Menu System Framework Proposal (DRAFT)

We have heard input from LCDC about the need to find a middle ground between simplicity and flexibility. We think both these goals could be achieved by developing a curated menu framework that builds on the "Housing Production Strategy Program - List of Tools, Actions, and Policies" (subsequently referred to as the *HPS Menu*). This menu would serve as a framework for cities during their HPS process and act as a pre-existing guide to possible requirements if cities are referred to the Acceleration Program.

Objectives of the Menu System:

1. Flexible Problem-Solving During the HPS Phase:
   - Enable jurisdictions to choose from several options to address local needs while providing clear sideboards for what strategies are considered "acceptable" for their HPS, mirroring the concepts of a Safe Harbor program.
   - Provides an opportunity for a hybrid approach for requirements via allowing cities to select from several options in order to satisfy certain expectations or requirements.
2. Guided Course Correction During the Acceleration Program:
   - Offer cities a predictable and structured path to strengthen their strategies if referred to the Acceleration Program.

Implementation of the Scoring System:

- Establish the Impact Values:
  1. Establish a shorter, curated list of strategies from the *HPS Menu* (Including strategies added, fleshed out, or updated during 2025 HAWG efforts). Focus on best or promising practices for key issues such as:
     - Affordability (differentiated by OHNA-defined income brackets)
     - Affordable homeownership and wealth building opportunities
     - Accessible and adaptable housing
     - Access to community assets and mitigation of exposure to harms
     - Housing stability, anti-displacement and displacement mitigation
     - Addressing and disrupting patterns of segregation, and their correlation with concentrated areas of affluence and poverty
  2. Tag each item with each issue area it is meant to address (reflective on the list of topics above). Many strategies may and should address multiple issue areas.
  3. Assign "impact values" to each item on the menu (could be a numbers system or a "low, medium, high" impact denotion).
- Establish a minimum score threshold that cities must meet to:
  1. Achieve Safe Harbor during their HPS adoption:
     - Ensure automatic approval of specific HPS criteria by DLCD.
     - The intent is not for a city to secure safe harbor for its entire HPS through a single pathway. However, theoretically, a city could achieve this by combining multiple safe harbors within the framework.
  2. Satisfy baseline expectations and requirements during their HPS adoption:
     - All cities would need to meet a lower points threshold for certain key equity areas such as accessibility and/or affordability.
  3. Address Acceleration Program Requirements:
     - Guide cities referred to the program by requiring them to select from targeted strategies to address production areas where they are falling short.
- Continuous Improvement: The State will establish a process to regularly update the *HPS Menu* based on observed outcomes. This process will incorporate new, successful strategies implemented by jurisdictions and assign appropriate impact values to them, and may result in downgrading or removal of less impactful strategies as more data are available.

Contact: Julia Metz - julia@sightline.org