Appendix A: 2011–2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need

The Metropolitan Land Planning Act¹ requires cities and townships in the seven-county Twin Cities region to plan for "sufficient existing and new housing" to meet their local share of the overall need for low- and moderate-income housing. Each community includes this planning in the housing section of their comprehensive land use plan. To help communities meet this requirement, Metropolitan Council:

- forecasted the need for affordable housing in the region between 2011 and 2020; and
- allocated that need to individual cities and townships.

In 2006, an advisory panel of housing market specialists determined that the Twin Cities region would need to add about 51,000 housing units affordable to low- and moderate-income households to its existing housing stock between 2011 and 2020 in order to meet the future need for affordable housing. (See the summary report, "Determining Affordable Housing Need in the Twin Cities, 2011–2020" in a separate PDF.)

The Allocation of Affordable Housing Need numbers presented in this table are based on forecasts completed for the 2030 Regional Development Framework adopted by the Metropolitan Council in January 2004. As cities and townships submitted formal changes to their comprehensive plan over the past decade, their number of affordable units was also updated to reflect the 2010 or 2020 household forecast changes.

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
	Current as of December 2013	
Afton	0	0
Andover	635	2
Anoka	96	2
Apple Valley	1,307	0
Arden Hills	288	4
Bayport	29	0
Baytown Township	0	0
Belle Plaine	202	3
Belle Plaine Township	0	0
Benton Township	0	0
Bethel	0	0
Birchwood Village	0	0
Blaine	1,865	7
Blakeley Township	0	0
Bloomington	1,003	1
Brooklyn Center	163	0
Brooklyn Park	1,469	14
Burnsville	727	60
Camden Township	0	0

¹ Enacted in 1976, the Metropolitan Land Planning Act (Minnesota Statute 473.859) requires communities in the region to include housing in their comprehensive land-use plans. This housing component must acknowledge the community's share of the forecasted regional need for affordable housing.

Metropolitan Council | Regional Policy and Research | 390 Robert Street North | Saint Paul, MN 55101-1805 | metrocouncil.org

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need Current as of December 2013	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
Carver	894	0
Castle Rock Township	0	0
Cedar Lake Township	0	0
Centerville	170	0
Champlin	179	2
Chanhassen	1,166	4
Chaska	1,105	4
Circle Pines	13	0
Coates	0	0
Cologne	211	0
Columbia Heights	231	6
Columbus	53	1
Coon Rapids	192	13
Corcoran	302	0
Cottage Grove	985	12
Credit River Township	0	0
Crystal	130	4
Dahlgren Township	0	0
Dayton (Hennepin Co. part)	1,256	0
Deephaven	0	0
Dellwood	0	0
Denmark Township	0	0
Douglas Township	0	0
Eagan	1,034	74
East Bethel	181	0
Eden Prairie	1,844	2
Edina	212	1
Elko New Market	456	0
Empire Township	147	0
Eureka Township	0	0
Excelsior	7	0
Falcon Heights	21	0
Farmington	492	87
Forest Lake	551	74
Fridley	116	2
Gem Lake	19	0
Golden Valley	183	0

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
	Current as of December 2013	
Grant	0	0
Greenfield	14	0
Greenvale Township	0	0
Greenwood	0	0
Grey Cloud Island Township	0	0
Ham Lake	0	4
Hamburg	6	0
Hampton	4	0
Hampton Township	0	0
Hancock Township	0	0
Hastings	99	7
Helena Township	0	1
Hilltop	43	0
Hollywood Township	0	0
Hopkins	143	15
Hugo	855	0
Independence	36	0
Inver Grove Heights	872	24
Jackson Township	0	0
Jordan	114	2
Lake Elmo	465	0
Lake St. Croix Beach	0	0
Lakeland	0	0
Lakeland Shores	0	0
Laketown Township	0	0
Lakeville	2,260	0
Landfall	0	0
Lauderdale	35	0
Lexington	8	0
Lilydale	28	0
Lino Lakes	560	0
Linwood Township	0	0
Little Canada	72	0
Long Lake	40	0
Loretto	3	0
Louisville Township	0	0
Mahtomedi	27	0
Maple Grove	1,764	52

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
	Current as of December 2013	
Maple Plain	19	0
Maplewood	388	0
Marine on St. Croix	0	0
Marshan Township	0	0
May Township	0	0
Mayer	172	13
Medicine Lake	0	0
Medina	506	0
Mendota	3	0
Mendota Heights	43	0
Miesville	0	0
Minneapolis	4,224	1,518
Minnetonka	378	55
Minnetonka Beach	0	0
Minnetrista	209	0
Mound	68	1
Mounds View	65	0
New Brighton	137	0
New Germany	11	2
New Hope	213	2
New Market Township	0	0
New Trier	0	0
Newport	68	0
Nininger Township	0	0
North Oaks	56	0
North St. Paul	108	1
Norwood Young America	194	5
Nowthen	0	0
Oak Grove	0	1
Oak Park Heights	23	24
Oakdale	184	43
Orono	310	0
Osseo	26	0
Pine Springs	0	0
Plymouth	1,045	67
Prior Lake	1,166	3
Ramsey	636	68

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
	Current as of December 2013	
Randolph	0	0
Randolph Township	0	0
Ravenna Township	0	0
Richfield	765	22
Robbinsdale	133	3
Rogers	373	0
Rosemount	1,000	1
Roseville	201	21
San Francisco Township	0	0
Sand Creek Township	0	0
Savage	1,237	70
Scandia	0	0
Sciota Township	0	0
Shakopee	2,105	44
Shoreview	94	16
Shorewood	53	0
South St. Paul	104	0
Spring Lake Park	19	0
Spring Lake Township	0	0
Spring Park	31	0
St. Anthony	312	0
St. Bonifacius	0	0
St. Francis	74	4
St. Lawrence Township	0	0
St. Louis Park	501	1
St. Mary's Point	0	0
St. Paul	2,625	370
St. Paul Park	438	1
Stillwater	233	6
Stillwater Township	0	0
Sunfish Lake	0	0
Tonka Bay	9	0
Vadnais Heights	136	0
Vermillion	0	0
Vermillion Township	0	1
Victoria	975	0
Waconia	706	0
Waconia Township	0	0

City or township	2011-2020 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need Current as of December 2013	Number of affordable units produced, 2011-2013
Waterford Township	0	0
Watertown	60	2
Watertown Township	0	0
Wayzata	109	6
West Lakeland Township	0	0
West St. Paul	104	3
White Bear Lake	65	1
White Bear Township	113	0
Willernie	0	0
Woodbury	2,057	64
Woodland	0	0
Young America Township	0	0
REGIONAL TOTAL	52,266	2,923

Appendix B: Detailed survey responses about local tools and incentives used in 2013

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

									An	oka	a C	ou	nty	,												Ca	arv	er	Сс	un	ty				
	Andover	Anoka	Bethel	Blaine (part)	Centerville	Circle Pines	Columbia Heights	Columbus	Coon Rapids	East Bethel	Fridley	Ham Lake	Hilltop	Lexington	Lino Lakes	Linwood Township	Nowthen	Oak Grove	Ramsey	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Francis	Benton Township	Camden Township	Carver	Chanhassen (part)	Chaska	Cologne	Dahlgren Township	Hamburg	Hancock Township	Hollywood Township	Laketown Township	Mayer	New Germany	Norwood Young America
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹						x	x											x						x											
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	x	X			x		x			X								X								X									
Credit enhancements																																			
General obligation bonds	X		urvey.																																x
Housing revenue bonds			ne 2013 s																																x
Land write-down or sale	x	X	complete the	x		х	X		X		X								X					X		X									
Livable Communities grants			This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	x					X										X							x							x		x
Local fee waivers or reductions		x	This com	x	X	x			x		x								X					x		x							x		х
Local property tax levy		x					X	x			x								X								х						x		
Local tax abatement						x																											x		
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	x	x		X		х	x		x		X				x										x	X							x		
Taxable revenue bonds																																			
Other																																			
Total	4	5	NA	4	2	5	5	2	5	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

	(r C		-	′													ı	Dak	ot	a C	ou	ınty	/											
	San Francisco Township	Victoria	Waconia	Waconia Township	Watertown	Watertown Township	Young America Township	Valley Valley	Apple valley	Burnsville	Castle Rock Township	Coates	Douglas Township	Eagan	Empire Township	Eureka Township	Farmington	Greenvale Township	Hampton	Hampton Township	Hastings (part)	Inver Grove Heights	Lakeville	Lilydale	Marshan Township	Mendota	Mendota Heights	Miesville	New Iner	Nininger Township	Randolph	Randolph Township	Ravenna Township	Rosemount	Sciota Township	South St. Paul	Sunfish Lake
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹		x	x					×	(x				X																							
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)					x			×	(x		x		x			X				x		x											x		X	
Credit enhancements			x																																		
General obligation bonds													survey.		survey.	survey.		survey.		survey.				survey.	survey.					survey.	survey.	survey.			survey.		survey.
Housing revenue bonds			X										the 2013		the 2013	the 2013		the 2013		the 2013		X	X	the 2013	the 2013					the 2013	the 2013	the 2013			the 2013	X	the 2013
Land write-down or sale		x	x		x			×	(omplete 1		omplete 1	omplete 1		omplete 1		omplete 1				omplete 1	omplete 1					omplete 1	omplete 1	omplete 1		x	omplete 1	x	omplete 1
Livable Communities grants		x	x		x			×	(This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	x	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.				This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.					This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		X	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.
Local fee waivers or reductions			X		x					х			This com	X	This com	This com		This com		This com		X		This com	This com					This com	This com	This com		X	This com	x	This com
Local property tax levy											x											x	x														
Local tax abatement		x								х											x																
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)		X	x		X			×	(X				X								x	x											X		X	
Taxable revenue bonds																																					
Other																							X														
Total	0	5	7	0	5	0	0	5	,	5	1	1	NA	4	NA	NA	2	NΑ	0	NΑ	2	4	5	NΑ	NΑ	0	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	0	5	NΑ	5	1

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

		Со	kota unt	у													Н	eni	nep	oin	Co	un	ity												
	Vermillion	Vermillion Township	Waterford Township	West St. Paul	Bloomington	Brooklyn Center	Brooklyn Park	Champlin	Chanhassen (part)	Corcoran	Crystal	Dayton (part)	Deephaven	Eden Prairie	Edina	EXcelsior	Golden Valley	Greenfield	Greenwood	Hopkins	Independence	Long Lake	Loretto	Maple Grove	Maple Plain	Medicine Lake	Medina	Minneapolis	Minnetonka	Minnetonka Beach	Minnetrista	Mound	New Hope	Orono	Osseo
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹				x		x	X	x			x			x	X									x			X	x	X				x	x	
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)				x	x	X	x	x						x	x		x			x	x			x			X	x				х	x	x	x
Credit enhancements																																			
General obligation bonds Housing revenue bonds	2013 survey.	2013 survey.	2013 survey.																				x			2013 survey.		x	x	2013 survey.					
Land write-down or sale	omplete the	omplete the	omplete the	x	X						x									X						omplete the				omplete the	-				X
Livable Communities grants	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.											x			X			x			x		X	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	X	х		This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		x		x	x
Local fee waivers or reductions	This com	This com	This com					x																x	x	This com	Х			This com		x		x	
Local property taX levy					X						x												x						x						
Local taX abatement								x			X														X										x
TaX Increment Financing (TIF)				x	X	X	x	x			X			x						x			x		X			x	x			x		x	x
Taxable revenue bonds				X	x																														
Other							X							X	X	X													X						
Total	NA	NA	NA	5	5	3	4	5	0	0	5	0	0	5	3	1	2	0	0	4	1	0	4	3	4	NA	4	5	5	NA	0	4	2	5	5

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

			ŀ	Не		epi onti			ınt	У									R	lan	nse	y (Cou	unt	y						
	Plymouth	Richfield	Robbinsdale	Rogers	Shorewood	Spring Park	St. Anthony (part)	St. Bonifacius	St. Louis Park	Tonka Bay	Wayzata	Woodland	Arden Hills	Blaine (part)	Falcon Heights	Gem Lake	Lauderdale	Little Canada	Maplewood	Mounds View	New Brighton	North Oaks	North St. Paul	Roseville	Shoreview	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Anthony (part)	St. Paul	Vadnais Heights	White Bear Lake (part)	White Bear Township
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹	x	x	X				X		X		X				X				x					x	X			x		x	
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	X	х									X				x								X	x						x	
Credit enhancements																															
General obligation bonds	X				survey.	survey.				survey.								survey.			X										
Housing revenue bonds					ne 2013 s	ne 2013 s			X	ne 2013 s								ne 2013 s						x				x			
Land write-down or sale		X	x	X	omplete th	omplete th			X	omplete th			x					omplete th			X		X	X	X					X	
Livable Communities grants				x	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.			x	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	x		x					This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	x		x		x	x	x			x		x	
Local fee waivers or reductions	x			X	This com	This com				This com								This com							X						
Local property tax levy	x	x																													
Local tax abatement				X							x																				
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)		x	x	X					x		x		x		x		X		X		x		x	X	X			X	x	X	x
Taxable revenue bonds																															
Other																							X					X			
Total	5	5	3	5	NA	NA	1	0	5	NA	5	0	3	0	3	0	1	NA	3	0	4	0	5	6	5	0	0	5	1	5	1

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

procervation:							Sc	oti	t Co	oui	nty											,	Wa	sh	ing	jto	n C	ou	nty	,				
																									_	•			_					
	Belle Plaine	Belle Plaine Township	Blakeley Township	Cedar Lake Township	Credit River Township	Elko New Market	Helena Township	Jackson Township	Jordan	Louisville Township	New Market Township	Prior Lake	Sand Creek Township	Savage	Shakopee	Spring Lake Township	St. Lawrence Township	Afton	Bayport	Baytown Township	Birchwood Village	Cottage Grove	Dellwood	Denmark Township	Forest Lake	Grant	Grey Cloud Township	Hastings (part)	Hugo	Lake Elmo	Lake St. Croix Beach	Lakeland	Lakeland Shores	Landfall
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹									x						x							X			x						X			
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)															X							X							x		X			
Credit enhancements																																		
General obligation bonds														X				survey.			survey.												survey.	
Housing revenue bonds									X						X			he 2013 s			he 2013 s				x								he 2013 s	
Land write-down or sale						x								x				omplete t			omplete t								x				omplete t	
Livable Communities grants														x				This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.			This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	x			x				x				This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.	
Local fee waivers or reductions						x						X		x				This corr			This com				x								This corr	
Local property tax levy	x					x									x																	X		
Local tax abatement	x													X															x					
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	x											X		X	x				X						X				x					
Taxable revenue bonds																																		
Other	X											X																						
Total	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	6	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	2	1	1	0

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

Criterion #6: Please identify local fiscal tools or initiatives that were available from the city in 2013 to assist/facilitate the development or preservation of affordble or life-cycle housing. The identification of state and/or federal dollars is only applicable if the community could have used the dollars for activities other than affordable housing development or preservation.

preservation.						_				_						
					W	las	hin <i>C</i>		on inue		un	ty				
	Mahtomedi	Marine on St. Croix	May Township	Newport	Oak Park Heights	Oakdale	Pine Springs	Scandia	St. Mary's Point	St. Paul Park	Stillwater	Stillwater Township	West Lakeland Township	White Bear Lake (part)	Willemie	Woodbury
Collaboration for long-term affordability ¹				x		X				x	X					x
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)				x	X					x	X					x
Credit enhancements																
General obligation bonds		survey.		x	X		survey.		survey.							
Housing revenue bonds		he 2013 s					he 2013 s		he 2013 s							
Land write-down or sale		complete t				X	complete t		complete t							
Livable Communities grants	x	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.				x	This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey.		This commuity did not complete the 2013 survey	x						
Local fee waivers or reductions	x	This com		x		X	This com		This com							x
Local property tax levy					x											x
Local tax abatement																
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	x			x	X	X				x						x
Taxable revenue bonds	X															
Other	X				X											
Total	5	NA	0	5	5	5	NA	0	NA	4	2	0	0	0	0	5

¹ Collaboration and participation with a community land trust, philanthopic foundation or other nonprofit organization to preserve long-term affordability.

Notes:

2) Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five fiscal tools or initiatives were used in 2013.

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

									An	oka	Co	un	ty												Ca	rve	r C	our	nty			
	Andover	Anoka	Bethel	Blaine (part)	Centerville	Circle Pines	Columbia Heights	Columbus	Coon Rapids	East Bethel	Fridley	Ham Lake	Hilltop	Lexington	Lino Lakes	Linwood Township	Nowthen	Oak Grove	Ramsey	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Francis	Benton Township	Camden Township	Carver	Chanhassen (part)	Chaska	Cologne	Dahlgren Township	Hamburg	Hancock Township	Hollywood Township	Laketown Township
Allow alternative construction methods		X							X							X			X							X						
Accessory dwelling units																																
Density bonus system									X															X								
Density transfers		Х							X																							
Floor area ratio waiver									X																							
Inclusionary housing requirement																										x						
Increased building height flexibility		х																								x						
Mixed-use development		х	survey.				X		x		X				x									X		x						
Parking variances			2013						X										X							X						
Private street allowances			lete the	x					x		x								x					x	x	X						
Reduction in lot sizes and widths		x	ot comp	X			X	x	x		X													X	X	X						
Reduction in public improvement and development costs			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.												x											x						
Reduction in residential street width, right-of- way or surfacing widths			This com								x															x						
Setback reductions		х		х					X		X				X									x	х	х		x				
Service availability charge (SAC) credits									x																	x						
Sewer or water service line size reduction																										x						
Soil correction variance																			x													
Special or conditional use permits		x																				x						x				x
Other											X																					
Total	0	7	NA	3	0	0	2	1	10	0	6	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	3	12	0	2	0	0	0	1

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

			С		er			ty										D	ako	ota (Coı	unty	/							
			g			,,,,,,	Ju			dihi			0																	
	Mayer	New Germany	Norwood Young America	San Francisco Township	Victoria	Waconia	Waconia Township	Watertown	Watertown Township	Young America Township	Apple Valley	Burnsville	Castle Rock Township	Coates	Douglas Township	Eagan	Empire Township	Eureka Township	Farmington	Greenvale Township	Hampton	Hampton Township	Hastings (part)	Inver Grove Heights	Lakeville	Lilydale	Marshan Township	Mendota	Mendota Heights	Miesville
Allow alternative construction methods																									X					
Accessory dwelling units																									X					
Density bonus system																														
Density transfers																														
Floor area ratio waiver																														
Inclusionary housing requirement											X																			
Increased building height flexibility																														
Mixed-use development															survey.	x	survey.	survey.		survey.		survey.		x	x	survey.	survey.			
Parking variances											X				2013		2013	2013		2013		2013		х		2013	2013			
Private street allowances												x			te the	х	te the	te the 2		te the 2		te the 2		х		te the 2	te the 2			
Reduction in lot sizes and widths					x	x					x				t comple	x	t comple	t comple		t comple		t comple	X	X	x	t comple	t comple			
Reduction in public improvement and development costs								x							This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.				This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			
Reduction in residential street width, right-of-way or surfacing widths											x				This com		This com	This com		This com		This com		x		This com	This com			
Setback reductions					X	х					X	X											X	х						
Service availability charge (SAC) credits																x														
Sewer or water service line size reduction																														
Soil correction variance																														
Special or conditional use permits							X					x																		
Other																х			X											
Total	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	6	3	0	0	NA	5	NA	NA	1	NA	0	NA	2	6	4	NA	NA	0	0	0

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

					Da		ta (unty d	1										Не	enr	nep	oin	Co	our	nty						
	New Trier	Nininger Township	Randolph	Randolph Township	Ravenna Township	Rosemount	Sciota Township	South St. Paul	Sunfish Lake	Vermillion	Vermillion Township	Waterford Township	West St. Paul	Bloomington	Brooklyn Center	Brooklyn Park	Champlin	Chanhassen (part)	Corcoran	Crystal	Dayton (part)	Deephaven	Eden Prairie	Edina	Excelsior	Golden Valley	Greenfield	Greenwood	Hopkins	Independence	Long Lake	Loretto
Allow alternative construction methods Accessory																								X								
dwelling units														X																		
Density bonus system														X										X								
Density transfers																							X									
Floor area ratio waiver																								X					X			
Inclusionary housing requirement																								X								
Increased building height flexibility		ί.	į.				٠.		į.	į.	٠.	٠.														X						
Mixed-use development		urey	urvey	JIVey		X	JIV ey		JIVey	JIV ey	JIV ey	JIV ey		X										X		X			х			
Parking variances		13 SI	13 SI	13 SI			13 sı		13 SI	13 sı	13 SI	13 sı		X									X	X		X						
Private street allowances		the 20	the 20	the 20			the 20		the 20	the 20	the 20	the 20																				
Reduction in lot sizes and widths		complete	complete	complete		x	complete		complete	complete	complete	complete		X							X		x									
Reduction in public improvement and development costs		nity did not	nity did not	nity did not		x	nity did not		nity did not	nity did not	nity did not	nity did not											x									
Reduction in residential street width, right-of-way or surfacing widths		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.																				
Setback reductions		_		_		х	_	х						х							х		х	х								
Service availability charge (SAC) credits																				x												
Sewer or water service line size reduction																																
Soil correction variance																																
Special or conditional use permits																				X				x		x						
Other						Х																		X					X			
Total	0	NA	NA	NA	0	5	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	9	0	4	0	0	3	0	0	0

- 1) In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.
- 2) Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

										He			n C		unt	у										ı	Rar	ns	ey (Coı	ınt	y	
	Maple Grove	Maple Plain	Medicine Lake	Medina	Minneapolis	Minnetonka	Minnetonka Beach	Minnetrista	Mound	New Hope	Orono	Osseo	Plymouth	Richfield	Robbinsdale	Rogers	Shorewood	Spring Park	St. Anthony (part)	St. Bonifacius	St. Louis Park	Tonka Bay	Wayzata	Woodland	Arden Hills	Blaine (part)	Falcon Heights	Gem Lake	Lauderdale	Little Canada	Maplewood	Mounds View	New Brighton
Allow alternative construction methods Accessory																																	
dwelling units																																	
Density bonus system																																	
Density transfers Floor area ratio waiver																					х												х
Inclusionary housing requirement																																	
Increased building height flexibility					x																						x						x
Mixed-use development			urvey		X		urvey					X					urvey	urvey				urvey			X		X			urvey			x
Parking variances)13 s		X)13 s					X		X)13 s)13 s			X)13 s			X)13 s			X
Private street allowances	x		te the 20				te the 20		x								te the 20	te the 20				te the 20								te the 20			X
Reduction in lot sizes and widths			complet		X	x	complet	x									complet	complet	X			complet								complet			x
Reduction in public improvement and development costs	x		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.				This community did not complete the 2013 survey.										This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.				This community did not complete the 2013 survey.								This community did not complete the 2013 survey			
Reduction in residential street width, right-of-way or surfacing widths			This comm				This comm										This comm	This comm				This comm								This comm			x
Setback reductions	X				X	X		Х	X					X					X		X												X
Service availability charge (SAC) credits														X																			
Sewer or water service line size reduction	x																																
Soil correction variance																																	
Special or conditional use permits					x																X		X		x								x
Other					X	X									X																		
Total	4	0	NA	0	7	3	NA	2	2	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	NA	NA	2	0	4	NA	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	NA	0	0	9

- 1) In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.
- 2) Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

			Ra			r Ce inue	our ed	nty									Sc	ott	: C	ou	nty						
	North Oaks	North St. Paul	Roseville	Shoreview	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Anthony (part)	St. Paul	Vadnais Heights	White Bear Lake (part)	White Bear Township	Belle Plaine	Belle Plaine Township	Blakeley Township	Cedar Lake Township	Credit River Township	Elko New Market	Helena Township	Jackson Township	Jordan	Louisville Township	New Market Township	Prior Lake	Sand Creek Township	Savage	Shakopee	Spring Lake Township	St. Lawrence Township
Allow alternative construction methods																											
Accessory dwelling units									X																		
Density bonus system																											
Density transfers																											
Floor area ratio waiver																											
Inclusionary housing requirement																											
Increased building height flexibility							x																				
Mixed-use development									X																		
Parking variances				X		X	X																				
Private street allowances																											
Reduction in lot sizes and widths	x			X			x																				
Reduction in public improvement and development costs																											
Reduction in residential street width, right-of- way or surfacing widths			x																								
Setback reductions	x		х	X			х				х																
Service availability charge (SAC) credits				x																							
Sewer or water service line size reduction																											
Soil correction variance																											
Special or conditional use permits			X	X			X		X																		
Other																											
Total	2	0	3	5	0	1	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 1) In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.
- 2) Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #7: Please identify examples during 2013 in which the municipality reduced, adjusted, eliminated, waived, or in some fashion was flexible in the implementation of a local official control, development, or building requirement; OR for which it is the municipality's policy and practice to reduce, adjust or eliminate such requirement, when requested to do so, to reduce development costs for the development of affordable or life-cycle housing.

														V	Vas	hing	gto	n C	oun	ty														
	Afton	Bayport	Baytown Township	Birchwood Village	Cottage Grove	Dellwood	Denmark Township	Forest Lake	Grant	Grey Cloud Township	Hastings (part)	Hugo	Lake Elmo	Lake St. Croix Beach	Lakeland	Lakeland Shores	Landfall	Mahtomedi	Marine on St. Croix	May Township	Newport	Oak Park Heights	Oakdale	Pine Springs	Scandia	Scalidia	St. Mary's Point	St. Paul Park	Stillwater	Stillwater Township	West Lakeland Township	White Bear Lake (part)	Willernie	Woodbury
Allow alternative construction methods Accessory dwelling units																																		X
Density bonus system								х																										х
Density transfers																																		x
Floor area ratio waiver																																		
Inclusionary housing requirement								X																										x
Increased building height flexibility	Š			÷								X				÷			÷					÷			÷.							
Mixed-use development	surve			surve				X								surve			surve				X	surve			surve							
Parking variances	2013			2013				X								2013	X		2013					2013		3	2013							X
Private street allowances	ete the			te the												ste the			ete the			X		ste the		;	ste the							X
Reduction in lot sizes and widths	comple			comple	X											comple			comple					comple		•	comple							X
Reduction in public improvement and development costs	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.												This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.					This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			I his community did not complete the 2013 survey.							x
Reduction in residential street width, right-of-way or surfacing widths	This comm			This comm	x											This comm			This comm					This comm		·	I nis comm							
Setback reductions					X																	X												X
Service availability charge (SAC) credits																																		
Sewer or water service line size reduction																																		
Soil correction variance																																		
Special or conditional use permits																																		X
Other								X																										
Total	NA	0	0	NA	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	NA	1	0	NA	0	0	2	1	NA	0	1	IΑ	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is may include up to five examples, with no more than two variances for each project.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

										An	ok	a C	our	nty												Са	rve	r C	our	nty			
		Andover	Anoka	Bethel	Blaine (part)	Centerville	Circle Pines	Columbia Heights	Columbus	Coon Rapids	East Bethel	Fridley	Ham Lake	Hilltop	Lexington	Lino Lakes	Linwood Township	Nowthen	Oak Grove	Ramsey	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Francis	Benton Township	Camden Township	Carver	Chanhassen (part)	Chaska	Cologne	Dahlgren Township	Hamburg	Hancock Township	Hollywood Township	Laketown Township
For owner-occupied	Housing maintenance code and enforcement Housing	x	x		x			X		X		X				x			X		x					x							
For own	rehabilitation loan or grant program	x	x	·ey.	x	X		X				x	x							x													
ter-occupied	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	x	x	the 2013 surv	x	X	X	X		X	x	X				x				x	x					x		X					
For renter-occupied	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	x	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x							x								x					x								
es	Local tool sharing center or program		x	mmunity did	x					x		x													x								
Other activities	Home improvement loan or grant program		x	This co				X	x	X			x							x													
	Home improvement resource center		x				X			X																							
	Other											X					X																

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

				C	Carv	ver onti	Co	unt ed	у												Da	kot	a C	ou	nty									
		Mayer	New Germany	Norwood Young America	San Francisco Township	Victoria	Waconia	Waconia Township	Watertown	Watertown Township	Young American Township	Apple Valley	Burnsville	Castle Rock Township	Coates	Douglas Township	Eagan	Empire Township	Eureka Township	Farmington	Greenvale Township	Hampton	Hampton Township	Hastings (part)	Inver Grove Heights	Lakeville	Lilydale	Marshan Township	Mendota	Mendota Heights	Miesville	New Trier	Nininger Township	Randolph
occupied	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	x				X			x			x	x		x		x			x						x			x					
For owner-occupied	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program			x		x	x		x			x	x			· Śe	x	· Śe	ey.	x	. ye		ey.	x	x	x	· Ńe	· Se		x			ey.	ey.
ccupied	Housing maintenance code and enforcement			x		x	x		x			x	x		x	he 2013 surve	x	he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve		he 2013 surve	x	he 2013 surve	x		x	he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve	x				he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve
For renter-occupied	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program						x		x			X	x			This community did not complete the 2013 survey	X	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey		This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x		X	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	This community did not complete the 2013 survey		x			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.
	Local tool sharing center or program						x		x			X				mmunity di	x	mmunity di	mmunity di	X	mmunity di		mmunity di	X		X	mmunity di	mmunity di					mmunity di	mmunity di
Other activities	Home improvement loan or grant program						x					x	x			This co	x	This co	This co	X	This co		This co	X		x	This cc	This co					This co	This co
Ö	Home improvement resource center																			x				x		x								
	Other												X				X								X	X								

- 1) In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.
- 2) Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

					C	Carv	er onti	Co	unt ed	У												Da	kot	a C	ou	nty									
			Mayer	New Germany	Norwood Young America	San Francisco Township	Victoria	Waconia	Waconia Township	Watertown	Watertown Township	Young American Township	Apple Valley	Burnsville	Castle Rock Township	Coates	Douglas Township	Eagan	Empire Township	Eureka Township	Farmington	Greenvale Township	Hampton	Hampton Township	Hastings (part)	Inver Grove Heights	Lakeville	Lilydale	Marshan Township	Mendota	Mendota Heights	Miesville	New Trier	Nininger Township	Randolph
occupied	S S	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	X				x			x			x	x		x		x			X						X			x					
For owner-occupied	units	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program			x		x	x		x			x	x			ey.	x	ey.	ey.	X	ey.		ey.	x	x	x	ey.	æy.		X			ey.	ey.
ccupied	s	Housing maintenance code and enforcement			x		x	x		x			x	x		x	he 2013 surve	x	he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve		he 2013 surve	x	he 2013 surve	x		x	he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve	x				he 2013 surve	he 2013 surve
For renter-occupied	units	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program						X		X			x	X			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	X	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x		x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		x			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.
		Local tool sharing center or program						x		x			x				ommunity did	x	ommunity did	ommunity did	x	ommunity did		ommunity did	x		x	ommunity did	ommunity did					ommunity did	ommunity did
Other activities		Home improvement loan or grant program						x					x	x			This co	x	This co	This co	x	This co		This co	x		x	This co	This co					This co	This co
5	5	Home improvement resource center																			x				x		X								
		Other												X				X								X	X								

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

					D		ota onti		unt ed	у										Н	len	nep	oin	Со	unt	y								
			Randolph Township	Ravenna Township	Rosemount	Sciota Township	South St. Paul	Sunfish Lake	Vermillion	Vermillion Township	Waterford Township	West St. Paul	Bloomington	Brooklyn Center	Brooklyn Park	Champlin	Chanhassen (part)	Corcoran	Crystal	Dayton (part)	Deephaven	Eden Prairie	Edina	Excelsior	Golden Valley	Greenfield	Greenwood	Hopkins	Independence	Long Lake	Loretto	Maple Grove	Maple Plain	Medicine Lake
-occupied	units	Housing maintenance code and enforcement			x		x					x	x	x	x	x			x			x	x	x	X			x	x		X	x		
For owner-occupied	듬	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	ey.			·ey.	x	ey.	·ey.	·ey.	·ey.	x	X	x	x				x			x	x		X			x	X		x	x		·ey.
occupied	ts	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	the 2013 surv		x	the 2013 surv	x	the 2013 surv	the 2013 surv	the 2013 surv	the 2013 surv	x	X	x	x	x			X	x		x		x	X		x	x	X		x	x		the 2013 surv
For renter-occupied	units	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x		x	x	x									X						x	x		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.
(0)		Local tool sharing center or program	ommunity did			ommunity did	x	ommunity did	ommunity did	ommunity did	ommunity did	x		x	x													x				x		ommunity did
Other activities		Home improvement loan or grant program	This co			This co	x	This co	This co	This co	This co	X	x	x	x				x			x	X					x	x					This co
윰		Home improvement resource center										x		x	X				x									x	X					
		Other					X																											

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

										Н	len	nep Cor				y											F	lam	sey	Co	oun	ty			
			Medina	Minneapolis	Minnetonka	Minnetonka Beach	Minnetrista	Mound	New Hope	Orono	Osseo	Plymouth	Richfield	Robbinsdale	Rogers	Shorewood	Spring Park	St. Anthony	St. Bonifacius	St. Louis Park	Tonka Bay	Wayzata	Woodland	- H. H	Arden Hills	Plaine (pair) Falcon Heights	Gem Lake	Lauderdale	Little Canada	Maplewood	Mounds View	New Brighton	North Oaks	North St. Paul	Roseville
occupied	mai	using intenance de and orcement		x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x			x		x		x		2	ĸ	X		x		x	x				x
For owner-occupied	reha Ioa	using abilitation n or grant gram		x	x	ey.		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		ey.		x		x	ey.	x				X			ey.		x	x		X	x
occupied	mai cod	using intenance de and orcement		x	x	the 2013 surv		x	x		x	x	x		x	the 2013 surv	the 2013 surv	x		x	the 2013 survey	x		2	ĸ	x		x	the 2013 surv	x	x	x		X	x
For renter-occupied	reh: Ioai	using abilitation n or grant gram		x		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		x	x			x		x		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey			x	This community did not complete the								This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			x			x
	sha or p	cal tool aring center program				mmunity did			x		x	x		x		mmunity did	mmunity did			x	mmunity did								mmunity did	x	X				x
Other activities	Hor imp loai pro	me provement n or grant gram		x	x	This co					x	x	x	x		This co	This co			x	This co								This co		X			x	X
- #S	imp	orovement ource		x								x	x	x						x						x					x			x	x
	Oth	ner			X																														

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

				mse <i>Cor</i>				'							S	coti	Co	oun	ty							W	ash	ing	tor	C	our	ıty
		Shoreview	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Anthony (part)	St. Paul	Vadnais Heights	White Bear Lake (part)	White Bear Township	Belle Plaine	Belle Plaine Township	Blakeley Township	Cedar Lake Township	Credit River Township	Elko New Market	Helena Township	Jackson Township	Jordan	Louisville Township	New Market Township	Prior Lake	Sand Creek Township	Savage	Shakopee	Spring Lake Township	St. Lawrence Township	Afton	Bayport	Baytown Township	Birchwood Village	Cottage Grove	Dellwood	Denmark Township
occupied its	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	x		x	x	x	x		x													x					x			x	X	
For owner-occupied units	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	x		X	x		x	x						x			x			x			x			ey.			ey.	x		
occupied ts	Housing maintenance code and enforcement	x		X	x	x	x	X	x														x			the 2013 surv	x		the 2013 surv	x		
For renter-occupied units	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	x			x		x	x						x						x						This community did not complete the 2013 survey.			This community did not complete the 2013 survey	x		
	Local tool sharing center or program	x																					x			mmunity did			mmunity did			
Other activities	Home improvement loan or grant program	x			x				x					x									x			This co	x		This co	x		
ğ	Home improvement resource center	x																														
	Other	X							X								X															

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

Criterion #8: Please identify the housing preservation/maintenance activities your municipality conducted or that were available in your community in 2013 to maintain or improve your existing housing stock. County-administered programs are applicable.

											١	Nas		ngte ont			unty	y									
		Forest Lake	Grant	Grey Cloud Island Township	Hastings (part)	Hugo	Lake Elmo	Lake St. Croix Beach	Lakeland	Lakeland Shores	Landfall	Mahtomedi	Marine on St. Croix	May Township	Newport	Oak Park Heights	Oakdale	Pine Springs	Scandia	St. Mary's Point	St. Paul Park	Stillwater	Stillwater Township	West Lakeland Township	White Bear Lake (part)	Willernie	Woodbury
For owner-occupied units	Housing maintenance code and enforcement			x							x	x				x	x							x		x	x
For owner ur	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program							x	x	ey.	x		ey.			x	x	ey.		ey.	x						x
For renter-occupied units	Housing maintenance code and enforcement									This community did not complete the 2013 survey		x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey			x	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	x						x
For renter	Housing rehabilitation loan or grant program	x						x	x	I not complete			I not complete			x		I not complete		I not complete							x
w	Local tool sharing center or program							x		ommunity did			ommunity did			X		ommunity did		ommunity did							
Other activities	Home improvement loan or grant program	x						x	X	This co			This co				X	This co		This co	X						x
8	Home improvement resource center	x																			x						x
	Other								X								X										

¹⁾ In city and township names, "part" refers to cities and townships split across multiple counties. Each area receives a separate survey, reported in each respective county.

²⁾ Each city and township is instructed to select up to five examples, even if more than five housing preservation/maintenance activities were used in 2013.

									An	oka	a Co	our	nty								
	Andover	Anoka	Bethel	Blaine (part)	Centerville	Circle Pines	Columbia Heights	Columbus	Coon Rapids	East Bethel	Fridley	Ham Lake	Hilltop	Lexington	Lino Lakes	Linwood Township	Nowthen	Oak Grove	Ramsey	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Francis
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?		x	3 survey.																		
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	x					x		x				x				x		
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?			This community did								x										

									Ca	rve	r C	our	nty								
	Benton Township	Camden Township	Carver	Chanhassen (part)	Chaska	Cologne	Dahlgren Township	Hamburg	Hancock Township	Hollywood Township	Laketown Township	Mayer	New Germany	Norwood Young America	San Francisco Township	Victoria	Waconia	Waconia Township	Watertown	Watertown Township	Young America Township
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?																			X		
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?					X														x		
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?			X		X														x		

									Da	kota	a C	oui	nty								
	Apple Valley	Burnsville	Castle Rock Township	Coates	Douglas Township	Eagan	Empire Township	Eureka Township	Farmington	Greenvale Township	Hampton	Hampton Township	Hastings (part)	Inver Grove Heights	Lakeville	Lilydale	Marshan Township	Mendota	Mendota Heights	Miesville	New Trier
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?					3 survey.		3 survey.	3 survey.		3 survey.		3 survey.				3 survey.	2013 survey.				
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?	x				This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	x	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		x		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	not complete the 201				
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?		x			This community did		This community did I	This community did I		This community did		This community did I				This community did I	This community did not complete the				

				D	ako Co		Co inue		y			
	Nininger Township	Randolph	Randolph Township	Ravenna Township	Rosemount	Sciota Township	South St. Paul	Sunfish Lake	Vermillion	Vermillion Township	Waterford Township	West St. Paul
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?	3 survey.	3 survey.	3 survey.		X	3 survey.		3 survey.	3 survey.	3 survey.	3 survey.	
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013	This community did not complete the 2013			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.	not complete the 2013	
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?	This community did	This community did	This community did		x	This community did		This community did	This community did	This community did	This community did not complete the	

								Н	len	nep	oin	Со	unt	:y							
	Bloomington	Brooklyn Center	Brooklyn Park	Champlin	Chanhassen (part)	Corcoran	Crystal	Dayton (part)	Deephaven	Eden Prairie	Edina	Excelsior	Golden Valley	Greenfield	Greenwood	Hopkins	Independence	Long Lake	Loretto	Maple Grove	Maple Plain
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?																					
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?	x						x				x		x							x	
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?																					

									He		•	n C inue		nty								
	Medicine Lake	Medina	Minneapolis	Minnetonka	Minnetonka Beach	Minnetrista	Mound	New Hope	Orano	Osseo	Plymouth	Richfield	Robbinsdale	Rogers	Shorewood	Spring Park	St. Anthony (part)	St. Bonifacius	St. Louis Park	Tonka Bay	Wayzata	Woodland
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?	3 survey.				3 survey.										2013 survey.	3 survey.				3 survey.		
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?	This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		x		not complete the 2013							x			not complete the 2013	not complete the 2013 :				This community did not complete the 2013 survey.		
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?	This community did		x		This community did not complete the										This community did not complete the	This community did not complete the				This community did		

							ı	Ran	nse	y C	Cou	nty	•						
	Arden Hills	Blaine (part)	Falcon Heights	Gem Lake	Lauderdale	Little Canada	Maplewood	Mounds View	New Brighton	North Oaks	North St. Paul	Roseville	Shoreview	Spring Lake Park (part)	St. Anthony (part)	St. Paul	Vadnais Heights	White Bear Lake (part)	White Bear Township
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?						3 survey.					X								
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?			x			This community did not complete the 2013 survey.					x		x		x	x		x	
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?						This community did													

							Sc	ott	Co	un	ty						
	Belle Plaine	Belle Plaine Township	Blakeley Township	Cedar Lake Township	Credit River Township	Elko New Market	Helena Township	Jackson Township	Jordan	Louisville Township	New Market Township	Prior Lake	Sand Creek Township	Savage	Shakopee	Spring Lake Township	St. Lawrence Township
In 2013, did your community acquire land to be held specifically for development or redevelopment as affordable or senior housing (exclusively 55+)?																	
In 2013, did your community approve the development or local financial participation in a proposed development of new affordable or senior (exclusively 55+) housing?														x			
In 2013, did your community approve the involvement of the municipality in the preservation and reinvestment in affordable or senior housing which has not yet been undertaken for reasons beyond the municipality's control?																	