

All Applications

| | |
|---------------|------|
| Highest Score | 100 |
| Lowest Score | 10 |
| Median Score | 76.3 |

This document summarizes the scoring of the Mainstream Voucher Program, FR-6100-N-43, applications. It provides two sets of information:

1. The PHA’s maximum score for each section of the application; and
2. A summary of the common reasons PHAs lost points in each section of the application.

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

| Rating Factor | Maximum Available Score |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1a. PHA Capacity & Demonstrated Commitment to Provide Housing for Persons with Disabilities | 25 |
| 1b. Partner Agency Capacity | 15 |
| 1c. Geographic Jurisdiction | 10 |
| 1d. Admissions Preference | 10 |
| 2. Leveraging Resources | 30 |
| 3. Achieving Results and Program Evaluation | 10 |
| Total Number of Points Available | 100 |

Competition Summary:

- In April 2018, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) announced the Mainstream Voucher Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), allocating up to \$100 million to fund new Mainstream housing choice vouchers. This funding will assist non-elderly persons with disabilities who are:
 - Transitioning out of institutional or other segregated settings
 - At serious risk of institutionalization
 - Homeless, or
 - At risk of becoming homeless
- The NOFA required applicants to submit all required application materials to Grants.gov by June 20, 2018. The NOFA also required applicants to be either a PHA or non-profit organization that already administers the Housing Choice Voucher program.
- HUD scored 337 of the 391 applications submitted. Unscored applications were duplicates, were submitted by an ineligible entity, or did not include required application materials.

- The NOFA required complete applications to include narratives and non-form attachments, as outlined in Section IV.B.1.
- Awards were made to applications scoring 60 points or higher.
- On September 4, 2018, HUD awarded **286 PHAs, 12,027 vouchers, totaling \$98,949,908.**

Below is an overview of the NOFA rating factors and HUD’s scoring and funding decision-making processes. See [Section V.A.1. of the NOFA](#) for specific information on scoring criteria.

Rating Factor I: Capacity and Experience—Maximum Points: 60

Documentation: Narrative provided under Section D of HUD-52515 and performance data available in HUD systems.

1a. PHA Capacity and Demonstrated Commitment to Provide Housing for Persons with Disabilities. HUD awarded up to 25 points to applicants that demonstrated the PHA’s and partner organization(s)’s experience and capacity for providing the following services:

- Coordinating outreach and referral of persons with disabilities in institutional and other segregated settings who want to move to community settings.
- Coordinating outreach and referral of persons who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless.
- Assisting persons with disabilities applying to various housing programs.
- Assisting persons with disabilities in finding housing, making or facilitating home modifications and securing disability-related accommodations.
- Assisting persons with disabilities moving into units on the private rental market.
- Making referrals, coordinating, and monitoring home and community-based services.
- Providing tenancy support for persons with disabilities.

The most common reason that PHAs lost points for this rating factor was they did not address the PHA’s experience or capabilities to provide the specific services outlined in the NOFA or they did not provide enough detail.

1b. Partner Agency Capacity. HUD awarded up to 15 points to applicants that provided specific examples within the narrative of their partner agencies’ experiences in providing the following services:

- Securing any accommodations.
- Transitioning persons with disabilities from institutional and other segregated settings to rental market units.
- Coordinating voluntary services and supports after the transition.
- Providing other similar assistance described in the application (only if clearly featured).

The most common reason PHAs lost points for this rating criteria was they did not address their partners experience and capabilities for providing the specific services

outlined in the NOFA or they did not provide adequate detail.

1c. Geographic Jurisdiction. HUD awarded 10 points to applicants that provided a statement verifying any one of the following:

- Has a state-wide jurisdiction.
- Submitted a portion of the administrative plan showing that the PHA does not restrict portability prior to the applicant leasing up in the jurisdiction for 1 year. This policy only received points if the statement reflected it was not exclusive to mainstream participants.
- The PHA formed a consortium, created cooperative agreement(s) or merged to create a larger operational jurisdiction.

Applicants were not awarded points on this rating factor if they did not include a supporting statement.

1d. Admissions Preference. HUD awarded 10 points to applicants that provided the following certification statement:

(Insert name of PHA) will provide a preference in its administrative plan for non-elderly persons with disabilities transitioning out of institutional and other segregated settings, at serious risk of institutionalization, homeless, or at risk of becoming homeless. An update to the administrative plan will be completed within one calendar year of award date.

Applicants were not awarded points on this rating factor if they did not include this certification statement.

Rating Factor 2: Leveraging Resources—Maximum Points: 30

Documentation: Letters of intent, memorandum of understanding (MOU) or other documentation of commitment from the partner agency/organization.

HUD awarded up to 30 points to applicants that demonstrated, through letters of intent, MOUs, and/or other formal agreement, that it has one or more partners to provide the following services:

- Coordinating outreach and referral of persons in institutional and other segregated settings who want to move to community-based integrated settings, persons at serious risk of institutionalization, homeless, or at risk of becoming homeless
- Funding or staffing to support training and coordination of program implementation, including any necessary training, between PHA and partner organization(s)
- Assisting persons with disabilities to apply to and obtain acceptance in housing programs OR find housing OR secure home modifications and/or disability-related accommodations
- Assisting persons with disabilities move into units, including physically accessible units where appropriate, on the private rental market
- Referring, coordinating, or providing home and community-based services

Applicants lost points on this rating factor if they did not include commitment letters to coincide with the above listed services. Some letters submitted as commitment letters solely provided statements of support of the PHA receiving Mainstream vouchers rather than commitments to specific services. The primary reason applicants lost points for this rating factor was because they did not provide letters of intent, MOUs, or other documentation of commitment from the partner agency/organization which outlined the services the organization will provide.

Rating Factor 3: Achieving Results and Program Evaluation–Maximum Points: 10

Documentation: Narrative provided under Section D of HUD-52515.

HUD awarded up to 10 points to applicants that outlined an evaluation plan that included the following:

PHA/non-profit provided a program evaluation plan describing how it will work with partner agencies to monitor and correct issues with number of referrals received, vouchers issued, units leased/families housed, service coordination and tenancy support provided, and overall utilization. The plan identified who will maintain the report, how frequently it will be produced, and how it will be shared between the organization.

An additional 5 points was awarded if the program evaluation plan addressed the criterion above but also included a centralized tracking system used with the partner agencies, allowing both the PHA and partner organizations to access the required metrics electronically.

The most common reason that PHAs lost points for this rating factor was they did not fully outline a plan to evaluate the program and coordinate with partner organizations. Most agencies did not provide documentation or information to support a centralized tracking system would be used from program monitoring and tracking.