

# LIVABLE COMMUNITIES GRANT PROGRAMS

## POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The Policy Development program provides funding to participating cities to support locally adopted policies that influence physical development and further both Livable Communities Act (LCA) and Imagine 2050 goals with an emphasis on equitable development.

### Funding

**Available Funding:** \$200,000 per year

**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

**Round 1 Application Due:** April 21, 2025 at 3PM

**Round 1 Decision:** June 2025

**Round 2 Application Due:** July 21, 2025 at 3PM

**Round 2 Decision:** September 2025

### Eligible Costs

- Consultant services to develop an eligible policy that will further LCA and Imagine 2050 goals
- Staff time directly related to developing an eligible policy that will further LCA and Imagine 2050 goals

### Ineligible Costs

- Work done before the grant was awarded
- General staff time not directly related to policy development

### Funding Considerations:

If requests exceed the available funding, the Metropolitan Council may supplement the Livable Communities Policy Development grant program with funds from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Pathways for Removing Obstacles to (PRO) Housing program.

**Program Coordinator**

Emily Seddon

Emily.Seddon@metc.state.mn.us



# Policy 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 Development Outcomes

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

## Policy Development Scoring Table Continued

<b>How: Policy Development Process</b>				
	Scoring Criteria	Points	Evaluation Considerations	Examples to Achieve Points
<b>Process</b>	The process will include analysis of who will benefit most from the policy and in what ways, and use findings to influence equitable development strategies and outcomes	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where did the need for the policy come from (e.g., private market, City Council, communities of color, general community engagement)?</li> <li>Who will benefit from the policy, now and in the future?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy needs were identified to reduce disparities or by those most impacted by disparities.</li> <li>Short- and long-term policy benefits help to reduce disparities across the city</li> </ul>
<b>Who: Policy Development Team</b>				
<b>Who Is Involved</b>	The project team has a defined scope of work with tangible goals	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project team clearly outlined the work of the consultant and the outcomes they expect from the consultant?</li> <li>Was the scope of work developed in partnership with community members impacted by the policy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A scope of work that is manageable and clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities of the consultant as well as the city</li> <li>The relationship between the consultant and the city is clearly defined</li> </ul>
<b>City Capacity</b>	Of Livable Communities Act Participating Cities, if net tax capacity falls within the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top 25%: 2 points</li> <li>50%-75% Percentile: 6 points</li> <li>Below 50% Percentile: 10 points</li> </ul>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Per capita net tax capacity (2023)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See appendix on pages 4-5 for point listing by City</li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>		<b>60</b>		
Applications must score at least 25 out of the 60 possible points to be eligible				

## Appendix

### LCA Participating City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy Development Grants

City	2023 Net Tax Capacity (\$ per capita)	Score for Policy Development
Apple Valley	91.46	10
Belle Plaine	75.91	10
Blaine (Anoka Co. part)	152.84	6
Bloomington	310.88	2
Brooklyn Center	128.70	10
Brooklyn Park	184.74	6
Burnsville	206.49	6
Carver	62.46	10
Centerville	99.13	10
Chanhassen (Carver Co. part)	220.00	6
Chaska	171.30	6
Columbia Heights	44.36	10
Coon Rapids	137.76	10
Cottage Grove	87.75	10
Crystal	74.93	10
Eagan	285.94	2
Eden Prairie	289.70	2
Edina	308.81	2
Elko New Market	27.02	10
Excelsior	412.62	2
Falcon Heights	35.26	10
Farmington	63.92	10
Fridley	288.13	2
Golden Valley	389.87	2
Hastings (Dakota Co. part)	82.38	10
Hopkins	224.46	6
Hugo	92.75	10
Inver Grove Heights	135.84	10
Jordan	94.36	10
Lauderdale	119.80	10
Lino Lakes	84.05	10
Little Canada	217.96	6
Long Lake	405.31	2
Loretto	178.45	6
Mahtomedi	70.00	10
Maple Grove	230.57	2
Maplewood	175.16	6
Mayer	42.49	10
Medina	242.70	2
Minneapolis	204.79	6

## Appendix Continued

### LCA Participating City Net Tax Capacity Score for Policy Development Grants

<b>City</b>	<b>2023 Net Tax Capacity (\$ per capita)</b>	<b>Score for Policy Development</b>
Minnetonka	297.30	2
Mounds View	204.12	6
New Brighton	166.91	6
New Germany	57.38	10
New Hope	195.21	6
Newport	174.98	6
North St. Paul	65.61	10
Osseo	250.38	2
Plymouth	281.52	2
Prior Lake	67.27	10
Ramsey	125.42	10
Richfield	142.92	10
Robbinsdale	45.65	10
Rogers	513.35	2
Rosemount	121.94	10
Roseville	356.15	2
Savage	152.94	6
Shakopee	318.51	2
Shoreview	119.21	10
South St. Paul	84.23	10
St. Francis (Anoka Co. part)	46.61	10
St. Louis Park	265.07	2
St. Paul	113.00	10
St. Paul Park	91.07	10
Stillwater	145.63	6
Tonka Bay	81.58	10
Vadnais Heights	280.26	2
Victoria	32.21	10
Waconia	140.17	10
Watertown	42.27	10
Wayzata	711.71	2
West St. Paul	106.36	10
White Bear Lake (Ramsey Co. part)	152.07	6
White Bear Township	168.09	6
Woodbury	169.06	6