affordable housing and/or prevent displacement in areas receiving new investment;
 - Support wealth building and economic opportunity for communities of historic wealth extraction; and/or
 - Minimize climate impact by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and conserving natural resources through housing, land use and other policies that affect the built environment.
- Develop an implementation plan for investing Local Affordable Housing Account (LAHA) funds.
- Develop a program or launch a new partnership that removes barriers to producing or preserving affordable housing.

*The Metropolitan Council may use federal funds to fulfill all or part of grant requests, which may have different reporting and record keeping requirements than other Metropolitan Council grants.

Program Coordinators

Emily Seddon
Emily.Seddon@metc.state.mn.us

Olivia Boerschinger
Olivia.Boerschinger@metc.state.mn.us



Eligible Costs

- Consultant services to develop an eligible policy, program, or partnership that will further LCA and Imagine 2050 goals
- Staff time directly related to developing an eligible policy, program, or partnership that will further LCA and Imagine 2050 goals
- Materials necessary to launch program or partnership (i.e. printed materials)

Ineligible Costs

- Work done before the grant was awarded
- General staff time not directly related to policy, program, or partnership development
- Seed funding for new resources (i.e. the initial investment in an affordable housing trust fund or downpayment assistance program)
- Program or partnership operating costs
- Costs related to an existing policy or program
- Administrative or enforcement costs of a policy

Policy & Program Development Scoring Table

While we recognize there are different types of inequities based on identity and circumstance, LCA is focused on addressing racial inequity in the region given race is the largest predictor of inequitable outcomes in jobs, housing, and other LCA goals. Projects addressing racial equity will be prioritized in scoring. Projects addressing other inequities will earn points towards how they address those inequities but will not receive full points unless they also consider the intersection of racial inequity.

What: Policy, Program, or Partnership Development Outcomes

The proposed policy, program, or partnership would meet one or more of the following LCA and/or Imagine 2050 goals associated with physical development:

	Scoring Criteria	Points	Evaluation Considerations	Examples to Achieve Points
LCA and Imagine 2050 Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove barriers to producing or preserving affordable housing, with priority given to efforts that focus on housing affordable to households living at 30% of the area median income and/or prevent displacement in areas receiving new investment. Support wealth building and economic opportunity for communities of historic wealth extraction Minimizing climate impact by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and conserving natural resources 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the future initiative create or preserve affordable housing in the city to provide more affordable housing options in the city? Will the initiative create more affordable housing opportunities in the city? How will the policy support new living wage jobs? Will the initiative support increased density in a way that leads to more connected development? How is the policy considering impacts of climate change as a result of physical development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve existing affordable housing New affordable housing created through inclusionary zoning or requiring affordable units to receive city funding Prioritize housing affordable to households living on 30% of the area median income Disadvantaged business enterprise or other policies that introduces contracting requirements for developers working in the city Policies that support affordable commercial space or commercial space ownership programs for small business owners Local policies that require living wage jobs for development projects that include local financing or need local approvals Allow for more density throughout the city or in key areas Multimodal connections requirements for new developments or redevelopments Complete streets policies Building requirements that prioritize environmental sustainability such as LEED or other widely recognized environmental sustainability standards
	Support more equitable development outcomes in physical developments and/or through city process to approve physical developments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will the policy reduce disparities that may be exacerbated by future development projects? Does the policy prioritize equitable outcomes as a result? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City-wide policies that protect tenants (e.g., right of first refusal, no crime free drug free lease addendum requirements, notice of sale policies). Affordable units are indistinguishable from market rate units Affordable housing developments are located with easy access to amenities, for example preserving land within ¼ mile of parks for affordable housing Policy that supports equitable economic growth or prioritizes workforce training to residents most impacted by economic disparities Environmental sustainability policies prioritize residents who have been disproportionately impacted by past environmental harms

Policy & Program Development Scoring Table Continued

How: Policy, Program, or Partnership Development Process

	Scoring Criteria	Points	Evaluation Considerations	Examples to Achieve Points
Process	The process will include analysis of who will benefit most from the policy, program, or partnership and in what ways, and use findings to influence equitable development strategies and outcomes	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where did the need for the policy or program come from (e.g., private market, City Council, communities of color, general community engagement)? Who will benefit from the policy or program, now and in the future? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy, program, or partnership needs were identified to reduce disparities or by those most impacted by disparities Short- and long-term policy benefits help to reduce disparities across the city

Who: Policy, Program, or Partnership Development Team

Who Is Involved	The project team has a defined scope of work with tangible goals	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project team clearly outlined the work of the consultant and the outcomes they expect from the consultant? Was the scope of work developed in partnership with community members impacted by the policy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A scope of work that is manageable and clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities of the consultant as well as the city The relationship between the consultant and the city is clearly defined
City Capacity	Of metropolitan area cities and townships, if net tax capacity falls within the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Top 25%: 2 points 50%-75% Percentile: 6 points Below 50% Percentile: 10 points 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per capita net tax capacity (2024) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See appendix on pages 5-9 for point listing by city
Total		60		

Applications must score at least 25 out of the 60 possible points to be eligible

Appendix

City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy & Program Development Grants

City	2024 Net Tax Capacity (<i>\$ per capita</i>)	Score for Policy & Program Development
Afton	3920.69	2
Andover	1600.71	10
Anoka	1613.46	10
Apple Valley	1617.83	10
Bayport	1571.50	10
Baytown Township	3612.82	6
Belle Plaine	1259.88	10
Belle Plaine Township	4020.45	2
Benton Township	3484.19	6
Bethel	1304.34	10
Birchwood Village	2727.24	6
Blaine	1807.51	10
Blakeley Township	4401.05	2
Bloomington	2540.52	6
Brooklyn Center	1140.55	10
Brooklyn Park	1576.48	10
Burnsville	1833.45	10
Camden Township	2648.93	6
Carver	1692.42	10
Castle Rock Township	3369.71	6
Cedar Lake Township	2711.13	6
Centerville	1873.91	10
Champlin	1644.24	10
Chanhassen	2803.47	6
Chaska	1889.46	10
Circle Pines	1315.45	10
Coates	3297.30	6
Cologne	1402.95	10
Columbia Heights	1117.26	10
Columbus	2761.91	6
Coon Rapids	1484.83	10
Corcoran	2663.32	6
Cottage Grove	1688.09	10
Credit River	2849.22	6
Crystal	1356.79	10
Dahlgren Township	3255.69	6
Dayton (Hennepin Co. part)	2592.86	6
Deephaven	6335.24	2

Appendix Continued

City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy & Program Development Grants

City	2024 Net Tax Capacity (\$ per capita)	Score for Policy & Program Development
Dellwood	5383.71	2
Denmark Township	3877.19	2
Douglas Township	3483.32	6
Eagan	2333.48	6
East Bethel	1585.38	10
Eden Prairie	2766.67	6
Edina	3815.88	2
Elko New Market	1400.46	10
Empire	1900.58	10
Eureka Township	3531.99	6
Excelsior	4563.06	2
Falcon Heights	1299.09	10
Farmington	1388.66	10
Forest Lake	1885.87	10
Fort Snelling (unorganized)	463.95	10
Fridley	1929.86	10
Gem Lake	3682.67	6
Golden Valley	3119.20	6
Grant	3473.12	6
Greenfield	2743.60	6
Greenvale Township	3580.41	6
Greenwood	9628.69	2
Grey Cloud Island Township	2484.46	6
Ham Lake	2016.09	10
Hamburg	845.37	10
Hampton	1167.45	10
Hampton Township	3874.75	2
Hancock Township	3045.97	6
Hanover (Hennepin Co. part)	1955.55	10
Hastings	1412.30	10
Helena Township	2909.22	6
Hilltop	800.45	10
Hollywood Township	2488.59	6
Hopkins	1964.58	10
Hugo	2042.61	10
Independence	3218.29	6
Inver Grove Heights	1805.81	10
Jackson Township	2183.58	6

Appendix Continued

City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy & Program Development Grants

City	2024 Net Tax Capacity (<i>\$ per capita</i>)	Score for Policy & Program Development
Jordan	1285.08	10
Lake Elmo	2674.73	6
Lake St. Croix Beach	1772.69	10
Lakeland	2246.87	6
Lakeland Shores	2682.96	6
Laketown Township	2430.03	6
Lakeville	1931.45	10
Landfall	297.29	10
Lauderdale	1635.76	10
Lexington	1319.37	10
Lilydale	3880.30	2
Lino Lakes	1797.85	10
Linwood Township	1643.51	10
Little Canada	1837.72	10
Long Lake	3172.13	6
Loretto	1757.24	10
Louisville Township	3952.94	2
Mahtomedi	2150.09	10
Maple Grove	2403.79	6
Maple Plain	2031.38	10
Maplewood	1604.49	10
Marine on St. Croix	3257.85	6
Marshan Township	3221.12	6
May Township	4160.18	2
Mayer	1156.15	10
Medicine Lake	5161.01	2
Medina	4304.43	2
Mendota	3386.49	6
Mendota Heights	3172.59	6
Miesville	2171.76	10
Minneapolis	1942.13	10
Minnetonka	2977.99	6
Minnetonka Beach	12298.21	2
Minnetrista	3757.62	6
Mound	2644.24	6
Mounds View	1571.65	10
New Brighton	1708.19	10
New Germany	1101.93	10

Appendix Continued

City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy & Program Development Grants

City	2024 Net Tax Capacity (\$ per capita)	Score for Policy & Program Development
New Hope	1639.72	10
New Market Township	3149.91	6
New Prague (Scott Co. part)	1418.00	10
New Trier	1215.93	10
Newport	1811.26	10
Nininger Township	2600.78	6
North Oaks	4051.81	2
North St. Paul	1278.55	10
Northfield (Dakota Co. part)	1741.73	10
Norwood Young America	1245.89	10
Nowthen	2026.40	10
Oak Grove	1778.34	10
Oak Park Heights	3523.47	6
Oakdale	1712.14	10
Orono	6873.61	2
Osseo	1917.12	10
Pine Springs	2351.55	6
Plymouth	2713.22	6
Prior Lake	2171.73	10
Ramsey	1794.35	10
Randolph	1330.14	10
Randolph Township	3764.18	6
Ravenna Township	1921.66	10
Richfield	1612.65	10
Robbinsdale	1287.41	10
Rockford (Hennepin Co. part)	1700.73	10
Rogers	3099.81	6
Rosemount	1896.67	10
Roseville	2392.08	6
San Francisco Township	2835.66	6
Sand Creek Township	3188.31	6
Savage	1872.94	10
Scandia	2770.91	6
Sciota Township	2806.46	6
Shakopee	2235.70	6
Shoreview	1981.45	10
Shorewood (Hennepin Co. part)	4076.66	2
South St. Paul	1320.70	10

Appendix Continued

City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy & Program Development Grants

City	2024 Net Tax Capacity (\$ per capita)	Score for Policy & Program Development
Spring Lake Park (Anoka Co. part)	1412.79	10
Spring Lake Park (Ramsey Co. part)	1047.97	10
Spring Lake Township	2912.11	6
Spring Park	3236.33	6
St. Anthony (Hennepin Co. part)	1874.75	10
St. Anthony (Ramsey Co. part)	1887.75	10
St. Bonifacius	1565.65	10
St. Francis	1192.50	10
St. Lawrence Township	3098.23	6
St. Louis Park	2439.59	6
St. Marys Point	3876.75	2
St. Paul	1352.13	10
St. Paul Park	1264.75	10
Stillwater	2236.16	6
Stillwater Township	3311.58	6
Sunfish Lake	5808.57	2
Tonka Bay	7030.70	2
Vadnais Heights	2237.92	6
Vermillion	1332.23	10
Vermillion Township	3034.00	6
Victoria	2473.67	6
Waconia	1921.08	10
Waconia Township	3457.11	6
Waterford Township	2954.19	6
Watertown	1158.88	10
Watertown Township	3319.95	6
Wayzata	9383.52	2
West Lakeland Township	2991.08	6
West St. Paul	1466.41	10
White Bear Lake	1812.82	10
White Bear Township	2161.95	10
Willernie	1420.88	10
Woodbury	2265.04	6
Woodland	15171.68	2
Young America Township	3149.70	6