

2026 Housing & Economic Development Policy Committee Roster

Name	Title	Organization
Sarah Abe	Housing & Redevelopment Authority Administrator	Bloomington
Megan Alford	Councilmember	Savage
Brett Angell	Community Development Director	Rogers
Karen Barton	Community Development Director	St. Louis Park
Tim Benetti	Community Development Director	Apple Valley
Josh Berg	Councilmember	Elko New Market
Anika Bowie	Councilmember	St. Paul
Jenn Brewington	Community and Economic Development Director	Victoria
Connie Buesgens	Councilmember	Columbia Heights
Heather Butkowski	City Administrator	Lauderdale
Peter Butler	Councilmember	Coon Rapids
Kissy Coakley	Councilmember	Minnetonka
Jeffrey Dahl	City Administrator	Woodbury
Terri Dill	City Planner	Apple Valley
Krystin Eldridge	Planner	Brooklyn Center
Inderia Falana	Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis
Clancy Ferris	Legislative and Grants Analyst	St. Louis Park
Tom Fischer	Mayor	Little Canada
Mitchell Forney	Community Development Director	Columbia Heights
Jamie Fritts	Housing and Economic Development Coordinator	Woodbury
Ryan Garcia	City Administrator	South St. Paul
Ben Gozola	Asst. Director of Community Assets and Development	New Brighton
Janice Gundlach	Community Development Director	Roseville
Maurice Harris	Councilmember	Golden Valley
Stephanie Hawkinson	Affordable Housing Development Manager and Planning	Edina
Joe Hogeboom	Community & Economic Development Director	Maple Grove
Clint Hooppaw	Mayor	Apple Valley
Steven Huser	Senior Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis

Cheryl Jacobson	City Administrator	Mendota Heights
Rachel James	Councilmember	Columbia Heights
**Beth Johnston	Intergovernmental Relations Representative	League of MN Cities
Nate Kabat	Community Development Director	Chaska
Julie Klima	Director of Community Development	Eden Prairie
**Daniel Lightfoot	IGR Representative	League of MN Cities
Logan Martin	City Administrator	Rosemount
Paul Mogush	Planning Director	Brooklyn Park
Steve Morris	Councilmember	Woodbury
Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas	Mayor	New Brighton
Jennifer O'Rourke	IGR Director	St. Paul
Loren Olson	Senior Government Relations Representative	Minneapolis
Shelle Page	Councilmember	Brooklyn Park
**Hannah Pallmeyer	Government Affairs Liaison	Metropolitan Council
Danette Parr	Community Development Director	Maplewood
Julie Pointner	Councilmember	Plymouth
Chris Queitzsch	Councilmember	Golden Valley
Brock Ray	Councilmember	New Hope
Michael Sable	City Manager	Maplewood
Rebecca Schack	Mayor	Minnetonka
Cara Schulz	Councilmember	Burnsville
Eric Searles	Assistant Community Development Director	Woodbury
Tracy Shimek	Housing & Economic Development Coordinator	White Bear Lake
Mike Supina	Councilmember	Eagan
Jeff Thomson	Deputy City Manager/Community Development Director	Burnsville
Julie Urban	Asst. Community Development Director	Richfield
Nikki Villavicencio	Councilmember	Maplewood
Sean Walther	Planning Manager/Deputy Community Development Director	St. Louis Park
Jason Wedel	City Manager	Prior Lake
Kimberly Wilburn	Councilmember	Minnetonka
**Pierre Willette	Senior Government Relations Representative	League of MN Cities

**Owen Wirth	Intergovernmental Relations Representative	League of MN Cities
*Julie Wischnack	Community Development Director	Minnetonka
Nyle Zikmund	City Administrator	Mounds View

*Committee Chair

**Guest/Non-City Official

September 23, 2026

TO: Housing and Economic Development Policy Committee Members
FROM: Julie Wischnack, Community Development Director, City of Minnetonka
SUBJECT: Meeting Notice and Agenda

Wednesday, September 30, 2026
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting: LMC Lake
Superior Room and Zoom
Join Zoom Meeting:

♦ Thank you for agreeing to be a policy committee member!

Attached are the materials for the third Housing and Economic Development Policy Committee meeting. Please take the time to read through the policies before the meeting and come with your ideas and suggestions.

AGENDA

1. Call to order. (Julie Wischnack, Chair)
2. Approval of minutes for the August 26, 2026, meeting.
3. Policy Committee Protocols and Processes.
4. Presentation on Hatch Bloomington: ***Barb Wolff, Assistant Port Authority Administrator, City of Bloomington, and Sean Lundy, Special Projects & Initiatives Manager, City of Bloomington***
5. Review policy committee memo. (Ania McDonnell, Government Relations Specialist)
6. Discussion of policies and suggested modifications.
 - a. Policies with suggested changes from staff or committee members.
7. Discuss additional suggestions for policies, and issues for future consideration.
8. Other business.
9. Adjourn. (3:30 pm)

Housing & Economic Development Meeting Minutes of August 26, 2026

Present: Tracy Shimek, Mike Lund, Ania McDonnell, Jennifer Dorn, Brock Ray, Clint Hooppaw, Tom Fischer, Stephanie Hawkinson, Angela Torez, MacKenzie Young-Walter, Jennifer O'Rourke, Steve Huser, Hannah Pallmeyer, Tim Bennetti, Paul Mogush, Patricia Nauman, Ben Gozola, Eric Searles, Danette Parr, Jason Wedel, Julie Klima, Julie Urban, Logan Martin, Maurice Harris, Nikki Villavicencio, Mike Supina, Terri Dill, Sean Walther, Sarah Abe, Krystin Eldridge, Kimberly Wilburn, Cheryl Jacobson, Julie Pointner, Connie Buesgens, Mitchell Forney, Jeff Thomson, Joe Hogeboom, Daniel Lightfoot, Inderia Falana, Pierre Willette, Steve Morris, Shelly Page.

Chair Shimek called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm. Motion by Fischer, seconded by Hooppaw to approve the minutes, with a name correction as noted. Motion adopted.

MacKenzie Young-Walter, Senior Planner, Metropolitan Council presented information on land use data and plat monitoring. Discussion and questions followed.

Ms. McDonnell reviewed the committee memo. Ms. Hawkinson requested keeping policies open as she has some suggestions for policies. Ms. Villavicencio also indicated she had suggestions and that she sent to staff, but they were not included in the packet. Ms. Nauman noted that the amendments were received by staff the morning after the packet was distributed. Chair Shimek asked for clarification on deadlines for submitting policies and Ms. Nauman clarified timelines. Chair Shimek moved to policies with suggested changes.

HED-2 City Role in Affordable and Life Cycle Housing. Ms. McDonnell reviewed the change on page 10, line 88-92 to strike older data.

HED-4 Metropolitan Council Role in Housing. Ms. McDonnell reviewed suggested language. Ms. Hawkinson stated that the policy needs to be more encompassing. Mr. Morris would like to see the red lined language. Chair Shimek stated we can pull from the list for the next meeting.

HED-5 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need. Ms. McDonnell reviewed changes.

HED-7 State Role in Housing. Ms. McDonnell reviewed staff suggested change. Ms. Urban presented Richfield's suggestion. Ms. Falana reviewed Minneapolis' suggested changes.

HED-11 Economic Development. Mr. Ray reviewed New Hope's suggestion and said the metro area cities need additional support to attract new small businesses, support existing businesses, and encourage reinvestment in aging and built-out commercial areas.

HED-15 Tax Increment Financing. Ms. McDonnell noted this was left open. Mr. Morris asked about line 441 and requested this be considered at the third meeting. HED-7. Ms. Hawkinson asked are we approving the changes. Chair Shimek stated yes.

Motion to recommend changes of HED-2, HED-5, HED-11 by Hawkinson, seconded by Ray. Motion adopted. Mr. Hooppaw would like to review policy changes and would like discussion, but to hold on votes until the third meeting so that language can be reviewed. Chair Shimek

announced a five-minute break.

Ms. Hawkinson presented suggestions for policies on aligning zoning changes with comp plans, priority for funding housing in regional programs, tenant protection laws, LAHA monies, allowances for 30% AMI units, restricting eminent domain and eliminating language supporting an interdisciplinary TIF team to review TIF bills. Ms. Nauman noted that Metro Cities policies generally address the need for regional requirements for comp plans, density, etc. to be implemented in close collaboration with cities and in a manner that maintains existing local autonomy and decision making and noted the Council does not have jurisdiction over local zoning, that their role is generally a “review and comment” role over plans. Mr. Ray stated he would rather see incentives. Mr. Morris added that he would want consideration for adding or maintaining affordable housing stock. Mr. Hooppaw voiced concerns with adding restrictions to LAHA dollars. Mr. Morris opposes a timeline for LAHA dollars. Ms. Urban stated that it took the city four years and many funds to purchase an abandoned property and said she did not want to add restrictions for eminent domain parameters. Members indicated that they would need to review language for the proposed policy changes.

Chair Shimek moved to Ms. Villavicencio’s proposed language. Ms. Villavicencio discussed proposed changes for the inclusionary housing policy. Discussion. Chair Shimek noted that the language will need to be sent to members for review.

Chair Shimek moved to discussion of additional suggestions for policies, and issues for future consideration. Staff reiterated timelines for suggestions for the packet.

Chair Shimek adjourned the meeting at 3:16pm.

Metro Cities' Policy Protocols and Processes

Metro Cities is a member association representing the shared interests of cities in the seven-county metropolitan area at the state and regional levels of government. The association's membership encompasses over 90 municipalities from across the metropolitan region.

Metro Cities' work is guided by the core principle that cities be self-determining, that they have sufficient authority and flexibility in providing services, and that state and regional policies, funding and regulations account for local needs, circumstances and capacities.

Metro Cities legislative policies follow this core principle and generally emphasize the need for sufficient and flexible state and regional resources and policymaking that allows cities to address local service needs. Metro Cities' legislative policies broadly and consistently emphasize the importance of resource adequacy and local autonomy and flexibility and oppose state or regional directives that would erode local authority, or create financial risks for cities and taxpayers.

Each year, four policy committees meet to review, discuss and recommend the association's legislative policies. Votes are made by consensus, with each city having one vote. Once recommended, policies are forwarded to the Metro Cities Board of Directors. Following Board approval, policies are transmitted to the general membership for final adoption. Policies guide the association's work at the state and regional levels of government.

Policy committee members must act in their capacity as an elected or appointed city official. The committee process and association policies are not for promoting personal or external interests, or policy objectives that are outside the scope of, or contrary to, Metro Cities' core principles.

Committee Decorum

Appropriate decorum is expected. Members are encouraged to attend all meetings, and when at all possible, to attend in person. Comments should be addressed through the chair.

Members attending remotely will be asked to use the hand raise function, or to speak to questions put into the chat. When speaking, members will be asked to identify themselves and their city. Members are asked to turn cameras on when speaking.

Members may offer amendments for committee consideration. Committee packets are sent a week in advance, and any amendments must be received by 5:00 pm on the day prior to the distribution of the committee packet. Amendments that are corrective or technical in nature may be offered orally at the discretion of the chair. Members are expected to present their own amendments.

Each city has one vote, and votes are made by acclamation unless a roll call is requested and seconded. Guests are welcome to observe meetings but may not vote or raise issues for consideration.

September 23, 2026

TO: Housing and Economic Development Policy Committee
FROM: Ania McDonnell, Metro Cities Staff
RE: Housing and Economic Development Policy Committee Memo

Welcome to the third and final policy committee meeting. The committee will review suggested modifications for remaining policies. Policy amendments based on discussion and staff review are included in this packet. I look forward to seeing you next week.

ADOPTED AMENDMENTS

HED-2 City Role in Affordable and Life Cycle Housing	<i>Staff suggested update.</i>
HED-5 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	<i>Staff suggested update.</i>
HED-11 Economic Development	<i>Language from the city of New Hope.</i>

REMAINING OPEN POLICIES AND AMENDMENTS

HED-1 to HED-10: Introduction	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-1 City Role in Housing	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood. Language from the city of Edina and city of Apple Valley.</i>
HED-2 City Role in Affordable and Life Cycle Housing	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-3 Inclusionary Housing	<i>Language from the city of Edina. Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-4 Metropolitan Council Role in Housing	<i>Staff suggested change. Language from the city of Edina.</i>
HED-5 Allocation of Affordable Housing Need	<i>No additional suggested changes other than adopted staff suggested update.</i>
HED-6 Housing Policy & Production Survey	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood</i>
HED-7 State Role in Housing	<i>Language from the city of Richfield. Staff suggested update. Language from the city of Edina and Woodbury. Language from the city of Minneapolis. Language from the city of Edina and city of Apple Valley. Language from the city of Edina. Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-8 Federal Role in Affordable and Workforce Housing	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-9 Vacant, Boarded, and Foreclosed Properties and Properties at Risk	<i>No suggested changes.</i>

HED-10 Housing Ordinance Enforcement	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-11 to HED-14: Introduction	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-11 Economic Development	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-12 Redevelopment	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-13 Adaptive Reuse	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-14 Workforce Readiness	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
HED-15 Tax Increment Financing	<i>Language from the city of Edina.</i>
HED-16 Eminent Domain	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-17 Community Reinvestment	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-18 Business Incentives Policy	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-19 Broadband Technology	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-20 City Role in Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
HED-21 Impaired Waters	<i>No suggested changes.</i>
<u>HED-NEW Community-Based Services, HCBS Waivers & Housing Choice</u>	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>
<u>HED-NEW Housing Accessibility & Disability Justice</u>	<i>Language from the city of Maplewood.</i>

HED-1 TO HED-10: INTRODUCTION

While the provision of housing is predominantly a private sector, market-driven activity, all levels of government – federal, state, regional and local – have a role in facilitating the production and preservation of affordable housing in Minnesota.

Adequate affordable housing is a significant concern for the metropolitan region and effective approaches require participation from all levels of government, the private sector, and nonprofit groups.

HED-1 CITY ROLE IN HOUSING

Cities in Minnesota are responsible for most ground-level housing policy, including land use planning, code enforcement, rental licensing, and often the packaging of multi-level financial incentives. Cities are responsible for ensuring local health and safety and the structural soundness and livability of the local housing stock through building permits and inspections.

Cities are charged with providing public infrastructure to serve current and future residents and must assess the effects of a new development on parks, local roads, water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater capacities to ensure that additional needs for infrastructure are assumed by the new development and not current taxpayers. It is the city that assumes the future financial responsibility, management, and maintenance for improvements and infrastructure after a developer has completed a project.

It is also the responsibility of cities to periodically review local requirements such as land use regulations and ordinances, and make long range plans consistent with state statute, to ensure that they are consistent with these purposes. While local government financial resources constitute a relatively small portion of the total costs of providing housing, many cities take on a significant administrative burden by providing financial incentives and regulatory relief, participating in state and regional housing programs, and supporting either local or countywide housing and redevelopment authorities and community development agencies.

When a developer seeks to advance a development proposal that does not meet straight housing and mixed-use zoning codes and requirements, the developer may request a planned unit development (PUD) agreement with a city. PUDs, where appropriate, can provide zoning flexibility to develop a site that is otherwise not permitted by a city code. The use of PUDs may allow for more variety and creativity in

land uses, increased density on a site, internal transfers of density, construction phasing, reduced setbacks, and a potential for lower development costs.

In the interest of adhering to local long-range plans and managing local health, safety, viability, and welfare needs, a city may request certain public benefits from a developer, including but not limited to additional open space, preservation of wooded land and environmentally sensitive areas, landscaping along major roadways, providing a mix of housing types, and enhanced design and landscaping features.

Cities may also provide a developer with credit for investments in public infrastructure greater than would be minimally required, including water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, or road infrastructure.

~~Metro Cities opposes any effort to reduce, alter or interfere with cities' authority to carry out these functions in a locally determined manner.~~

Metro Cities recognizes that cities are a key player in addressing housing needs and supports cities' authority to carry out these functions in a manner that supports their unique needs, characteristics and infrastructure. (Suggestion by the cities of Edina and Apple Valley).

Metro Cities supports allowing cities to establish rental licensing for micro-unit dwellings in sacred settlement communities to give cities the ability to fulfill their responsibility to promote the health, safety and welfare of residents by ensuring the structural soundness and livability of these units are consistent with their rental housing inspection policies and programs.

Metro Cities supports exceptions to the land use timelines in Minn. Stat. § 15.99 in the event of extenuating local and state circumstances. Metro Cities supports local authority determination when exercising the use of exceptions, recognizing projects may be in different stages of approval. If a state of emergency limits the ability of city staff to complete a land use review, it should not result in de facto approval of an application.

Metro Cities should support local authority to encourage and incentivize accessibility, universal design, visitability, aging in place, affordable housing, and housing serving people with disabilities, seniors, and other marginalized residents as public benefits in development and redevelopment projects.

Metro Cities supports housing policies that allow seniors and people with disabilities to remain in their homes and communities as they age, with access to necessary services, accessibility modifications, transportation, and community-based supports. Aging in place and community-based living can reduce unnecessary reliance on more costly institutional care and align with the community-integration principles of Olmstead v. L.C..

When public financial assistance, regulatory flexibility, or other public benefits are provided to a housing development, cities should have authority to seek meaningful community benefits, including accessibility and affordability beyond minimum requirements.

(Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-2 CITY ROLE IN AFFORDABLE AND LIFE CYCLE HOUSING

Metro Cities supports housing that is affordable and appropriate for people at all stages of life. A variety of housing opportunities are important to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities and the metropolitan region. The region faces challenges in meeting the existing and future housing needs of low and moderate income residents.

Existing housing stock is aging, with over half older than 40 years old, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. Older housing stock can be more affordable; however, it requires investments to remain viable.

Private investors have purchased subsidized and unsubsidized rental units, made improvements, and charged higher rents that have made access to previously affordable units prohibitive for low and moderate-income residents. This investor ownership has converted owner-occupied houses to rental houses, which has impacted the ability of lower-income renters to become homeowners and build wealth. Neighbors and cities have seen a lack of investment in these rental homes that has led to the deterioration of the housing stock.

~~The Metropolitan Council has projected the region will add nearly 60,845 households earning up to 50 percent area median income between 2020 and 2030 that will need affordable housing. Senior households bring the number of low-income households up significantly, with the number of age 65+ households growing by 51,691 during that time-period. (Staff suggested change). – ADOPTED~~

112 Metro Cities recognizes accessible, affordable housing as an essential component of the
113 region's housing supply and supports housing that allows people with disabilities and
114 seniors to live in the communities of their choice.

115 Metro Cities supports incentives and resources for universal design, visitability, adaptable
116 housing, wheelchair-accessible housing, sensory and communication accessibility, and
117 modifications to existing housing.

118 Metro Cities supports increasing the supply of housing that is both deeply affordable and
119 accessible, recognizing that an accessible unit is not meaningful to a person who cannot
120 afford it and an affordable unit is not meaningful if the person cannot use it.

121 Metro Cities supports increased and sustained legislative funding for supportive housing
122 and community-based services for people with disabilities, seniors, and people with
123 significant support needs. Investment in supportive housing can provide greater value for
124 public dollars by helping people maintain stable housing in the community while reducing
125 unnecessary reliance on more costly institutional, emergency, shelter, and crisis systems.

126 Supportive housing should promote choice, self-determination, interdependence,
127 accessibility, community integration, and long-term housing stability. (Suggestion by the
128 city of Maplewood).

130 Consistent with the principles of Olmstead v. L.C., Metro Cities supports community-
131 integrated housing and the right of people with disabilities to choose where, how, and with
132 whom they live.

133 Community integration shall not be interpreted to require disabled people to live apart from
134 one another. Metro Cities recognizes people with disabilities as a community with shared
135 culture, identity, history, and lived experience and supports their right to choose to live near
136 other disabled people, family, friends, and support networks.

137 Housing policy should distinguish between institutional or provider-driven segregation and
138 disabled people voluntarily choosing community with one another. (Suggestion by the city
139 of Maplewood).

140
141 Cities should work with the private and nonprofit sectors, counties, state agencies and the
142 Metropolitan Council to ensure the best use of new and existing tools and resources to
143 produce new housing and preserve existing affordable housing. Cities can
144 facilitate the production and preservation of affordable and life cycle housing by:

145

- 146 • Applying for funding from available grant and loan programs;
- 147
- 148 • Using city and county funds to support affordable housing. This can include creating
- 149 a local or regional housing trust fund to support affordable housing;
- 150
- 151 • Providing information, encouraging and incentivizing participation in the Section 8
- 152 Housing Choice Voucher program to landlords;
- 153
- 154 • Working with developers and residents to blend affordable housing into new and
- 155 existing neighborhoods, including locations with access to amenities and services;
- 156
- 157 • Working with the state and Metropolitan Council to recognize the relationship
- 158 between housing and mobility options, including transit and pedestrian routes;
- 159
- 160 • Periodically examining local requirements, policies and review processes to
- 161 determine their impacts on the construction of affordable housing;
- 162
- 163 • Considering criteria under which a city may change its fee structure in support of
- 164 additional affordable housing;
- 165
- 166 • Supporting housing options that meet a city's current and future demographics,
- 167 including family size, age, mobility, and ability levels;
- 168
- 169 • Supporting housing design that is flexible, accessible and usable for residents with
- 170 varied abilities at multiple stages of life;
- 171
- 172 • Supporting housing with supportive services for people with disabilities;
- 173
- 174 • Employing innovative strategies to advance affordable housing needs such as
- 175 public- private partnerships or creative packaging of regulatory relief and incentives;
- 176
- 177 • Using available regulatory mechanisms to shape housing communities;
- 178
- 179 • Recognizing the inventory of subsidized and unsubsidized (naturally occurring)
- 180 affordable housing, and working collaboratively with buyers and sellers of naturally
- 181 occurring affordable housing to retain affordability;
- 182
- 183 • Tracking the impacts of investor-owned homes on the housing market, and

enacting local strategies and policies that support home purchases by owners who reside in the homes;

- Supporting policy solutions that provide cities with tools to mitigate any negative impacts on city housing stock and prospective homebuyers due to investor-owned purchasing of homes.

HED-3 INCLUSIONARY HOUSING

While Metro Cities believes there are cost savings to be achieved through regulatory reform, density bonuses as determined by local communities, and fee waivers, Metro Cities does not believe a mandatory inclusionary housing approach can achieve desired levels of affordability solely through these steps. Several cities have established local inclusionary housing policies, in some cases requiring the creation of affordable units if the housing development uses public financial assistance or connecting the policy to zoning and land use changes. The Metropolitan Council, in distributing the regional allocation of housing need, must recognize both the opportunities and financial limitations of cities. The Council should partner with cities to facilitate the creation of affordable housing through direct financial assistance and/or advocating for additional resources through the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency.

Metro Cities supports the location of affordable housing in residential and mixed-use neighborhoods throughout a city. Metro Cities supports a city's authority to enact its own inclusionary housing policy. ~~However, Metro Cities does not support passage of a mandatory inclusionary housing state law imposed on local governments that would require a certain percentage of units in all new housing developments to be affordable to households at specific income levels.~~ *(Suggestion by the city of Edina).*

Metro Cities supports a clarification to state statute that statutory and charter cities may collect a payment in lieu of the inclusion of affordable housing units that will be directed to a local housing trust fund to support affordable housing preservation, development, and housing stabilization in alignment with individual city goals.

Metro Cities supports local authority to incorporate accessibility, universal design, and visitability requirements into inclusionary housing policies, development agreements, and housing incentive programs.

Metro Cities supports a benchmark that at least 5% of housing units in new multifamily residential developments and substantial residential rehabilitation or conversion projects be designed as accessible, universal-design units, in addition to accessibility otherwise required by federal or state law.

Accessible units should be available across different unit sizes, affordability levels, and locations within a development so disabled people have meaningful housing choices.

Publicly funded or publicly assisted housing should meet or exceed the 5% benchmark whenever feasible, and cities should retain authority to establish higher accessibility requirements based on demonstrated community need.

Affordable accessible units created through public investment should remain both affordable and accessible over the long term. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-4 METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ROLE IN HOUSING

The Metropolitan Council is statutorily required to assist cities with meeting the provisions of the Land Use Planning Act (LUPA) under Minn. Stat. § 473. The LUPA requires cities to adopt sufficient standards, plans and programs to meet their local share of the region's overall projected need for low and moderate-income housing. The Council's responsibilities include the preparation and adoption of guidelines and procedures to assist local government units with accomplishing the requirements of the LUPA. These guidelines include requirements that cities guide residential land at densities sufficient to create opportunities for additional affordable housing through minimum residential densities to support a city's allocation of future affordable housing need. (Staff suggested change).

The Metropolitan Council also offers programs and initiatives to create affordable housing opportunities, including the Livable Communities Act programs and operation of a metropolitan housing and redevelopment authority. Unlike parks, transit and wastewater, housing is not a statutory regional system. The Metropolitan Council's role, responsibilities and authority are more limited in scope, centered on assisting local governments by identifying the allocation of need for affordable housing, projecting regional growth and identifying available tools, resources, technical assistance and methods that cities can use to create and promote affordable housing opportunities in their communities. The Metropolitan Council should work in partnership with local governments to ensure that the range of housing needs for people at various

life cycles and incomes can be met. Metro Cities opposes the elevation of housing to “Regional System” status. ~~Metro Cities supports removing the Metropolitan Council’s review and comment authority connected to housing revenue bonds under Minn. Stat. § 462C.04.~~ (Suggestion by the city of Edina).

In 2014, the Metropolitan Council released its first housing policy plan in nearly thirty years. A Metropolitan Council housing policy plan should include defined local, regional, and state roles for the provision of housing in all sectors, identify the availability of and need for tools and resources for affordable and life-cycle housing, be explicit in supporting partnerships for the advocacy for state and federal resources for housing, and encompass policies, best practices, and technical guidance for all types of housing. A plan should also recognize the diversity in local needs, characteristics, and resources.

Metro Cities supports strategies such as regional and sub-regional cooperation and the sharing of best practices among local governments and other entities and partners to address the region’s affordable housing needs.

A policy plan should allow for ongoing research and analysis by the Metropolitan Council to provide communities with timely and updated information on regional and local housing needs and market trends as regional and local needs change and evolve. Metro Cities supports the solicitation and use of local data, inputs and analyses and local governments’ review of such data.

Metro Cities supports continued city representation in any updated or new regional housing policy plan and other regional housing policy considerations.

HED-5 ALLOCATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED

The affordable housing need allocation methodology determines the number of needed affordable housing units for the metropolitan region and distributes the need by assigning each city its fair share through an affordable housing need number. Minn. Stat. § 473.859 requires cities to guide sufficient land to accommodate local shares of the region’s affordable housing need. The Metropolitan Council forecasts that between 2030 and 2040, the region will add 39,700 low-income households that will need affordable housing, also known as the region’s Total Future Need for Affordable Housing. Of those households, the region will need 21,150 units of deeply affordable housing. Metro Cities

supports additional Metropolitan Council resources to assist cities in meeting cities' share of the region's affordable housing needs. *(Staff suggested change.) - ADOPTED*

Metro Cities supports the creation of a variety of housing opportunities. However, the provision of affordable and lifecycle housing is a shared responsibility between the private sector and government at all levels, including the federal government, state government and Metropolitan Council. Land economics, construction costs, labor costs, and infrastructure needs create barriers to the creation of affordable housing that cities cannot overcome without assistance.

Therefore, Metro Cities supports a Metropolitan Council affordable housing policy and allocation of need methodology that recognizes the following tenets:

- Regional housing policies characterize individual city and sub-regional housing numbers as a range of needs in the community;
- Cities need significant financial assistance from the federal and state government, as well as the Metropolitan Council, to make progress toward creating additional affordable housing and preserving existing affordable housing;
- Metropolitan Council planning and policies must be more closely aligned to help ensure that resources for transportation and transit are available to assist communities in addressing their local share of the regional affordable housing need and to ensure that all populations have adequate mobility to reach jobs, education and other destinations regardless of where they live;
- The Metropolitan Council will not hold cities responsible if a city does not meet its affordable housing need number. However, efforts to produce affordable housing may be considered when awarding grants;
- The Metropolitan Council, with input by local government representatives, should examine the allocation of need methodology with respect to the relationship between the regional allocation and the local share of the need. The formula should also be routinely evaluated to determine if market conditions have changed or if underlying conditions should prompt readjustment of the formula;
- The Council should use a methodology that incorporates data accumulated by individual cities and not limited to census driven or policy driven growth projections;

• The formula should be adjusted to better reflect the balance and breadth of existing subsidized and naturally occurring affordable housing stocks; and

• The Council should work with local governments through an appeals process to resolve any local issues and concerns with respect to the need allocations and the plan review process.

HED-6 HOUSING POLICY AND PRODUCTION SURVEY

The Metropolitan Council annually calculates a city's housing production. Production information is collected through an annual city survey as well as Council data. Cities participating in Livable Communities programs are required to include their housing action plan and ALHOA funding amounts in their survey responses. Beginning in 2022, the Council began compiling the data in a report to share city practices and funding sources that support the creation of new affordable housing units.

Metro Cities supports a regular review of the survey questions and use of data, with city input. Any proposed new, deleted, or expanded uses or programs in which data from the Housing Policy and Production Survey would be used should be reviewed by local officials and Metro Cities. Metro Cities supports a consistent schedule for sending the annual housing production survey to cities.

Regional housing data should identify the availability and need for accessible and adaptable housing, including housing affordable at different income levels.

Metro Cities supports improving housing data so cities can better understand the intersection of disability, accessibility, affordability, age, housing tenure, and housing need, while protecting individual privacy.

Metro Cities also supports identifying disparities in homeownership and opportunities to purchase homes for people with disabilities, people of color, people with low incomes, and other marginalized communities.

Metro Cities supports expanding pathways to homeownership for communities that have historically experienced barriers to purchasing homes, including down-payment and closing-cost assistance, accessible homebuyer education, affordable financing, and resources to purchase or modify homes for accessibility.

State and regional programs should recognize accessibility-related costs so disabled homebuyers are not forced to choose between a home they can afford and one they can actually use. *(Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).*

HED-7 STATE ROLE IN HOUSING

The state must be an active participant in providing funding for housing, including direct funding, financial incentives, and initiatives to assist local governments and developers to support affordable housing and housing appropriate for people at all stages of life.

State funding is a major and necessary component for the provision of housing. Current resource levels are insufficient to meet the spectrum of needs in the metropolitan region and across the state.

Primarily through programs administered by the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA), the state establishes the general direction and prioritization of housing issues, and financially supports a variety of housing, including transitional housing, privately and publicly owned housing, supportive housing, senior housing, workforce housing, and family housing.

Workforce housing is generally defined as housing that supports economic development and job growth and is affordable to the local workforce. A statewide program, administered through the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, supports workforce homeownership efforts in the metropolitan area. State policies and funding should recognize that affordable housing options that are accessible to jobs and meet the needs of a city's workforce are important to the economic competitiveness of cities and the metropolitan region. In addition, significant housing related racial disparities persist in Minnesota, especially as it relates to the percentage of households of color who pay more than 30 percent of their income in housing costs and as it relates to the significant disparity gap in homeownership rates. *(Staff suggested change).*

Minnesota's low-income rental property classification, commonly known as class 4d(1), allows landlords to certify qualifying low-income rental property. The classification provides a significant reduction in the tax rate for qualified properties; however, the cost of that reduced rate is shifted to other taxpayers. The state must continue to be an active partner in addressing life cycle and affordable housing needs; ~~however, - Any program~~

expansion proposals for state mandated class-rate reductions should include a full analysis of the impacts to local property tax bases before their enactment. Metro Cities opposes any changes to the 4d(1) program that substantially increases the tax responsibility for residents and businesses or increases the tax benefit for landlords without including increased benefits for renters of 4d(1) units.

~~Metro Cities supports a property owner being required to receive city approval where the property is located, for all 4d(1) property that has not in whole or in part been classified as 4d(1) property.~~

~~Metro Cities supports 4d(1) aid being made permanent and available to all impacted cities.~~

~~Metro Cities supports the continuation of a reporting process for landlords benefitting from the 4d(1) class rate reduction to ensure deeper affordability or property reinvestment, and a sunset period for any changes made to the program to evaluate the range of impacts that expanding the program may have. (Suggestion by the city of Richfield).~~

~~Workforce housing is generally defined as housing that supports economic development and job growth and is affordable to the local workforce. A statewide program, administered through the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, supports workforce homeownership efforts in the metropolitan area. State policies and funding should recognize that affordable housing options that are accessible to jobs and meet the needs of a city's workforce are important to the economic competitiveness of cities and the metropolitan region. In addition, significant housing related racial disparities persist in Minnesota, especially as it relates to the percentage of households of color who pay more than 30 percent of their income in housing costs and as it relates to the significant disparity gap in homeownership rates. (Staff suggested change to move language up in policy).~~

A 0.25% metropolitan area regional sales tax enacted in 2023 provides Local Affordable Housing Aid (LAHA) to cities over 10,000 in population in the metropolitan region, and cities received the first distribution of LAHA in 2024. A report to the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency on LAHA uses and expenditures is due on December 1st of each year, 2025, and every year thereafter. (Staff suggested update).

~~Given the variability in sales taxes collected each year, Metro Cities urges the Legislature to consider extending the timeline in which cities must expend funds. Metro Cities further~~

441 ~~supports having funds be considered expended if they are deposited into a local housing~~
442 ~~trust fund, which provides flexibility for cities in maximizing public resources for housing~~
443 ~~projects. Metro Cities supports allowing a percentage of LAHA funds to be put toward~~
444 ~~administrative costs. A variety of programs such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Federal~~
445 ~~Section 8, and local Bring It Home MN programs all recognize this need, but as of now,~~
446 ~~LAHA does not. Metro Cities supports a sunset to the LAHA reporting requirements,~~
447 ~~including reporting on locally funded housing expenditures. (Staff suggested change to~~
448 ~~move to bullet points).~~

449
450 Metro Cities supports:

- 451
452 • Increased, sustainable and adequate state funding for new and existing programs
453 that support life cycle, workforce and affordable housing, address homeownership
454 disparities, address foreclosure mitigation, address housing for families with
455 children, and support senior, transitional and emergency housing for the metro
456 region;
- 457
458 • An ongoing state match for local and regional housing trust fund investments and
459 local policies in support of affordable housing. State funds should be issued on a
460 timeline that works with a city's budget process;
- 461
462 • Private sector funding for workforce housing;
- 463
464 • Housing programs that assist housing development, preservation and maintenance
465 of existing housing stock, including unsubsidized, naturally occurring affordable
466 housing that is affordable to residents throughout the low-to-moderate income
467 range;
- 468
469 • State funded housing assistance programs to help with affordability;
- 470
471 • Housing programs designed to develop market rate housing in census blocks with
472 emerging or high concentrations of poverty, where the private market might not
473 otherwise invest, as a means of creating mixed-income communities and
474 reconciling affordable housing with community development goals;
- 475
476 • Continuing the policy of using the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency's investment
477 earnings for housing programs;
- 478

- City input into state legislation and administrative policies regarding distribution of tax credits and tax-exempt bonding;
- Exemptions from, or reductions to sales, use and transaction taxes applied to the development and production of affordable housing;
- Consideration of the use of state bond proceeds and other appropriations for land banking, land trusts, and rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing;
- Programs that help avoid foreclosures, improve homeownership rates and reduce racial disparities through homeownership assistance programs and counseling services, including down payment assistance and pre-purchasing counseling to improve financial wellness and inform homeowner and potential homeowners of their rights, options, and costs associated with owning a home;
- State tenant protection policies as well as a city's ability to enact tenant protections to support access to affordable housing and housing stability for tenants;
- Reviewing existing tenant protection laws to support the health and safety of tenants. This includes allowing an expedited eviction process for tenants who threaten the health and safety of other tenants due to gun violence, arson, drug transactions, documented physical and verbal threats to staff or other health and safety issues; (Suggestion by the cities of Woodbury and Edina).
- Prohibiting landlords from denying housing opportunities to residents based on their source of income;
- Housing stability for renters through policies that mitigate the impact of or reduces the number of evictions filed;
- Policies that encourage public housing authorities and owners of federally assisted housing to consider a holistic approach to selecting tenants during the application and screening process, and avoid excluding tenants solely based on criminal records;
- Exploring best practices toward increased housing affordability for residents, housing maintenance standards and providing quality housing for residents. Cities should work with rental housing owners and operators when establishing best

practices;

- The state housing tax credit to support local governments and the private sector to help spur construction and secure additional private investment; ~~and~~

- Maintaining existing municipal authority to establish a housing improvement area (HIA). If the Legislature grants multi-jurisdictional entities the authority to create HIAs, creation of an HIA must require municipal approval;:-

- Providing for housing infrastructure bond set-asides for metropolitan area communities to support housing units created as a result of the Hollman Consent Decree that are in need of rehabilitation and a capital infusion; (Suggestion by the city of Minneapolis).

- Requiring a property owner to receive city approval where a 4d(1) property is located, for all 4d(1) property that has not in whole or in part been classified as 4d(1) property; (Suggestion by the city of Richfield).

- Making 4d(1) aid permanent, available to all impacted cities, and commensurate to the cost; (Suggestion by the city of Richfield).

- Continuing the required reporting process for landlords benefitting from the 4d(1) class rate reduction to ensure deeper affordability or property reinvestment, and a sunset period for any changes made to the program to evaluate the range of impacts that expanding the program may have; (Suggestion by the city of Richfield).

- ~~• Extending the timeline in which cities must expend Local Affordable Housing Aid (LAHA) funds given the variability in sales taxes collected each year. (Previous language).~~

- Extending the timeline in which cities must commit Local Affordable Housing Aid (LAHA) funds to allow sufficient time to accrue a balance to support larger developments; (Suggestion by the city of Apple Valley and Edina).

- LAHA funds considered expended if they are deposited into a local housing trust fund, which provides flexibility for cities in maximizing public resources for housing projects; (Staff suggested change).

- Allowing a percentage of LAHA funds to be put toward administrative costs. A variety of programs such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Federal Section 8, and local Bring It

Home MN programs all recognize this need, but as of now, LAHA does not; *(Staff suggested change)*.

- Enacting a sunset to the LAHA reporting requirements, including reporting on locally funded housing expenditures; and *(Staff suggested change)*.
- Allowing a percentage of the 30% AMI units that financed to not be restricted to people coming from Coordinated Entry or having experienced homelessness. *(Suggested by the city of Edina)*.

HED-7 — LAHA: Local Flexibility with Equity & Nondiscrimination

Metro Cities supports preserving local flexibility and city authority to determine how Local Affordable Housing Aid (LAHA) and other state housing resources are used to address locally identified housing needs.

Within that local flexibility, Metro Cities supports prioritizing equitable housing outcomes for people who experience significant barriers to obtaining and maintaining housing, including people with disabilities, seniors, people with low incomes, and other marginalized communities.

Cities should have flexibility to use resources for accessible and affordable housing, accessibility modifications, supportive housing, aging in place, emergency rental assistance, eviction prevention, homelessness prevention, and other locally determined housing-stability strategies.

Local flexibility shall not be used to discriminate against, exclude, or create unnecessary barriers for people with disabilities, seniors, or other protected or marginalized communities.

Metro Cities supports sufficient state resources to meet these equity priorities without removing local decision-making authority. *(Suggestion by the city of Maplewood)*.

HED-7 — Tenant Protections, Eviction Prevention & Housing Stability

Metro Cities supports state and local policies that prevent unnecessary eviction and displacement and preserve housing stability, particularly for people with disabilities, people with low incomes, seniors, families with children, people of color, and other residents who experience significant barriers to obtaining replacement housing.

Metro Cities supports emergency rental assistance, eviction diversion, reasonable repayment agreements, tenant education and legal assistance, and policies addressing discriminatory or unnecessarily restrictive tenant screening.

Eviction prevention should be recognized as both housing policy and homelessness-prevention policy. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-7 — Preserve Accessibility Investments in Rental Housing

Metro Cities supports policies that protect and preserve accessibility features and modifications in rental housing, including ramps, accessible entrances, automatic door openers, assistive and smart-home technology, accessible bathrooms and kitchens, grab bars, widened doorways, lifts, and other accessibility improvements.

Rental property owners should not unnecessarily remove, disable, or destroy accessibility modifications when a disabled tenant leaves when those features remain safe, functional, and appropriate for residential use.

Before removing significant accessibility modifications, property owners should make reasonable efforts to preserve the accessible unit and make it available to another disabled tenant who needs or could benefit from those features, consistent with fair housing requirements and individual housing choice.

Preserving existing accessibility modifications is also fiscally responsible. When public, nonprofit, or private resources have funded accessibility improvements, unnecessarily removing them can waste those investments and require similar modifications to be funded again elsewhere.

Metro Cities supports resources and incentives to maintain, repair, and update accessibility improvements rather than remove them, particularly when public funds contributed to the modification. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-7 — Homelessness & Disability

Metro Cities recognizes that people with disabilities are disproportionately represented among people experiencing homelessness and that disability must be explicitly addressed in homelessness policy, planning, and funding decisions.

Local data can demonstrate the magnitude of this intersection. For example, Ramsey County data indicating that approximately 81% of people experiencing homelessness are

620 disabled should inform housing and homelessness investments. (The exact source and
621 year for this statistic should be verified before final submission.)

622 Metro Cities supports increased and sustained funding for accessible emergency shelter,
623 deeply affordable and supportive housing, permanent housing, housing stabilization,
624 eviction prevention, accessibility modifications, and community-based services that help
625 disabled people obtain and maintain housing.

626 Emergency shelters and homelessness-response systems shall be physically, sensory,
627 technologically, and communication accessible and provide reasonable accommodations.

628 People with disabilities and people with lived experience of homelessness should be
629 meaningfully involved in developing and evaluating homelessness policies and programs.
630 *(Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).*

631

632 **HED-8 FEDERAL ROLE IN AFFORDABLE AND WORKFORCE HOUSING**

633

634 Federal funding plays a critical role in aiding states and local governments in their
635 efforts to maintain and increase affordable and workforce housing. Providing working
636 families access to housing is an important piece to the economic vitality of the region.
637 Metro Cities encourages the federal government to maintain and increase current
638 levels of funding for affordable and workforce housing. Federal investment in
639 affordable and workforce housing will maintain and increase the supply of affordable
640 and life cycle housing as well as make housing more affordable through rental
641 assistance programs such as the Section 8 housing choice voucher program.

642

643 In July 2015, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
644 released a final rule on affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) with an aim to
645 provide communities that receive HUD funding with clear guidelines to meet their
646 obligation under the Fair Housing Act of 1968 to promote and reduce barriers to fair
647 housing and equal opportunity. HUD has since provided new guidance to comply with the
648 AFFH rule.

649

650 Metro Cities supports strong federal funding and enforcement of fair-housing protections,
651 including protections for people with disabilities and requirements for reasonable
652 accommodations and reasonable modifications.

Federal housing resources should support the creation, preservation, identification, and modification of accessible affordable housing and protect housing choice for people with disabilities and other marginalized communities. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

Metro Cities supports:

- Preserving and increasing funding for the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) and the federal HOME program that are catalysts for creating and preserving affordable housing;
- Preserving and increasing resources and incentives to sustain existing public housing throughout the Metro Area;
- Maintaining the federal tax credit program to help spur construction and secure additional private investment, including making the four percent Low Income Housing Tax Credit a fixed rate as was done with the nine percent credit in 2015;
- Creating and implementing a more streamlined procedural method for local units of government to participate in and access federal funding and services dealing with grants, loans, and tax incentive programs for economic and community development efforts;
- Additional resources to assist communities to meet obligations to reduce barriers to and promote fair housing and equal opportunity;
- Maintaining and increasing resources to Section 8 funding and to support incentives for rental property owners to participate in the program;
- Federal funding programs for renters with limited income or fixed income;
- Rental increase caps when the rent increase exceeds a 5-year running average;
- and
- Federal funding to provide short-term assistance for HRAs to facilitate the sale of tax- exempt bonds.

HED-9 VACANT, BOARDED, AND FORECLOSED PROPERTIES AND PROPERTIES AT RISK

Abandoned residential and commercial properties can harm communities when vacant buildings result in reduced property values and increased crime. The additional public safety and code enforcement costs of managing vacant properties are a financial strain on cities.

Metro Cities supports solutions to vacant and boarded properties that recognize that prevention is more cost effective than a cure, the causes of this problem are many and varied, requiring a variety of solutions, and cities must not be expected to bear the bulk of the burden of mitigation, because it is not simply a “city” problem. Further, Metro Cities supports:

- Registration of vacant and boarded properties;
- Allowing cities to acquire vacant and boarded properties before deterioration and vandalism result in unsalvageable structures, including providing financial tools such as increasing eminent domain flexibility;
- Improving the ability of cities to recoup the increased public safety, management, and enforcement costs related to vacant properties;
- Improvement of the redemption process to provide increased notification to renters, strengthen the ability of homeowners to retain their properties, and reduce the amount of time a property is vacant;
- Expedition of the tax forfeiture process;
- Increasing financial tools for neighborhood recovery efforts, including tax increment financing; and
- Year-round notification by utility companies of properties not receiving utility service.

HED-10 HOUSING ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT

A Minnesota State Supreme Court ruling, *Morris v. Sax*, stated that provisions of the city of Morris’ rental housing code were invalid because there were subjects dealt with under the state building code and the city was attempting to regulate these areas

“differently from the state building code.”

Minn. Stat. § 326B.121, subdivision 1 states: “The State Building Code is the standard that applies statewide for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, repair, and use of buildings and other structures of the type governed by the code. The State Building Code supersedes the building code of any municipality.” Subdivision 2 states: “A municipality must not by ordinance, or through development agreement, require building code provisions regulating components or systems of any structure that are different from any provision of the State Building Code. This subdivision does not prohibit a municipality from enacting or enforcing an ordinance requiring existing components or systems of any structure to be maintained in a safe and sanitary condition or in good repair, but not exceeding the standards under which the structure was built, reconstructed, or altered, or the component or system was installed, unless specific retroactive provisions for existing buildings have been adopted as part of the State Building Code. A municipality may, with the approval of the state building official, adopt an ordinance that is more restrictive than the State Building Code where geological conditions warrant a more restrictive ordinance. A municipality may appeal the disapproval of a more restrictive ordinance to the commissioner.”

Metro Cities supports the ability of cities to enforce all housing codes passed by a local municipality to maintain its housing stock.

HED-11 to HED-14 INTRODUCTION

The economic viability of the metropolitan area is enhanced by an array of economic development tools that create infrastructure, revitalize previously developed property, provide incentives for business development, support technological advances, support a trained workforce, and address disparities in economic development and workforce development. It should be the goal of the state to champion development and redevelopment by providing adequate and sustainable funding to assure competitiveness in a global marketplace. The state should recognize the relationship between housing and economic development. Access to affordable childcare supports working families and allows parents to enter or remain in the workforce. Economic development and redevelopment are not mutually exclusive – some projects require a boost on both counts. The State of Minnesota should recognize cities as the primary unit of government responsible for the implementation of economic development, redevelopment policies, and land use controls.

HED-11 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For purposes of this section, economic development is defined as a form of development that can contain direct business assistance, infrastructure development, technical assistance, and policy support with the goal of sustainable job creation, job retention, appropriate state regulation or classification, or to nurture new or retain existing industry in the state. The measure of return on investment of public business subsidies should include the impact (positive or negative) of “spin- off development” or business development that is ancillary and supportive of the primary business.

A strength of the regional economy is its economic diversity. Multiple industry clusters and sectors employ a specialized, trained workforce and support entrepreneurs in developing new businesses. Partnerships and collaborations among the state and local levels of government, higher education and industry should continue to develop, to commercialize new technologies and to support efforts to enhance the economic vitality of the region.

While cities are the unit of local government primarily responsible for the implementation of economic development, counties have an interest in supporting local economic development efforts. Any creation of a county CDA, EDA or HRA with economic development powers should follow Minn. Stat. § 469.1082 that requires a city to adopt a resolution electing to participate. Cities can work with the public and private sectors to support the region’s economic growth by reducing barriers to economic participation by people of color.

Metro Cities supports state funded programs that support new and expanding businesses, infrastructure development and public-private partnerships. This includes the Minnesota Investment Fund, Job Creation Fund and Angel Tax Credit. Programs using statewide funding should strive to award funds balanced between the metro region and greater Minnesota. Metro Cities supports competitive funding for statewide grant programs such as the Minnesota Investment Fund (MIF) as opposed to direct legislative appropriations for projects from these funds.

Metropolitan area cities need additional support to attract new small businesses, support existing businesses, and encourage reinvestment in aging and built-out commercial areas. Metro Cities supports a permanent successor to the Main Street Economic Revitalization Program that is accessible to communities throughout the metropolitan region and provides financial assistance for small businesses and commercial property

804 improvements.

805

806 Metro Cities also supports state funding to help cities build local small-business
807 development capacity. This could include conducting market analysis, developing
808 recruitment and retention strategies, maintaining commercial property inventories,
809 connecting businesses with available spaces, and providing technical assistance to
810 entrepreneurs. (Suggested by the city of New Hope). - ADOPTED

811

812 Metro Cities supports a percentage of MIF loan repayments to cities. The state
813 should provide administrative support and technical assistance to cities that
814 administer these programs. Applications for state MIF funds should allow a city to
815 indicate support for a MIF grant or a loan.

816

817 Metro Cities supports economic tools that facilitate job growth without relying solely
818 on the property tax base; green job development and related innovation and
819 entrepreneurship; programs to support minority business start-ups; small business
820 financing tools including a state new markets tax credit program mirrored on the
821 federal program; tools to attract and retain data centers and other IT facilities; access
822 to affordable child care; and maintaining existing municipal authority to establish a
823 special service district (SSD). Metro Cities supports further study of allowing mixed
824 use buildings that have both commercial and residential uses to be included in an
825 SSD.

826

827 Economic development programs, incentives, and public business subsidies should
828 produce equitable community benefits for people with disabilities, people of color,
829 women, immigrants, people with low incomes, and other communities that have
830 historically experienced barriers to economic opportunity.

831 Equitable community benefits shall be evaluated in relation to the demographics and
832 needs of the city receiving or providing the public investment. Cities should use relevant
833 local demographic and economic data to determine whether publicly supported
834 development is creating meaningful opportunities for the communities that make up that
835 city, particularly populations experiencing disparities.

836 Cities should retain authority to establish community-benefit expectations such as
837 accessible workplaces, living-wage employment, inclusive hiring, workforce development,
838 and opportunities for local and historically marginalized businesses.

Public investment should not be considered equitable solely because economic growth occurred. Cities should evaluate who benefited from that growth and whether those benefits reflect the people and communities within the city. *(Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).*

HED-12 REDEVELOPMENT

Redevelopment facilitates the re-use of previously developed land, thereby leveling the playing field between greenfield and brownfield sites so that a developer can choose to locate on land that has already been used.

Redeveloping properties supports community vibrancy and revitalization.

Redevelopment increases the local property tax base, increases land values, provides more efficient use of new or existing public infrastructure (including public transit), reduces urban sprawl, and enhances the livability of neighborhoods. Jobs are created three times – at demolition and cleanup, during construction, and ongoing jobs tied to the new use.

Redevelopment may occur on non-polluted land or on brownfields. Brownfields are abandoned, idled, or underused industrial and commercial properties where financing or redevelopment is complicated by actual or suspected environmental contamination.

Federal, state, regional and local governments fund investigation and cleanup of blighted or other brownfield properties that allows for redevelopment without risking human health or potential environmental liabilities. Correcting and stabilizing polluted soils and former landfill sites allows cities to redevelop and reuse properties. For many cities in the metropolitan region, redevelopment is economic development.

Metro Cities supports increased funding from federal, state and regional sources. The Metropolitan Council's Livable Communities Act programs fund redevelopment activities that support cleanup and tax base revitalization. Metro Cities supports allowing a maximum levy amount for this program, as provided under law. Metro Cities supports increased and sustained state funds for DEED-administered programs like the Redevelopment Grant and Demolition Loan Program, dedicated to metropolitan area projects, innovative Business Development Public Infrastructure grants, as well as increased, flexible, and sustained funding for the Contamination Cleanup and Investigation Grant Program.

The expansion of transit service throughout the region brings opportunity for redevelopment and transit-oriented development (TOD).

Metro Cities supports financing, regulatory tools, and increased flexibility in the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) to nurture TOD. Metro Cities supports funding Transit Improvement Areas (TIAs) and ensuring that the eligibility criteria encourage a range of improvements and infrastructure and accommodate varying city circumstances and needs.

Metro Cities supports expansion of existing tools or development of new funding mechanisms to correct unsuitable soils as well as city authority to redevelop land previously used as landfills and dumps. If a city receives initial approval from a state regulatory authority, a city's redevelopment project approval should be considered final. Local governments and cities may choose to revitalize historic structures rather than construct new buildings.

Metro Cities supports extension of the sunset of the state income tax credit and maintaining the federal tax credit for preservation of historic properties. Metro Cities supports collection of the state refund for the historic expenditures over one year.

Metro Cities supports state funding to allow cities and/or their development authorities to assemble small properties so that business expansion sites will be ready for future redevelopment.

Metro Cities supports redevelopment that strengthens communities without unnecessarily displacing existing residents, small businesses, or community institutions.

Publicly supported redevelopment should consider impacts on renters, people with disabilities, people with low incomes, people of color, seniors, transit-dependent residents, and other marginalized communities.

Redevelopment resources should support affordable and accessible housing preservation, displacement prevention, relocation assistance when displacement cannot be avoided, and opportunities for existing residents to benefit from neighborhood investment.
(Suggested by the city of Maplewood).

HED-13 ADAPTIVE REUSE

Cities in the metropolitan region are experiencing significant commercial vacancy issues in both downtown districts as well as in other commercial areas and need tools and resources to support efforts for the adaptive reuse of vacant, functionally obsolete, and/or underutilized commercial spaces to housing units or other higher uses, if it is determined to be supported by the city the project is located in.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, more employees are working from home on a full-time or hybrid basis, and more and more employers are downsizing their office spaces. As a result, cities are experiencing significant commercial vacancy issues across the metropolitan region in both downtown districts as well as in other commercial areas. At the same time, cities are facing a shortage of housing, and a severe shortage of affordable housing. According to recent coverage in the Real Estate Journal, Minnesota Star Tribune and the MN Reformer, nearly a fifth of office space across the country sits empty, with the Twin Cities having one of the highest vacancy rates in the nation at nearly 23%, and the largest properties in our central business districts exceeding 30% vacancy.

This presents an opportunity for cities to convert vacant, functionally obsolete, and/or underutilized commercial space to housing units or other higher uses. Cities are utilizing a variety of local tools to respond to this issue but need additional tools and resources to address this growing problem across the metropolitan area. The costs for the adaptive reuse of vacant and underutilized properties is expensive and complex.

Metro Cities supports state funding, tax credits and policy tools that will assist with the adaptive reuse of vacant commercial space to residential or new types of uses that support the economic growth of cities.

Cities need additional policy tools support efforts to:

- Disincentivize owners from holding vacant and underutilized properties;
- Target opportunities to increase the city property tax base;
- Encourage additional housing in commercial corridors; and
- Authorize tax increment financing to support the conversion of existing commercial non-residential property, including vacant properties, into multi-family

housing or new types of uses.

Metro Cities supports state resources and incentives to ensure adaptive-reuse projects incorporate accessibility, universal design, and affordable housing where feasible.

Conversion of commercial properties to residential use should be recognized as an opportunity to increase the regional supply of housing that is both accessible and affordable. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-14 WORKFORCE READINESS

A trained workforce is important to a strong local, regional, and state economy. Cities have an interest in the availability of qualified workers and building a future workforce based on current and future demographics, as part of their economic development efforts. Cities can work with the public and private sectors to address workforce readiness to include removing barriers to education access, addressing racial disparities in achievement and employment gaps, addressing the occupational gender gap and support training and jobs for people with disabilities. The state has a role to prepare and train a qualified workforce through the secondary, vocational, and higher education systems and job training and retraining programs in the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED), including youth employment programs.

Metro Cities supports:

- Increased funding for the Job Skills Partnership, youth employment programs and other workforce training programs administered by the state that lead to jobs that provide a living wage and benefits, support workers of all abilities, and help address racial disparity gaps in employment;
- Innovative workforce programs and partnerships that foster workforce readiness for a full range of jobs and careers, including skilled municipal jobs and current high opportunity areas such as manufacturing and construction;
- Investments in programs that address the gender wage gap, including training for women to enter nontraditional careers;
- Maintaining funding for local workforce development boards to support local input

and direction for meeting workforce development goals as outlined in state and federal statute;

- A payroll tax credit for job training programs that invest in employees; and
- A city's authority to tie workforce requirements to local public finance assistance.

Metro Cities supports competitive, integrated employment for people with disabilities with equal pay, meaningful career advancement, accessible workplaces, reasonable accommodations, and flexible employment practices. Employers should be encouraged and incentivized to provide flexible work environments, including but not limited to hybrid and remote work, flexible scheduling, accessible technology, and other practices that expand employment opportunities.

Metro Cities supports state legislative reforms that remove financial and programmatic barriers that discourage disabled people from working, increasing their hours, earning higher wages, or advancing in their careers. This should include examining and redesigning Medical Assistance for Employed Persons with Disabilities (MA-EPD) and other Medical Assistance eligibility, premium, income, and asset policies while preserving access to essential health care and disability-related services.

People with disabilities should not have to choose between meaningful employment and the health care, personal assistance, HCBS, assistive technology, or other supports necessary to live and work in their communities.

State laws and programs that create unnecessary employment disincentives for disabled people should be identified and reformed with meaningful participation from disabled workers and disability-led organizations. (Suggestion by the city of Maplewood).

HED-15 TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF)

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) continues to be the primary tool available for local communities to assist economic development, redevelopment, and housing. Over time, statutory changes have made this critical tool increasingly difficult to use. At the same time, federal and state development and redevelopment resources have been steadily shrinking. The cumulative impact of TIF restrictions, shrinking federal and state redevelopment resources and highly restrictive eminent domain laws constrain cities' abilities to address problem properties, which leads to an accelerated level of decline of developed cities in the metropolitan area. Thus, the only source of revenue

1023 available to accomplish the scope of redevelopment necessary is the value created by
1024 the redevelopment itself, or the “increment.” Without the use of the increment,
1025 development will either not occur or is unlikely to be optimal.
1026

1027 Metro Cities urges the Legislature to:

1028

1029 • Not adopt any statutory language that would further constrain or directly or
1030 indirectly reduce the effectiveness of TIF;

1031

1032 • Not adopt any statutory language that would allow a county, school district or
1033 special taxing district to opt out of a TIF district;

1034

1035 • Incorporate the Soils Correction District criteria into the Redevelopment District
1036 criteria so that a Redevelopment District can be comprised of blighted and
1037 contaminated parcels in addition to railroad property;

1038

1039 • Expand the flexibility of TIF to support a broader range of redevelopment projects;

1040

1041 • Allow and authorize tax increment financing, including property in existing TIF
1042 districts, to support the conversion of existing commercial non-residential property,
1043 including vacant properties, into multi-family housing or new types of uses that
1044 support economic growth for metropolitan cities;

1045

1046 • Amend MN Statutes to clarify that tax increment pooling limitations are calculated
1047 on a cumulative basis;

1048

1049 • Increase the ability to pool increments from other districts to support projects;

1050

1051 • Expand authority for all cities to transfer unobligated pooled increment from a housing or
1052 redevelopment TIF district to support a local housing trust fund for any
1053 eligible expenditure under Minn. Stat. § 462C.16;

1054

1055 • Modify the housing district income qualification level requirements to allow the
1056 levels to vary according to individual communities and/or to support deeply
1057 affordable units;

1058

1059 • Continue to monitor the impacts of tax reform on TIF districts and if warranted
1060 provide cities with additional authority to pay for possible TIF shortfalls;

- Allow for the creation of transit zones and transit-related TIF districts in order to shape development and related improvements around transit stations but not require the use of TIF districts to fund the construction or maintenance of the public transit line itself unless a local community chooses to do so;
 - Allow TIF eligibility expansion to innovative technological products, recognizing that not only physical items create economic value;
 - Support changes to TIF law that will facilitate the development of “regional projects”;
 - Shift TIF redevelopment policy away from a focus on “blight” and “substandard” to “functionally obsolete” or a focus on long range planning for a particular community, reduction in greenhouse gases or other criteria more relevant to current needs;
 - Encourage DEED to do an extensive cost-benefit analysis related to redevelopment, including an analysis of the various funding mechanisms, and an analysis of where the cost burden falls with each of the options compared to the distribution of the benefits of the redevelopment project;
 - ~~• Consider creating an inter-disciplinary TIF team to review local exception TIF proposals, using established criteria, and make recommendations to the legislature on their passage; (Suggestion by the city of Edina).~~
 - Encourage the State Auditor to continue to work toward a more efficient and streamlined reporting process. There are an increasing number of noncompliance notices that have overturned longstanding practices or limited statutorily defined terms.
- The Legislature has not granted TIF rulemaking authority to the State Auditor and the audit powers granted by statute are not an appropriate vehicle for making administrative or legislative changes to TIF statutes. If the State Auditor is to exercise rulemaking authority, the administrative power to do so must be granted explicitly by the Legislature. The audit enforcement process does not create a level playing field for cities to challenge the Auditor’s interpretation of statutes. The Legislature should provide a process through which to resolve disputes over TIF policy that is fair to all

1099 parties;

1100

1101 • Clarify the use of TIF when a sale occurs after the closing of a district;

1102

1103 • Revise the substandard building test to simplify, resolve ambiguities and reduce
1104 continued threat of litigation; and

1105

1106 • Amend TIF statutes to address, through extending districts or other mechanisms,
1107 shortfalls related to declining market values.

1108

1109 **HED-16 EMINENT DOMAIN**

1110

1111 Significant statutory restrictions on the use of eminent domain have resulted in
1112 higher public costs for traditional public use projects like streets, parks, and sewers,
1113 and have all but restricted the use of eminent domain for redevelopment to cases of
1114 extreme blight or contamination.

1115

1116 The proper operation and long-term economic vitality of our cities is dependent on
1117 the ability of a city, its citizens, and its businesses to continually reinvest and
1118 reinvent.

1119

1120 Reinvestment and reinvention strategies can occasionally conflict with the priorities
1121 of individual residents or business owners. Eminent domain is a critical tool in the
1122 reinvestment and reinvention process and without it our cities may deteriorate to
1123 unprecedented levels before the public reacts.

1124

1125 Metro Cities strongly encourages the Governor and Legislature to revisit eminent
1126 domain laws to allow local governments to address redevelopment problems before
1127 those conditions become financially impossible to address.

1128

1129 Specifically, Metro Cities supports:

1130

1131 • Clarifying contamination standards;

1132

1133 • Developing different standards for redevelopment to include obsolete structures
1134 or to reflect the deterioration conditions that currently exist in the metropolitan
1135 area;

1136

- 1137 • Allowing for the assembly of multiple parcels for redevelopment projects;
1138
- 1139 • Modifying the public purpose definition under Minn. Stat. § 117 to allow cities to
1140 more expediently address properties that are vacant or abandoned in areas with
1141 high levels of foreclosures, as well as address neighborhood stabilization and
1142 recovery;
1143
- 1144 • Providing the ability to acquire land from “holdouts” who will now view a publicly
1145 funded project as an opportunity for personal gain at taxpayer expense; i.e.
1146 allow for negotiation using balanced appraisals for fair relocation costs;
1147
- 1148 • Examining attorney fees and limit fees for attorneys representing a property
1149 owner;
1150
- 1151 • Allowing for relocation costs not to be paid if the city and property owner agree
1152 to a sale contract;
1153
- 1154 • A property owner’s appraisal to be shared with the city prior to a sale
1155 agreement; and
1156
- 1157 • Appropriately balanced awards of attorney fees and costs of litigation with the
1158 outcome of the eminent domain proceeding.
1159

1160 **HED-17 COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT**

1161

1162 Communities across the metropolitan region have aging residential and commercial
1163 structures that need repair and reinvestment. Reinvestment prevents neighborhoods
1164 from falling into disrepair, revitalizes communities and protects a city’s tax base.
1165

1166 Metro Cities supports state programs and incentives for reinvestment in older
1167 residential and commercial/industrial buildings, such as, but not limited to, tax credits
1168 and/or property tax deferrals.
1169

1170 Historically, the state has funded programs to promote reinvestment in communities,
1171 including the “This Old House” program, that allowed owners of older homestead
1172 property to defer an increase in their tax capacity resulting from repairs or
1173 improvements to the home and “This Old Shop” for owners of older
1174 commercial/industrial property that make improvements that increase the property’s

1175 market value.

1176

1177 **HED-18 BUSINESS INCENTIVES POLICY**

1178

1179 Without a thorough study, the Legislature should not make any substantive changes to
1180 the Business Subsidy Act, as defined in Minn. Stat. § 116J.993, but should look to
1181 technical changes that would streamline both state and local processes and
1182 procedures. The Legislature should distinguish between development incentives and
1183 redevelopment activities. In addition, in order to ensure cohesive and comprehensive
1184 regulations, the legislature should limit regulation of business incentives to the
1185 Business Subsidy Act.

1186

1187 Metro Cities supports additional legislation that includes tools to help enhance and
1188 facilitate economic development and job creation. Metro Cities supports increased
1189 flexibility for meeting business subsidy agreements during a state of emergency.

1190

1191 **HED-19 BROADBAND TECHNOLOGY**

1192

1193 Where many traditional economic development tools have focused on managing the
1194 costs and availability of traditional infrastructure – roads, rail, and utilities – the 21st
1195 century economy is dependent on reliable, cost effective, high bandwidth
1196 communications capabilities. This includes voice, video, data, and other services
1197 delivered over cable, telephone, fiber-optic, wireless, and other platforms.

1198

1199 The state has increased its role in expanding broadband infrastructure across the state
1200 by funding broadband access for residents and businesses. The Governor's
1201 Broadband Task Force regularly recommends updates to state broadband speed goals
1202 and funding levels to expand statewide broadband access. The Office of Broadband
1203 Development in the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED)
1204 supports the role of broadband in economic development. The Office coordinates
1205 broadband mapping and administers state broadband grant funds.

1206

1207 Cities play a vital role in achieving significantly higher broadband speeds. Local units of
1208 government are contributing to increasing broadband capacity and ensuring internet
1209 connectivity, reliability, and availability. However, attempts have been made in
1210 Minnesota and other states to restrict or stop cities from facilitating the deployment of
1211 broadband services or forming partnerships with private sector companies to provide
1212 broadband services to unserved or underserved residents or businesses. Restricting

municipal authority is contrary to existing state law on electric utility service, telecommunications, and economic development. Metro Cities opposes the adoption of state policies that further restrict a city's ability to finance, construct or operate broadband telecommunications networks.

Metro Cities supports:

- State policies and support programs that substantially increase speed and capacity of broadband services statewide, including facilitating solutions at the local level.

The state should offer incentives to private sector service providers to respond to local or regional needs and to collaborate with cities and other public entities to deploy broadband infrastructure capable of delivering sufficient bandwidth and capacity to meet immediate and future local needs as well as policies which seek to position Minnesota as a state of choice for testing next- generation broadband;

- Metro eligibility for broadband funds, including increased capacity for areas with existing levels of service;

- Testing and review of street-level broadband speeds and updating of comprehensive statewide street-level mapping of broadband services to identify underserved areas and connectivity issues.

- Programs and projects that improve broadband adoption, achieve significantly higher broadband speeds, and support efforts to improve digital inclusion by ensuring that robust and affordable Internet connectivity is widely available to all Minnesotans.

- Municipal authority and encouragement of local governments to play a direct role in providing broadband service. The state should clarify that cities have the authority to partner with private entities to finance broadband infrastructure using city bonding authority;

- Local authority to manage and protect public rights-of-way including public and private infrastructure, to zone, to collect compensation for the use of public assets, or to work cooperatively with and respond to applications from the private sector. Cities may exercise local authority over zoning and land-use decisions for siting, upgrading, or altering wireless service facilities and exercise regulations of structures in the public right-of-way; and

• Public-private collaborations that support broadband infrastructure and services at the local and regional level, including partnerships and cooperation in providing last mile connections.

HED-20 CITY ROLE IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Historically, cities have played a major role in environmental protection, particularly in water quality. Through the construction and operation of wastewater treatment and storm water management systems, cities are a leader in protecting the surface water of the state. In recent years, increased emphasis has been placed on protecting ground water and removing impairments from storm water. In addition, there is increased emphasis on city participation in controlling our carbon footprint and in promoting green development.

Metro Cities supports public and private environmental protection efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to further protect surface and ground water. Metro Cities also supports “green” design and construction techniques to the extent that those techniques have been thoroughly tested and are truly environmentally beneficial, economically sustainable and represent sound building practices. Metro Cities supports additional, feasible environmental protection with adequate funding and incentives to comply. Metro Cities supports state funding for municipal renewable energy objectives.

Metro Cities supports sustained state funding for new and existing programs that support local climate action planning, climate resiliency, climate related infrastructure projects including funding and technical support for local level public-private planning initiatives that address climate resiliency issues that impact economic viability in the metropolitan area at a local and regional level.

Green jobs represent employment and entrepreneurial opportunities that are part of the green economy, as defined in Minn. Stat. § 116J.437, including the four industry sectors of green products, renewable energy, green services and environmental conservation. Minnesota’s green jobs policies, strategies and investments need to lead to high quality jobs with good wages and benefits, meeting current wage and labor laws.

HED-21 IMPAIRED WATERS

1289
1290 Local units of government should not bear undue cost burdens associated with
1291 completed TMDL reports. As recent Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) reports show,
1292 non-point agricultural sources are producing more runoff pollution than urban areas at
1293 a rate of 13:1. Cities must not be required as primary entities for funding the clean-up
1294 and protection of state and regional water resources. Benefits of efforts must be
1295 proportional to the costs incurred and agricultural sources must be held responsible
1296 for their share of costs.

1297
1298 Metro Cities supports continued development of the metropolitan area in a manner
1299 that is responsive to the market but is cognizant of the need to protect the water
1300 resources of the state and metropolitan area. Since all types of properties are required
1301 to pay storm water fees, Metro Cities opposes entity-specific exemptions from these
1302 fees. Metro Cities supports the goals of the Clean Water Act and efforts at both the
1303 federal and state level to implement it.

1304
1305 Metro Cities supports continued funding of the framework established to improve the
1306 region's ability to respond to market demands for development and redevelopment,
1307 including dedicated funding for surface water impairment assessments, TMDL
1308 development, storm water construction grants and wastewater construction grants.

1309
1310 **HED-NEW COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES, HCBS WAIVERS & HOUSING CHOICE**

1311 *(Suggested by the city of Maplewood)*

1312
1313 Metro Cities supports increased, sustained, expanded, and protected state funding for
1314 Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) waivers and other community-
1315 based supports that allow people with disabilities and seniors to remain in their own
1316 homes and communities rather than being forced into institutional settings because
1317 necessary services are unavailable or underfunded.

1318 State policy should expand access to community-based services, reduce waiting periods
1319 and administrative barriers, strengthen the direct-care workforce, and protect people from
1320 reductions in services that could jeopardize their ability to remain in their homes.
1321 Investment in HCBS should be recognized as an essential housing-stability, aging-in-place,
1322 and community-integration strategy consistent with Olmstead v. L.C..

1323 Metro Cities recognizes group homes and other provider-operated residential settings as
1324 viable and appropriate housing choices for some people with disabilities when freely
1325 chosen by the individual. However, group homes and other congregate or provider-

1326 controlled settings can have institutional characteristics and shall not become the default
1327 option simply because adequate services are unavailable for someone to live in their own
1328 home or another community setting of their choice.

1329 State policy should prioritize the most individualized and community-integrated option
1330 chosen by the person. People with disabilities and seniors should have meaningful choices
1331 among living in their own home with supports, living with family or people of their choosing,
1332 supportive housing, group-home settings, and other community-based options.

1333 Funding should follow the person and their individual needs rather than requiring the
1334 person to enter a particular residential model to receive necessary services and supports.
1335 *(New policy suggested by the city of Maplewood).*

1336

1337 **HED-NEW HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY & DISABILITY JUSTICE** *(Suggested by the city of*
1338 *Maplewood).*

1339 Metro Cities recognizes housing as fundamental to the ability of people with disabilities
1340 and seniors to participate fully in community life. Metro Cities supports increasing and
1341 preserving housing that is accessible, affordable, integrated, connected to community
1342 resources, and responsive to individual choice.

1343 Housing policy should incorporate principles of Disability Justice, universal design, fair
1344 housing, aging in place, community integration, self-determination, and Olmstead.

1345 Metro Cities supports state and federal resources for accessible housing development,
1346 accessibility modifications, supportive housing, housing stabilization, homelessness
1347 prevention, HCBS, and preservation of existing accessible housing.

1348 People with disabilities, seniors, and disability-led organizations should be meaningfully
1349 involved in developing, implementing, and evaluating housing policies and programs that
1350 directly affect their communities. (New policy suggested by the city of Maplewood).