2025 Cost Containment Report

11/13/2025

Minnesota Housing
400 Wabasha St. N.
Suite 400
Saint Paul, MN 55102
651.296.7608
mn.housing@state.mn.us
www.mnhousing.gov

Table of Contents

Overview and Context

Containing the cost of housing development is a critical issue in Minnesota. In 2023, about 640,000 Minnesota households were cost burdened by spending more than 30% of their income on housing.[1] To address the shortage of housing that is affordable, we need to build and preserve more affordable homes across the state, especially for households with lower incomes, which is challenging.

- Current development resources for affordable housing are not scaled to meet the need. In recent years, about 11% of new rental construction was underwritten to be affordable to households with incomes at or below 50% of the area median income, falling substantially short of the 46% needed to match the incomes of renters.[2]
- Housing development costs rose very rapidly in 2021 and 2022, 10.7% and 8.5% respectively.[3] See Figure 1. While the rate of residential development inflation is now closer to a more normal level, the cost increases a couple years ago have made developing affordable housing more challenging. Higher interest rates and lower pricing for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits are also creating challenges for developing affordable housing.

[1] Minnesota Housing analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (2024, 1-year sample).

[2] Minnesota Housing analysis based on data from the Metropolitan Council (2022-2023 construction) and of HUD's 2017-2021 CHAS (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) data.

[3] Minnesota Housing analysis based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Producer Price Index for residential construction goods, the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development's weekly wage data for the multifamily housing construction sector, and CoStar data about acquisition costs in Minnesota.

Figure 1: Inflation 2004 to 2025



In addition, effective cost containment is nuanced and involves policy tradeoffs. For example:

- Using lower-quality materials and less efficient building systems (e.g. heating and cooling) will reduce upfront costs but can also increase ongoing maintenance, repair and utility costs, which may not be cost-effective in the long run.
- Using lower-quality materials and more basic designs for a building's exterior will also reduce costs but will make it more challenging to fit affordable housing in the surrounding neighborhood, particularly higher-income communities. Housing that does not fit in a community can lead to community opposition and increase costs related to delays, re-design and projects not moving forward.
- Building developments in less expensive locations can save money, but it can also reduce residents' access to jobs, services, amenities, safe neighborhoods, public transportation, well-resourced schools and other benefits.

We based our 2024-2027 Strategic Plan on the principle that housing is foundational to a full life and a thriving state, providing individuals, families and communities the opportunity to flourish. To achieve this outcome for as many lower-income households as possible, our goal is to finance high-quality, durable, green, accessible, location-efficient housing that provides access to jobs, transit and other amenities and is built at reasonable costs. We are balancing the goal of cost containment with other policy objectives.

Overall, total development costs (TDC) for projects financed by the Agency have been relatively consistent over time after controlling for residential development inflation. This has occurred even when we have added policy objectives that can increase development costs, including supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness and people with disabilities, energy-efficient and climate-resilient homes, and locations that provide access to jobs, transit and other amenities. As cost pressures continue, we will continue to identify and pursue additional strategies to contain and reduce costs, including encouraging different types of construction methods.

This report is broken into two sections – the first addresses multifamily costs, and the second addresses single-family costs.

Multifamily Costs

In a typical year, we distribute $150 million to $200 million for multifamily development.[4] We work to allocate these funds efficiently and effectively to address the significant shortage of rental housing that is affordable, particularly for those with the lowest incomes. The first part of this multifamily section provides an overview of our results, and the second part outlines our strategies for achieving those results and pursuing additional cost containment.

Overview of Multifamily Costs

Overall, the average TDC per unit for the housing we have financed has been around $281,000 (in 2025 dollars) for the last two decades, after adjusting for inflation in residential development. The data in Figure 2 applies to all types of developments, including new construction, rehabilitation, metro area, Greater Minnesota, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), non-LIHTC, workforce housing and supportive housing. The trend line is influenced by both the underlying cost trends and the mix of projects each year.[5] For example, a larger share of resources going to new construction with tax credits in the metro area will increase average costs, while a larger share going to rehabilitation without tax credits in Greater Minnesota will decrease average costs.

---

[4] This includes syndication proceeds from 9% Low-Income Housing Tax Credits.

[5] To increase the comparability of the data, we excluded developments with a TDC per unit that was less than $60,000, which took out rehabilitation projects with a more limited scope of work and added consistency to the level of rehabilitation being assessed. We also excluded developments with an overall acquisition cost of less than $10,000, which excludes projects with no acquisition or heavily subsidized acquisition.

Figure 2: Average TDC per Unit 2003 to 2025 – All Types of Developments (Adjusted for Residential Development Inflation, 2025 Dollars)



To control for the mix of projects in the trend line, Figure 3 shows the average TDC per unit just for new construction projects with tax credits in the metro area. Average costs have been relatively constant with a slight downward trend until about 2021, after which costs went up. The increase coincides with the construction of the first developments financed by Minnesota Housing that were required to meet the state's prevailing wage requirements. We were expecting prevailing wage requirements to increase total development costs by 10% to 20%, The recent increase in development costs in the metro area was a little less than 20%.

Figure 3: TDC per Unit 2003 to 2025 – New Construction with Tax Credits in the Metro Area (Adjusted for Residential Development Inflation, 2025 Dollars)



Figure 4 shows the equivalent graph for Greater Minnesota, with lower costs but similar trend line. The recent increase in Greater Minnesota costs was just over 10%.

Figure 4: TDC per Unit 2003 to 2024 – New Construction with Tax Credits in Greater MN (Adjusted for Residential Development Inflation, 2024 Dollars)



Other than the recent cost increase, we have contained costs while new policy objectives and changes have put upward pressure on costs.

- In 2003, we added a selection and funding priority for supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness, which is generally a more costly type of development.
- In 2007, we added our Green Communities Overlay, which requires that developments have energy-efficient and healthy-home features, and most recently, we have been incentivizing even more sustainable housing, such as Passive House.
- In the last several years, we strengthened our location efficiency priority by making it more geographically precise and increasing the points it receives in the selection process. Housing that is in a walkable neighborhood and near transit, jobs and other amenities can be more expensive.

While these policy changes have occurred, we also added cost containment provisions.

- In 2006, we first developed and started using our predictive cost model, which compares a development's proposed costs with the costs that we would expect for that development based on the Agency's experience with similar projects and industry-wide standards. This process flags high-cost developments and helps maintain costs at a reasonable level.
- In 2014, we also launched the Minnesota Challenge to Lower the Cost of Affordable Housing, which was initiated as an idea competition to identify and address system-level factors (such as land use policies or design standards) that increase costs for all developments. Since this initial competition, we have carried out several activities to address these systemic-cost drivers.

- In 2019, we participated in and co-sponsored the Construction Revolution, which is an initiative to increase innovation in residential construction techniques with a focus on modular and offsite construction. This effort continues today.

More information on these initiatives is provided in the report's next section.

To contain costs, it is important to understand the factors that drive costs. Table 1 provides a breakout of costs by project type, location and cost component.

- New construction with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits in the Twin Cities metro area is the most expensive type of project, while rehabilitation without tax credits in Greater Minnesota is the least expensive.

- Not surprisingly, construction is the primary cost new construction projects, while construction and acquisition costs are both key cost drivers for rehabilitation projects. Addressing these costs will have the largest impact on reducing or containing TDCs.

- While soft costs (non-construction/non-acquisition costs) account for a smaller share of TDC (15% to 24%), they should be a focus of cost containment strategies. Reducing construction costs can affect the quality, durability, accessibility and energy efficiency of the housing, and reducing acquisition costs can affect location efficiency. While soft costs are a necessary component of a housing development, eliminating inefficiencies in these costs will not affect the quality of the housing. The complexity of financing affordable housing adds to the soft costs.

- Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) appear to add about seven percentage points to the share of TDC attributable to soft costs, likely due to the added complexity and cost of putting together and financing a tax credit deal. For developments without tax credits, soft costs account for 15% to 17% of TDC. That percentage jumps to 21% to 24% for developments with tax credits.

Table 1: Share of TDC by Project and Credit Type and Location for Developments Completed between 2003 and 2025 (Adjusted for Residential Development Inflation, 2025 Dollars)

Activity Type	Tax Credit Financing	Region	Average TDC per Unit	Share of TDC			N
				Construct-ion Cost	Acquisition Costs	Soft Cost	
New Const.	LIHTC	Metro	$358,140	69%	7%	24%	113
New Const.	No-LIHTC	Metro	$297,999	73%	10%	17%	23
New Const.	LITHC	Greater MN	$290,765	74%	5%	21%	76
New Const.	No-LIHTC	Greater MN	$276,057	78%	7%	15%	17
Rehab	LIHTC	Metro	$285,486	37%	40%	23%	47
Rehab	No-LIHTC	Metro	$185,081	37%	48%	15%	31
Rehab	LITHC	Greater MN	$177,413	42%	36%	22%	46
Rehab	No-LIHTC	Greater MN	$147,883	42%	42%	16%	24

Strategies for Containing and Reducing Multifamily Costs

As mentioned earlier, we have taken a two-pronged approach to containing costs up to this point.

1. Assess Cost Reasonableness.

2. Address Systemic Cost Drivers.

Strategy 1: Assess Cost Reasonableness

Minnesota Housing assesses each development for cost reasonableness. An important tool for identifying high-cost developments is our predictive cost model. The model predicts a development's TDC per unit based on its characteristics. To develop the parameters for the model, we run a multivariate regression analysis on the inflation-adjusted costs and characteristics of the developments that the Agency financed between 2003 and 2025. The analysis uses the historical data to assess the effect that each of the following factors simultaneously has on TDC per unit:

- Activity Type:
    - New Construction
    - Extensive Rehabilitation[6]
    - More Limited Rehabilitation
    - Combination of New Construction and Rehabilitation

[6] This involves more extensive work on the interior, exterior, electrical and mechanical systems of a property. "Extensive" versus "more limited" is determined by staff using internal definitions.

    - Conversion/Adaptive-Reuse
- Building Type:
    - Walkup
    - Elevator
    - Townhome
    - Single Family Home/Duplex
- Number of Stories
- Unit Size – based on average number of bedrooms per unit in the development
- Gross Square Footage
- Location:
    - Minneapolis or Saint Paul
    - Suburbs in Twin Cities Seven-County Metro Area
    - Greater Minnesota – Large City[7]
    - Greater Minnesota – Regional Job Center[8]
    - Greater Minnesota – Rural
- Year Built
- Underground Garage
- Acquisition:
    - Land
    - Structure
    - None
- Financing:
    - Low-Income Housing Tax Credits
    - Number of Funding Sources
- Special Costs:

---

[7] The large cities are Duluth, Rochester, St. Cloud, Moorhead and Mankato, and include a five-mile commute area around the cities.

[8] There are 51 regional job centers, which are the top 15% of cities and townships in number of jobs. They include: Albert Lea, Albertville, Alexandria, Austin, Baxter, Bemidji, Brainerd, Buffalo, Cambridge, Cloquet, Cold Spring, Crookston, Detroit Lakes, Elk River, Fairmont, Faribault, Fergus Falls, Goodview, Grand Rapids, Hibbing, Hutchinson, International Falls, La Prairie, Little Falls, Marshall, Montevideo, Monticello, Morris, North Mankato, Northfield, Onamia, Owatonna, Park Rapids, Perham, Pipestone, Red Wing, Roseau, Saint Michael, Saint Peter, Sartell, Sauk Rapids, Thief Rivers Falls, Virginia, Waite Park, Waseca, Willmar, Windom, Worthington and Wyoming. These areas also include a five-mile commute area around the cities.

- Historic Preservation
- Environmental Abatement
- Supportive Housing
- Prevailing Wages

We apply the model's cost parameters for these factors to a proposed development to predict its costs. The model is also benchmarked against industry-wide cost data to ensure that our costs are in line with the industry. With different development characteristics, the predicted total development costs for new construction can vary from $290,000 to $645,000 per unit (in 2027 dollars, when 2025 selections will most likely draw funds).

Overall, the model explains a sizable portion (51% to 73%) of the variation in the costs for developments that we financed between 2003 and 2025, which is a robust result.[9] For comparison, Abt Associates (a national consulting firm) released in August 2018 a cost analysis of housing tax credit developments from across the county, and their regression models explained 52% to 54% of the variation in the national data.[10] Similarly, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) released in September 2018 another cost analysis of tax credit developments, and their regression models explained 63% to 65% of the variation in their national data.[11] Besides the statistical rigor, the model has proven very effective over the last decade and a half in objectively and systematically flagging developments with high costs. Each year, we revise and enhance the model based on the previous year's results and staff feedback.

Over time, we have tested models that predict costs on a per-unit and a per-square-foot basis. Based on our testing, the per-unit models have explained a larger share of the variation. We believe this has occurred for two reasons. First, some costs are clearly tied to the unit and do not increase with the size of the units. For example, apartments regardless of unit size have one kitchen (unless single-room-occupancy). Second, and most importantly, the per-unit model that we use includes a cost factor that

[9] The model explains about 73% of the variation in construction costs and about 51% of the variation in soft costs.

[10] Abt Associates, *Variation in Development Costs for LIHTC Projects* (prepared for the National Council of State Housing Agencies, August 30, 2018). The adjusted R-Squared values shown in the appendix varied from 0.5222 to 0.5433.

[11] U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Low-Income Housing Tax Credit: Improved Data and Oversight Would Strengthen Cost Assessments and Fraud Risk* (September 2018, GAO-18-637). The adjusted R-Squared values shown in Appendix II varied from 0.626 to 0.648.

accounts for unit size. Developments with larger units and more bedrooms have higher predicted costs.

Under current practice, when staff recommend to the board developments for funding, they identify the developments with a proposed cost that is more than 25% higher than the model's predicted cost for new construction and 35% higher for rehabilitation, and the board can decide to grant a waiver allowing the higher cost. For the higher-cost projects that staff recommends for funding, staff needs to explain why the proposed costs are reasonable even though they are above the 25% and 35% thresholds. There are a wide range of valid reasons why the costs could be reasonable. For example, a housing development and site may be critical to meet a local housing need, but the site requires an unusually large amount of environmental remediation.

While the predictive cost model is a useful tool to identify high-cost developments, it is not the only way that Agency staff review cost reasonableness. The professional judgment and expertise of our underwriting and architectural staff also play a critical role in the assessment of cost reasonableness. Even if a project has costs that are within the 25% and 35% predictive cost model thresholds, staff can still question costs if they seem high given the context of the development. Our staff has extensive experience reviewing funding applications and development costs. Each year, they typically evaluate 75 or more applications for funding.

Strategy 2: Address Systemic Cost Drivers

The first strategy addresses costs that are specific to individual developments. Systemic cost drivers outside the control of developers are critical issues that also need to be addressed. These cost drivers range from local policies and regulations that increase the cost of housing (such as maximum densities), to the cash reserves that funders and investors may require for affordable housing developments, to the complexity of assembling the multiple sources of funding that make an affordable housing deal work.

In January 2014, Enterprise Community Partners and the Urban Land Institute's (ULI's) Terwilliger Center for Housing released a report on best practices from across the country to address these systemic cost drivers.[12] Overall, the report finds that containing and reducing costs in a prudent and

[12] Enterprise Community Partners and Urban Land Institute's Terwilliger Center for Housing, *Bending the Cost Curve on Affordable Rental Development: Understanding the Drivers of Costs* (January 2014).

effective way does not involve a single magic bullet. Rather, housing costs are driven by dozens of small inefficiencies. As one of the lead authors described it, "death by a thousand cuts."[13]

To take on these cost drivers, we partnered with the McKnight Foundation, Enterprise, and ULI/Regional Conference of Mayors to create an initiative for Minnesota to implement these types of practices, which became the MN Challenge to Lower the Cost of Affordable Housing. It began in the winter of 2014 as an idea competition. We asked the development community to create cross-discipline teams (developers, funders, attorneys, local officials, housing advocates, etc.) and develop and submit ideas to address these systemic cost drivers. From the 12 submissions, we selected one to receive $70,000 for implementation.[14]

The winning idea was submitted by the Center for Urban and Region Affairs at the University of Minnesota, the Housing Justice Center and Becker Consulting. Their proposal addressed the issue of local practices and policies that add to the cost of affordable housing, including fees, land-use and zoning policies, approval processes and others. These cost drivers have been identified and known for years. The value of this idea was identifying and implementing best practices to address them, which included providing technical assistance to communities to pursue the practices and encouraging regional organizations to incorporate the implementation strategies into their policies and guidelines, including the Metropolitan Council's Planning Handbook and Housing Performance Scores and ULI's Toolbox for local communities.

As part of our overall cost containment strategy, we have carried out several initiatives that address systemic cost drivers.

- **2014 – Minnesota Housing's Multifamily Remodel Project.** We carried out a project for our Multifamily Division to redesign and streamline its application and funding processes – everything from proposal inception through application, selection, underwriting, closing, construction management and lease up. The purpose of the remodel was to reduce the time it takes a development to move from concept to occupancy. A key finding from the Enterprise/ULI report identified complexity, uncertainty and delays in the funding process as cost drivers. The project has achieved positive outcomes. For example, we created a customized online portal to receive funding applications for the multifamily consolidated RFP, eliminating paper applications.

[13] Michael Spotts, Enterprise Community Partner, presentation to the Affordable Housing Investors Council (AHIC), Portland Oregon, October 9, 2014.

[14] The initiative was jointly funded by the McKnight Foundation and Minnesota Housing.

- **2015 – MinnDocs – Consolidated Legal Documents**. Most affordable housing projects have multiple deferred loan funding sources, each with their own set of legal documents and attorneys, which add unnecessary costs. The Enterprise/ULI report highlighted Massachusetts' practice that consolidates legal documents for all subordinate debt into a single set. The development community in Minnesota was intrigued, and we took initial steps to pursue the concept. The complexity of making this work turned out not to be worth the limited cost savings that would result.

- **2016 – Minnesota Housing's Design and Construction Standards.** As part of our annual preparation for the consolidated RFP, we review these standards. During 2016, we specifically reviewed the standards with an emphasis on cost containment. We focused on reducing life-cycle costs (which includes ongoing maintenance, repair and utility costs), not just upfront development costs. Specifically, we surveyed architects, general contractors and developers who work on the developments that we finance about the standards and costs. We received 66 responses. Based on the feedback, we made several design changes that should reduce costs. For example, we clarified that a separate dining room is not required in units with two or more bedrooms but that a dining area (or eat-in kitchen) is sufficient. Each of the changes alone will unlikely result in significant savings, but they are examples of small savings that, when combined, can lead to larger savings over time.

- **2017 – Developer Fees.** These fees compensate developers for the time, compliance requirements and risks associated with developing affordable housing and can account for a substantial portion of a development's soft costs. Minnesota Housing allows a maximum developer fee of 15% of TDC for the first 50 units and 8% for additional units. In 2017, we assessed our fees and found that they are consistent with other states and that the average fee taken by our developers is 7% of TDC, well below our maximum. Given our overall cost containment incentives, it appears that developers are typically taking the minimum fee that still allows the deal to work for them. If developers take a higher fee, their applications will be less competitive in a highly competitive process. Based on this analysis, we decided not to adjust our developer fee structure at that time, but it is an area that we will continue to assess given the size of these costs.

- **2018 – Housing Task Force.** Minnesota Housing was a lead sponsor of Governor Dayton's Task Force, providing much of the staff support. The cost of developing housing was a primary issue addressed by the Task Force, which made several cost-related recommendations, including:

    - Position Minnesota as a national leader in the advancement of housing innovation and technology, which should increase the efficiency and productivity of developing housing and reduce the costs.

- Grow the pool of talent in Minnesota's building trades to enable the sector to meet current and future demand, which should address the current shortage of skilled labor.
- Create a statewide review panel to evaluate regulations related to building standards, land use and environmental stewardship for their impact on housing affordability.

While these actions are largely outside the scope of our work, they would directly impact the cost of the housing that we finance.

- **2019 to present – Off-site Construction and Other Innovative Techniques.** In 2019, we helped organize and co-sponsor the Construction Revolution Summit, which pursued the innovation and technology recommendation from the Housing Task Force. The Summit brought together construction industry leaders to discuss barriers and opportunities to advancing off-site construction (including modular and panelized).

  Housing construction is ripe for a major systemic change but has struggled to takeoff in the United States. Unlike other industries, construction has not experienced meaningful productivity increases over the last few decades. We are largely building homes the same way we did 50 years ago.



Without productivity gains, reducing the cost of housing construction will remain elusive. Some estimates suggest that off-site construction could reduce costs by as much as 20%.

The action plan that came out of the Construction Revolution Summit called for, among other things: (1) establishing learning opportunities on how to develop housing using modular construction, and (2) having public funders finance some developments using off-site construction as a pilot.

- In the winter of 2021, the Construction Revolution team provided a course on using modular construction, bringing together developers, architects, general contractors and others from the industry. One of Minnesota Housing's architects participated.
- In our scoring for the 2021 to 2024 consolidated RFPs, we added a selection preference for developments that use innovative construction techniques (including off-site construction) and have the potential to reduce construction costs by at least 10% and construction time by at least 20%.
- For the 2025 and 2026 RFPs, the Agency made the use of innovative construction techniques a pointing category, not just a selection preference. This should give developers an even stronger incentive to pursue innovative techniques. As a pointing category, the use of an innovative construction technique will directly impact a housing project's ranking in the selection process.

In 2025, the Construction Revolution is partnering with MOD X to identify and implement strategies to advance off-site construction in Minnesota. MOD X is a global strategy advisor and knowledge exchange network integrating academic, industry, government and related non-profit sectors to advance offsite construction.

Single-Family Costs

We typically distribute around $10 million to $15 million for single-family development through our Community Homeownership Impact Fund. Although the level of cost data that we collect is currently less than what we collect and analyze for multifamily developments, evaluating costs and cost containment is a part of our selection process.

Overview of Single-Family Costs

The total development costs for the single-family projects that we have financed are reasonable and consistent with industry benchmarks for moderately-sized, average-class homes. Table 2 shows the

median cost per home by location and activity for developments that we have financed over the last twelve and a half years, adjusted for residential development inflation.

Table 2: Impact Fund – Median TDC by Location and Project Type, Loans Closed from October 1, 2012 through March 25, 2025 (2027 dollars, when we expect 2025 selections to start construction)

Location	New Construction	Acquisition/Rehab/Resale
Greater Minnesota	$342,000	$285,000
Metro	$505,000	$399,000

Excludes projects by Habitat for Humanity and Community Land Trusts

In the last few years, some of the projects that we finance are now statutorily required to pay prevailing wages to construction workers. We generally assume that prevailing wages add 5% to 20% to the development costs. Consequently, we have recently seen some costs higher than these figures.

The median new construction costs in Table 2 are generally consistent with industry standards. Table 3 shows the predicted industry-wide costs for building new, average-class homes of varying sizes in the Twin Cities metro area (derived from RSMeans data).[15] These costs do not include prevailing wages. The median cost of the homes that we finance for new construction in the metro area ($505,000 as shown in Table 2) is in line with industry cost benchmarks for a 1,600 to 2,100 square-foot home ($486,000 to $558,000 as shown in Table 3). When prevailing wages apply, we are likely to see costs higher than these.

Table 3: Estimated Total Development Costs in Twin Cities Metro, Two Story Home, Unfinished Basement, Average Class, Wood Siding, 2-Bathrooms, Garage and No Prevailing Wages (2027 dollars, when we expect 2025 selections to start construction)

Location	1,100 Sqft	1,600 Sqft	2,100 Sqft	2,600 Sqft
Total Development Cots	$414,000	$486,000	$558,000	$630,000

Source: Minnesota Housing analysis based on construction cost data from RSMeans, *Residential Cost Data, 2025*. Besides the RSMeans data on construction costs, we added cost factors for land and soft costs.

The historical median cost for new construction in Table 2 for our work in Greater Minnesota ($342,000) is quite a bit less than the predicted costs based on the RSMeans data. Table 4 is the same as Table 3 but applies to projects in Greater Minnesota outside of the counties that make up the

[15] RSMeans is a national firm that provides a wide range of data on construction costs.

metropolitan statistical areas of the Twin Cities, Duluth, Moorhead, St. Cloud, Rochester and Mankato. Regardless of the size of the home, these predicted costs from the RSMeans data for rural Minnesota are substantially higher than the median development cost ($342,000) of the homes we have financed in the past.

Table 4: Estimated Total Development Costs in Rural Minnesota, Two Story Home, Unfinished Basement, Average Class, Wood Siding, 2-Bathrooms, Garage and No Prevailing Wages (2027 dollars, when we expect 2025 selections to start construction)

Location	1,100 Sqft	1,600 Sqft	2,100 Sqft	2,600 Sqft
Total Development Cots	$377,000	$443,00	$509,000	$574,000

Source: Minnesota Housing analysis based on construction cost data from RSMeans, *Residential Cost Data, 2025*. Besides the RSMeans data on construction costs, we added cost factors for land and soft costs.

The reason for the lower than predicted costs in Table 2 for Greater Minnesota is not entirely clear. The costs in Table 2 exclude projects sponsored by Habitat for Humanity, which often has lower costs with donated labor and materials.

Strategies for Containing and Reducing Single-Family Costs

Since 2015, we have focused on becoming more systematic and objective in our assessment of single-family development costs. We initially compared a project's proposed costs with the median and the 80th percentile cost home that we have financed in the past. While this approach was valuable as an initial assessment, it has deficiencies. It does not account for cost differences resulting from home sizes, garages, number of bathrooms, varying land costs and other factors. Starting with the 2022 RFP selections, we developed a predictive model for new construction projects, which is largely based on the RSMeans data and allows for a more nuanced assessment of the proposed costs. As shown in Tables 2 through 4, the costs are inflated to expected 2027 dollars so that they can serve as cost benchmarks for the 2025 funding selections, which will likely start construction in 2027.

Conclusion

For nearly two decades, we have worked to contain upfront development costs while adding new priorities that can increase costs. Given the shortage of affordable housing, limited resources, and the need to do more, cost containment will remain a critical issue. While many of the cost drivers are outside the direct control of the Agency or driven by the market, we will continue to pursue multiple strategies to contain costs.