SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

- STATE OF MINNESOTA and NATIONAL -

Field Dates:
State of Minnesota: June 24 – July 1, 2026
National: March 11-19, 2026

Sample Sizes:
State of Minnesota: 600
National: 1,200

Confidence Interval:
State of Minnesota: +/-4.3%
National: +/- 2.9%

Samples Provided by: Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege. Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.

Note: Rows may not add to 100% due to rounding

[Q1-12 withheld for future release]

Switching gears, you will now have the chance to evaluate federal proposals aimed at addressing the cost of housing.

For each one, please say whether you are in favor or opposed.

Q13. Providing $25 billion to local governments to increase the amount of high-density housing affordable to low- and middle-income households.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	74%	26%	1%
Republicans	63%	36%	1%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Independents	73%	26%	1%
Minnesota (statewide)	75%	24%	1%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	84%	15%	1%

Q14. Spending up to $40 billion to increase the amount of high-density housing (such as apartment buildings, duplexes and triplexes) affordable for people with low and very low incomes.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	74%	26%	0%
Republicans	64%	36%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Independents	71%	29%	0%
Minnesota (statewide)	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	67%	34%	0%
Democrats	82%	17%	1%

Q15. Spending up to $24 billion to provide more vouchers to help people pay rent who are very low income, disabled or elderly.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	80%	19%	1%
Republicans	74%	26%	1%
Democrats	89%	11%	1%
Independents	75%	25%	0%
Minnesota (statewide)	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	1%
Democrats	84%	15%	1%

Q16. Providing tax incentives to home builders to build or repair homes affordable to low- and middle-income households.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83%	16%	0%
Republicans	80%	20%	0%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%
Independents	81%	18%	1%
Minnesota (statewide)	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	1%

Q17. To help reduce the price of single-family homes, prohibiting large corporations from buying new single-family homes, and requiring those that already own such homes to sell them within the next ten years.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	77%	22%	1%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%
Independents	78%	22%	0%
Minnesota (statewide)	80%	19%	1%

Republicans	77%	23%	1%
Democrats	87%	12%	1%

[Q18-36, Q44-59 withheld for future release]
[Q37-43 previously released]

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size: The surveys were fielded by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's Civic Innovation Center, with representative non-probability samples obtained from multiple online panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

National
Field Dates: March 11-19, 2026 Total Sample Size: 1200 Response Rate: 8.3%

State of Minnesota
Field Dates: June 24 – July 1, 2026 Sample Size: 600 Response Rate: 8.1%

Pre-Stratification and Weighting: The samples were pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, educational attainment, household income, and home ownership. Benchmarks were obtained from the Census Bureau's 2024 and 2025 American Community Surveys, as well as the 2024 Current Population Survey's Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The national sample was also weighted by Census region and partisan affiliation. In the Minnesota sample, the distribution of partisan affiliation was weighted to be within expectations, based on voter registration data for non-leaners and/or Cook's Partisan Voting Index for leaners.

National
Confidence Interval: +/-2.9% Min Weight: 0.48 Max Weight: 1.92 Mean Weight: 1.0

State of Minnesota
Confidence Interval: +/-4.3% Min. Weight: 0.36 Max Weight: 2.03 Mean Weight: 1.0

Confidence Intervals were calculated using the sample variance of the weights using the following formula:
CI = Square root ((1+variance)/sample size)

Sample Collection: Sample collection was managed by Quant-E with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

Data Collection and Privacy: Survey responses were collected directly on the Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer, laptop, tablet, or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

Quality Control: Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey to disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.