

## FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

---

Applicant:  
Applicant Score:

	All Applications	Rural Applications
Highest Score	97	88.17
Lowest Score	48.17	54.33
Median Score	83.67	83.6

---

This document summarizes the score your Continuum of Care (CoC) received in the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) application by providing:

1. the CoC's score for each section of the application; and
2. a summary of the common reasons HUD deducted points in each section of the application.

The chart below indicates the maximum points available for each Rating Factor and the actual score your CoC received.

Rating Factor	Maximum Available Score	Median Score (All Applications)	Median Score (Rural Applications)	Your CoC
Leadership Capacity	15	14	14.5	
Community Need	20	17.7	14.5	
Collaboration	20	18	18.33	
Youth Collaboration	25	20	21	
Data and Evaluation Capacity	20	15.5	14.33	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>			
Rural Bonus for FY2020 funds	10			

---

### Competition Summary:

- On May 27, 2021, HUD published the YHDP Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) [FY 2019 and FY2020] which allocated \$142 million to help Continuums of Care (CoCs) develop and implement Coordinated Community Plans and fund projects to end youth homelessness in their communities.
- HUD scored 97 of the 111 applications submitted. Applications HUD did not score were not submitted by the Collaborative Applicant, as required in section III.A. of the NOFO, or were duplicate application submissions.
- The NOFO required complete answers to all questions and Section IV.B.1. of the NOFO listed all required attachments. HUD deducted points for applications that did not completely answer all questions.
- The lowest score for a selected non-rural community was 91.83 and the lowest score for a selected rural community was 82.83.

## FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

---

On September 15, 2021, HUD announced the selection of the following 33 communities for funding:

### Selected Communities: FY2019 funds

<b>CoC Number</b>	<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Award Amount</b>	<b>Rural</b>
WI-500	Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc.	\$7.7 million	Yes
PA-601	The PA Department of Community and Economic Development	\$3.8 million	Yes
SD-500	South Dakota Housing Development Authority	\$3.0 million	Yes
WV-500	Greater Wheeling Coalition for the Homeless, Inc.	\$1.2 million	Yes
VA-521	Commonwealth of Virginia	\$1.6 million	Yes
TN-500	Chattanooga Regional Homeless Coalition, Inc.	\$2.3 million	Yes
CA-506	Coalition of Homeless Services Providers	\$5.7 million	Yes
NY-510	Human Services Coalition	\$2.0 million	Yes
OR-500	Lane County, Oregon	\$3.6 million	No
MA-516	Department of Housing and Community Development	\$6.1 million	No
MI-501	Homeless Action Network of Detroit	\$5.7 million	No
WA-502	City of Spokane	\$2.8 million	No
NE-502	City of Lincoln, Nebraska	\$2.2 million	No
TN-501	Community Alliance for the Homeless	\$3.8 million	No
RI-500	Rhode Island Housing and Mortgage Finance Corporation	\$3.6 million	No
OK-502	City of Oklahoma City	\$3.0 million	No
CA-600	Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority	\$15.0 million	No

## FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Applicant Debriefing

---

### Selected Communities: FY2020 funds

CoC Number	Recipient	Award Amount	Rural
NY-601	County of Dutchess	\$1.4 million	No
NH-501	FIT/NHNNH, Inc	\$1.2 million	No
MN-500	Hennepin County	\$3.5 million	No
GA-500	Atlanta Continuum of Care/Partners for HOME	\$2.3 million	No
NY-600	The City of New York	\$15.0 million	No
OR-504	ORS 190 Entity, Mid-Willamette Valley Homeless Alliance	\$3.8 million	No
OH-505	Montgomery County Board of County Commissioners	\$1.8 million	No
TX-700	Coalition for the Homeless of Houston/Harris County	\$10.4 million	No
WI-503	City of Madison	\$2.5 million	No
CA-500	County of Santa Clara by/through Office of Supportive Housing	\$10.5 million	No
TX-601	Tarrant County Homeless Coalition	\$4.2 million	No
CA-502	Alameda County	\$6.7 million	No
NH-500	State of New Hampshire DHHS	\$2.2 million	Yes
ND-500	North Dakota Housing Finance Agency	\$2.0 million	Yes
FL-602	GULF COAST PARTNERSHIP, INC.	\$1.1 million	No
WV-508	West Virginia Coalition to End Homelessness, Inc.	\$2.6 million	Yes

Below is an overview of the NOFO rating factors and HUD's scoring and funding decision making processes, which includes a brief analysis of the questions most frequently associated with a loss of points. In general, the specific questions noted below were emphasized because, on average, applicants lost at least one-half point within the scoring criteria. See [Section V.A.1. of the NOFO](#) for specific information on scoring criteria and to review the questions identified in the tables below.

**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

---

**Rating Factor I: Leadership Capacity–15 points**

HUD awarded up to 15 points if responses demonstrate they have the necessary leadership in place to effectively manage the development of a Coordinate Community Plan (CCP) to prevent and end youth homelessness. In general, most applicants received full points on most questions in this section. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<p><b>Question 1.3</b></p>	<p>Describe the CoC's current written plan or strategy to prevent and end youth homelessness. If a part of a plan to prevent and end all forms of homelessness, to get maximum points under this criterion, there must be a dedicated section or set of youth-specific strategies and objectives.</p> <p>Applications did not include clear or current specific plans to prevent and end youth homelessness in their community</p>
<p><b>Question 1.4</b></p>	<p>Describe how the CoC prioritizes authentic youth collaboration through the Youth Action Board or through youth participation in committee meetings or planning and feedback events.</p> <p>Applicants lost points because they did not clearly show how it prioritized youth collaboration, the role that young people have in the process or the response or did not state exactly how youth are prepared and supported to participate effectively.</p>
<p><b>Rating Factor 1: Youth Review Perspective</b></p>	<p><b><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicants engaged youth participation.</li> <li>• Youth input is in an advisory capacity.</li> <li>• Youth participation appears to be relevant to the work being done.</li> <li>• Broad collaboration across government, youth, and community stakeholders</li> <li>• Provided very detailed and concise summaries of the community's challenges to end youth homelessness with corresponding strategies to address each.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicants provides youth little decision-making power.</li> <li>• YAB is not being prepared to be an equitable partner.</li> <li>• Most YABs are newly formed leading responses to appear disingenuous.</li> </ul>

**Rating Factor 2: Community Need - 20 Points**

**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

---

HUD awarded 20 points to applicants that demonstrated high need in the community based on the number and needs of the community’s youth experiencing homelessness. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<b>Question 2</b>	<p>Describe the most recent youth homelessness needs assessment conducted by the CoC.</p> <p>Almost all applicants indicated that they conducted a needs assessment in the community. However, the most common reason why applicants lost points in this section is because they did not adequately describe how youth were involved in designing or executing the needs assessment, the scope of the assessment, or provide a description of disparities.</p>
-------------------	--

**Rating Factor 3: Collaboration - 20 Points**

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants that demonstrated strong current community-wide partnerships that are working to prevent and end youth homelessness. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<b>Question 3.2</b>	<p>How does the CoC work with each of the following institutions to ensure that participants in the programs are not released into homelessness? (Child welfare (foster care), Justice system (juvenile and adult), Institutions of mental and physical health.)</p> <p>Responses clearly described the level of youth actively developing in collaboration. Applicant demonstrated a robust network of partnerships with other agencies, particularly within the adult and juvenile justice systems.</p> <p>In other cases, responses mentioned that they do not currently have discharge strategies in place for adult and juvenile justice or physical health institutions and applicants only provided vague overviews of each discharge strategy with no in depth descriptions or strategies.</p>
<b>Rating Factor 3: Youth Review Perspective</b>	<p><b><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant examples were provided on how the CoC works with each institution to make homelessness rare brief and non-recurring</li> </ul> <p><b><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some applicants did not provide an in-depth descriptions of each institution and how the CoC works with each of the institutions to</li> </ul>

**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

	ensure that participants in the programs are not released into homelessness.
--	--

**Rating Factor 4: Youth Collaboration – 25 Points:**

HUD awarded up to 25 points to applicants that demonstrated how Youth voice is a crucial component to addressing and ending youth homelessness. In order to be successful, responses to this section should clearly be written by Youth Action Board (YAB) members and applicants must have considered how youth with lived experience will be integrated into system and program design and implementation. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<b>Question 3 and 3a.</b>	<p>3. Is the membership of the YAB reflective of the population of youth and young adults experiencing homelessness in the community?</p> <p>3a. Provide data indicating the prevalence of youth of color, LGBTQ+, and gender non-conforming youth in the general population of youth experiencing homelessness and describe how the YAB works to ensure that its membership is reflective of the population of youth experiencing homelessness in the community.</p> <p>In many applications, responses did not fully expand on a description of the number of over-represented homeless youth in the system and how the community is working to ensure that the YAB becomes or continues to be representative of youth experiencing homelessness in the community</p> <p>In addition, responses included vague examples of how communities use Racial Equity Tools, HMIS, Coordinated Entry or Intake Assessment Tools, synopsis of the youth needs assessment, STELLA and etc.</p>
<b>Question 4.2d</b>	<p>How are youth and young adults with lived experience recruited for membership in the Youth Action Board?</p> <p>Strong applications described recruiting processes that are led by the YAB/youth members by election bases in reflection of the community’s demographics and included organization within the CoC. YABS are fully in charge of recruiting youth by referral, public events and word of mouth.</p>
<b>Question 4.2e</b>	<p>Describe the decision-making structure of the YAB.</p> <p>Applicants lost points if the description of a formalized, documented decision-making structure involving multiple members was not apparent and if a description of a decision-making structure that had not been formalized.</p>
<b>Question 4.2f</b>	<p>How is the YAB integrated into CoC-wide work (i.e., beyond issues solely dealing with youth homelessness)?</p> <p>Applicants provided information regarding how youth are integrated into CoC work but failed mention the involvement of youth outside of issues pertaining to youth homelessness.</p>

**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

<p><b>Question 4.2g</b></p>	<p>What training and other preparation are YAB members provided on the CoC structure, CoC rules, housing types, and other issues surrounding homelessness?</p> <p>Frequently applicants stated that YABs were not yet created or newly created to fulfill the requirements of the YHDP application. In these instances, trainings on the CoC structure, CoC rules, housing types, and other issues surrounding homelessness were minimal and or not fully integrated.</p> <p>Strong responses described defined training, job readiness, process of YAB leadership, resources on housing types, and community centralized issues, workshops on leadership, CoC 101, dismantling adultism, advocacy as well conference participation.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.3</b></p>	<p>Provide data indicating the prevalence of youth of color, LGBTQ+, and gender non-conforming youth in the general population of youth experiencing homelessness and describe how the YAB works to ensure that its membership is reflective of the population of youth experiencing homelessness in the community.</p> <p>Applicants provided comprehensive data on the demographics of the current YAB, acknowledged that it is reflective of youth experiencing homeless in the community and described a detailed strategy to address this issue. However, many responses lack data collection as a pertains to the prevalence of youth of color, LGBTQ+, and gender non-conforming youth in the general population of youth experiencing homelessness</p>
<p><b>Question 4.4</b></p>	<p>How are youth incentivized to participate in the YAB or other aspects of the youth homelessness system? These may include paid positions, professional development opportunities, access to other resources, etc.</p> <p>Strong applications provide descriptions of how youth are employed by the CoC, the YAB, or another youth organization to make decisions related to preventing and ending youth homelessness in the community AND youth engaged in professional development opportunities, including internships, available to youth in the community interested in preventing and ending homelessness. Many applications were vague or had not determined the incentive structure for the YAB or participating youth.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.5</b></p>	<p>From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges to integrating youth voice into community decision-making structures?</p> <p>Applicant did not receive full points if response was not clearly be written by a youth or did not include quotes from youth regarding the challenges to integrating youth voice.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.6</b></p>	<p>From a youth perspective, what are the biggest challenges/barriers to sustaining a Youth Action Board?</p> <p>Applicants did not receive full points if response was clearly be written by a youth or include quotes from youth regarding the challenges to sustain a Youth Action Board.</p>

**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

<p><b>Question 4.7</b></p>	<p>From a youth perspective, identify the biggest areas of risk in the current youth homelessness system (for example, aging out of foster care or transitioning from an institution) and how the community is working to address these risks.</p> <p>Applicants did not receive full points if the response failed to identify the biggest areas of risk in the current youth homelessness system and how the community is working to address these risks.</p>
<p><b>Question 4.9</b></p>	<p>4.9 Attach a letter of support for the application from the Youth Action Board (YAB), signed by all members of the YAB. The letter of support must indicate the age range of all YAB members and certify that the YAB meets the requirements outlined in Section I.A.4.k of this NOFO.</p> <p>Applicants lost points if the letters were not attached or if the letter was not signed by at least three members of the YAB.</p>
<p><b>Rating Factor 4: Youth Review Perspective</b></p>	<p><b><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth are compensated at or above-minimum wage rates on an hourly basis.</li> <li>• Professional growth opportunities are also offered in the form of positions within the parent company</li> <li>• Applicants clearly utilize youth voice in all process, strategically access youth funding, find opportunities to tear down corrupt systems and replace it with access to power and redistributing wealth in community centered work.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicants’ responses divulged that demographic data on homeless youth had not been explored.</li> <li>• Prevalence rates are not available for youth of color, LGBTQ+ and gender non-conforming youth.</li> <li>• Organizations had not created processes in synch with information on the local youth population of homelessness.</li> </ul>

**Rating Factor 5: Data and Evaluation – 20 points**

HUD awarded up to 20 points to applicants that demonstrated the existence of a functioning Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) that facilitates in the collection of information on homelessness using residential and other homeless services and effective performance measures. The most common reason HUD deducted points in this section was applicants did not fully answer the questions or did not provide sufficient detail. Common questions where HUD deducted points were:

<p><b>Question 5.3</b></p>	<p>Describe how the CoC actively recruits new homeless projects to HMIS for youth-dedicated projects.</p>
----------------------------	---



**FY2019 & FY2020 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP)  
Applicant Debriefing**

	Applicants lost points if they did not have a recruitment strategy.
<b>Question 5.8</b>	<p>Describe how youth are brought into evaluation and quality improvement conversation in your community.</p> <p>Applicants lost points if they did not include youth feedback and involvement in the evaluation and quality improvement work in the community.</p>
<b>Rating Factor 5: Youth Review Perspective</b>	<p><b><u>General Applicant Strengths:</u></b></p> <p>Applicants defined specific outcome measures.</p> <p><b><u>General Applicant Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <p>Applicants lacked youth voice on success.</p> <p>Applicants did not seem to prioritize subpopulations such as LGBTQ, POC, and pregnant and parenting youth.</p>