



FY2026 MN-500 Hennepin CoC NOFO Ranking Process, Procedures, and Score Tool

Contents

I. HUD McKinney-Vento Application Values	2
II. Priority Populations and Activities	2
Recommendation of support for Renewal Projects under the CoC Program in the 2026 NOFO	3
Recommendation of support for New Projects under the CoC Program in the 2026 NOFO	3
III. Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects.....	3
Scoring Tool Description.....	4
Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process.....	5
IV. Submission and Ranking Process for New Project Proposals.....	6
Scoring Tool Description.....	6
Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process.....	7
V. Appeals Process	7
Procedure for Appeal.....	8
Constitution of the Appeals Committee	8
Activity of the Appeals Committee.....	8
Appendix 1	10
MN-500 Hennepin CoC Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for CoC Renewal Projects	10
Appendix 2	13
MN-500 Hennepin CoC Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for New Projects	13
Appendix 3	21
MN-500 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program Renewal Project Ranking Policies and Procedures	21
Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects	21
Appendix 4	24
MN-500 Hennepin CoC Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for YHDP Renewal Projects	24

The working committee of the Minneapolis/Hennepin CoC Governing Board (CoC Funding Committee) is charged with directing this community's annual HUD CoC Program funding of approximately \$27 million, with support from Hennepin County Housing Stability in its role as the Collaborative Applicant, to meet federal requirements and local needs in its efforts to address and end homelessness. To accomplish this goal, the committee sets priorities for new project funding, and ranks renewal and new applications, based on project and CoC performance criteria, as well as local and HUD priorities.

I. HUD McKinney-Vento Application Values

In developing its overall strategy to address and end homelessness, and in particular with respect to ranking of renewal projects and solicitation of new project applications, the CoC and its Funding Committee are committed to upholding and applying the following values:

1. Maintain as much HUD Continuum of Care Program funding in our CoC as possible.
2. Promote our goal to make homelessness rare, brief, and one time in Minneapolis/Hennepin County and address issues of disproportionality
3. Prioritize projects that:
 - a. Actively participate in the Continuum of Care and help advance collective goals
 - b. Have movement to permanent housing and subsequent stability as the primary focus
 - c. Focus on those who are literally homeless (streets, shelter, transitional housing for homeless)
 - d. Participate in the HMIS with complete, high-quality data
 - e. Perform well against HUD McKinney Continuum of Care goals and positively impact system performance
 - f. Consistently meet and exceed operational standards for spending, match, occupancy and reporting.

II. Priority Populations and Activities

In preparation for HUD's 2026 NOFO Ranking, on May 13, 2026, the CoC Funding Committee examined local needs as identified by data from the 2026 Housing Inventory Count and Point In Time Count, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and Coordinated Entry system (CES) data. The committee found the following trends and affirmed their relevance to the prioritization of CoC funds for new and renewal projects:

Recommendation of support for **Renewal Projects** under the CoC Program in the 2026 NOFO

Renewal Project Population recommendation: Based on system inflow data, Point in Time Count results, Housing Inventory Count results, and housing enrollment rates, prioritize projects serving single adults first and projects serving families with children second.

Renewal program component recommendation: prioritize Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects.

Recommendation of support for **New Projects** under the CoC Program in the 2026 NOFO

Prioritize new projects that are housing focused: first, prioritize Support Services projects designed to help people experiencing homelessness find and maintain housing; second, prioritize service-rich Transitional Housing.

III. Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects

As part of the annual NOFO competition process, HUD requires each Continuum of Care to rank order all CoC Funded projects (both new and renewal) included in its CoC Consolidated Application using a documented, objective methodology which considers past project performance, and to further divide this ranked list of projects into two Tiers. The purpose of this tiered system is to indicate to HUD the relative funding priority of projects within a CoC, and thus, the priority order in which projects should receive resources should funding fall short of a CoC's Annual Renewal Demand. Tier 1 projects passing eligibility and threshold review will be conditionally funded by HUD, beginning with those in the highest-scoring CoC nationwide and proceeding to the lowest-scoring CoC; funding order of Tier 1 projects within a CoC thus depends on that CoC's own project evaluation process. Tier 2 projects are competitively funded and subject to evaluation by HUD using a scoring system which factors in a CoC's overall application score, the score awarded the project by the CoC, and whether the project implements a supportive services requirement.

To assist the Hennepin County/Minneapolis Continuum of Care Funding Committee in evaluating and ranking applications for both renewal and new project applications, Hennepin County Housing Stability has developed the Hennepin County NOFO Program Scoring Tool (see Attachment 1). The Scoring Tool is informed by efforts of all metro area CoCs (including the Suburban Metro and Ramsey County CoCs). While it is intended to serve as a common starting point for CoCs to evaluate NOFO project applications, individual CoCs may add to or amend the Tool based upon their individual needs.

Scoring Tool Description

The Scoring Tool evaluates renewal projects that have been operational for at least one full calendar year. It evaluates along three general performance dimensions – Operational Performance, Program Outcomes, and Coordinated Entry – each of which includes multiple component measures. Each performance measure is in turn based on one or more defined data elements drawn from a specific data source, including individual project applications, annual progress reports (APRs), HMIS, and HUD reports. For each individual measure, the Scoring Tool also defines three ranges of performance – Low, Medium, and High – and identifies for each a number of points awarded to programs whose outcomes fall within that range.

The intent is for each individual measure within the tool to be an objective metric with a defined method of calculation, and which corresponds to one or more data elements from specific reports. This approach reduces variability in assessment between reviewers, as independent reviewers (including projects engaging in self-assessment) using the same, defined data sources should thus be able to reliably arrive at the same value, and the same point score, for a project on any given measure. The overall score of a project is the sum of the points it receives in each of the component performance measures across the general performance dimensions.

Depending on the component of the project (i.e. whether it is Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing, Transitional Housing, or Support Services Only), some measures may not apply. Details can be found in the Appendix.

Operations

- Utilization – the ratio between the persons served at given points throughout the year and the project's stated capacity
- Funding Management: Unspent Funds – the percentage of a project's previous grant which was spent
- HMIS Data Quality – the percentage of missing data elements within the project's HMIS client records

Program Outcomes

- Housing Stability at 6 Months – the percent of entrants who remain in the project after 180 days
- Retention/Exits to Permanent Destinations – the percentage of a project's clients who are retained in the project at the time of data collection, or who have exited to permanent destinations in the past year (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 7b.1, 7b.2)
- Maintain or Increase Employment Income – the percent of eligible adults whose income from employment was maintained or increased at the time of annual assessment relative to employment income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1, 4.4)
- Maintain or Increase Other Income – the percent of clients who maintained or increased other income, including non-employment cash benefits, when compared to other income at both annual assessment and at program exit (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.2, 4.5)

- Returns to Homelessness – the percent of clients who did not reappear in the homeless response system (as documented in HMIS) within six months following a permanent exit from the program (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 2a).

Coordinated Entry

- Coordinated Entry Participation – the percent of received referrals from coordinated entry that end in a successful result (participant accepted into the program)
- Coordinated Entry Participation – the average length of time from referral-to-referral result (measures the average number of days from the time a program receives a referral from Coordinated Entry until the referral result is entered into HMIS)
- Coordinated Entry Participation – the average length of time from project start to housing move-in (measures the average number of days from the time a participant enters the project until they move into housing placement (this is evaluated relative to like projects (e.g. site based to site based, scattered site to scattered site)

The Scoring Tool provides the Funding Committee an objective point from which to start its ranking process. From this point, the Committee may consider other project characteristics not incorporated in the Scoring Tool, including (but not limited to): project capacity and expected number of individuals served; type and scope of services provided; client subpopulation(s) targeted by the project; extent to which a project meets existing areas of CoC need; provider performance using the coordinated entry system; changes in project performance over time; history of continuous improvement plan participation; project feedback or context provided to the CoC Funding Committee; cost effectiveness; tenant selection criteria, provider responsiveness, or other factors it deems relevant, to reorder projects and arrive at the CoC's final project ranking list.

It is also imperative to note that the Scoring Tool is intended to provide a relative, rather than an absolute, ranking of projects. While it is expected that a project's rank will be correlated with its overall performance to some degree, at the same time, a low rank on the Scoring Tool is not necessarily an indicator that a project is performing poorly; similarly, it is possible for a high-ranking project to fall short of expectations in one or more performance areas.

The Scoring Tool, as described above and presented in Attachment 1, was approved by the Funding Committee on **April 8, 2026**.

Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Projects were sent the NOFO Scoring Tool template on **4/13/2026**. Following the submission of the completed NOFO Scoring Tool template by the deadline of **4/28/2026**, Hennepin County Housing Stability used the NOFO Scoring Tool to begin to calculate each project's provisional score. These results, including both the overall project score, the score for each component metric within the Scoring Tool, and the raw outcome values from which those scores are calculated are shared with each project individually on **5/1/2026** to ensure there are no data or

calculation errors, and to assist all projects in understanding the measures and data from which their score is derived. Following this period for comment and (if necessary) correction, projects submitted formal approval & comments regarding their score to the CoC by **5/8/2026**. The Scoring Tool was applied to these applications to produce a preliminary score for all renewal projects.

After analysis and confirmation by Hennepin County Housing Stability, the scores were made available to the CoC Funding Committee. The Committee used this information in its meeting on **7/8/2026** to recommend a rank order of projects, designate which projects fall into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranges, and make any reallocation recommendations in order to fund new project proposals (see Section IV, below). After final analysis and confirmation by Hennepin County Housing Stability, results of this preliminary ranking process will be communicated to new and renewal project applicants via e-mail and through public posting on the Hennepin County website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V, below. Following the conclusion of the appeals process, the final rankings will be presented to the Heading Home Hennepin Executive Committee for a formal vote of approval as part of the CoC's Consolidated Application.

IV. Submission and Ranking Process for New Project Proposals

In addition to scoring and ranking renewal projects, the Continuum of Care Funding Committee will also evaluate, score, and rank new project proposals as part of the 2026 CoC NOFO competition.

Scoring Tool Description

As detailed in the New Project pre-application release issued by the CoC in conjunction with Hennepin County, new project proposals must meet the following minimum threshold requirements to be considered for funding:

- Project applicants must be a nonprofit organization, state or local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government, without limitation or exclusion
- The population targeted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
- The service model adopted by the project meets current HUD and CoC requirements
- New project pre-applications are submitted via Microsoft Forms on or before the **deadline of July 1, 2026**.
- Projects have both a plan in place, and the capacity, to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Entry System
- Applicant organizations have a mission/purpose statement, bylaws to govern operations, an active governing board that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or has a formal plan to recruit such a member), clear policies and procedures to

address potential conflicts of interest of board members, and possess adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing

- Applicants provide complete financial information which suggests the project is likely to be viable
- Applications include the most recent audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter, and this letter contains no significant adverse disclosures
- Applicants affirm they will not engage in forms of illegal racial discrimination
- Applicants affirm they will not operate drug injection sites or “safe consumption” sites, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control, or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia

Pursuant to the Priority Populations and Activities outlined in Section II, above, for the 2026 CoC Program NOFO competition, the CoC Funding Committee, & Heading Home Hennepin Executive Committee local priority approval, limited its consideration of new project applications to Transitional Housing and Support Services Only (Standalone, Street Outreach or CES).

Project applications meeting these requirements were evaluated and scored by the CoC Funding Committee using the New Project Evaluation and Scoring Tool (see Appendix 2). This tool was approved by the CoC Funding Committee on **7/1/2026**.

Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Using this tool, each new project pre-application were awarded a total score and ranked by the CoC Funding Committee. The Committee will then determine whether it wishes to recommend one or more top-ranking new projects for funding through reallocation and/or propose for funding through HUD bonus funds. New project proposals will be reviewed and applicants selected to move forward by **7/8/2026**. After final analysis and confirmation by Hennepin County Housing Stability, the final ranking will be communicated to new and renewal project applicants via e-mail the week of **7/13/2026** and through public posting on the Hennepin County website. At this point, projects rejected by the CoC may appeal the decision to the CoC following the procedure outlined in Section V, below. Following the conclusion of the appeals process, the final rankings will be presented to the Heading Home Hennepin Executive Committee for a formal vote of approval as part of the CoC’s Consolidated Application.

V. Appeals Process

Once projects have been notified of the preliminary results of the CoC Funding Committee’s ranking process on the week of **7/13/26**, projects will have the opportunity to appeal the CoC Funding Committee’s decision before an Appeals Committee, which is separate from the CoC Funding Committee conducting the original project ranking. Appeals may be made for the following reasons:

- A project’s application was not ranked,

- A project's application did not receive the full funding amount for which it applied.

The following are not eligible grounds for submission of a formal appeal:

- Determination that a project has not met threshold requirements,
- Ranking of a project in Tier 2 rather than Tier 1.

Appeals eligible under the criteria listed above will be evaluated by Hennepin County and the Appeals Committee. Notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted as part of a project's draft application by the application due date - no new or additional information will be considered as part of an appeal. Omissions to the application are not eligible grounds for appeal.

Procedure for Appeal

The due date and submission process for appeals will be shared in writing along with the notification of preliminary ranking. Appeals should be directed to the CoC Coordinator, and must adhere to the following requirements:

- Appeals should be scanned and submitted as an attachment via e-mail,
- The Notice of Appeal must include a written statement specifying, in detail, the grounds asserted for the appeal, and must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (e.g. Executive Director), and
- The Notice of Appeal must be single-spaced, in 12-point font, and may be no longer than one page.

The appeal must include a copy of the project's application and all accompanying materials as submitted to the CoC Funding Committee for original review and ranking; no additional information may be added to the original application.

Constitution of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee will be comprised of four members, subject to the following constraints:

- Two Appeals Committee members must be voting members drawn from the CoC Governing Board,
- Two Appeals Committee members must be members of the Funding Committee who participated in the original project ranking process,
- No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney-Vento funding, and must sign a conflict-of-interest statement to this effect.

Activity of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee will review and consider only the following materials associated with the appeal:

- The original project application submitted to the CoC Funding Committee for review and ranking
- The project rankings made by the CoC Funding Committee

- The one-page Notice of Appeal submitted by the applicant

The Appeals Committee's review will extend only to consideration of those specific portions of the project application being appealed. The decision of the Appeals Committee will be determined by a simple majority vote. All decisions of the Appeal Committee will be final.

Appendix 1

MN-500 Hennepin CoC Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for CoC Renewal Projects

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
Operations (maximum points in category: 8 for PSH, TH, RRH, 6 for SSO)								
Funding management - unspent funds	All	HUD Quarterly Spending Report	% of grant spent < 85%	Between 85% and 99% of grant spent	100% of grant spent	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
HMIS data quality	All but SSO-CE DV	APR Q6c (all but SSO-CE) 002 Data Quality Report (SSO-CE)	less than 56%	56% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Utilization (ratio of average households served at 4 points in time to units proposed in application)	PSH, RRH, TH	APR Q8b, Number of Households served; FY24 application	less than 58%	58% - 99%	100% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Capacity (ratio of total persons served to total persons served proposed in application)	SSO-CE DV	APR Q7a, Number of Persons served; FY24 application	less than 80%	Between 80% and 99%	100% or higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Program Outcomes: RRH and TH (maximum points in category: 22)								
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment	RRH, TH	APR Q19a1, row 1 (at annual assessment)	less than 3%	3% - 58%	59% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Annual Assessment	RRH, TH	APR Q19a1, row 5 (at annual assessment)	less than 1%	1% - 46%	47% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit	RRH, TH	APR Q19a2, row 1 (at exit)	less than 13%	13% - 62%	63% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Exit	RRH, TH	APR Q19a2, row 5 (at exit)	less than 12%	Between 12% and 52%	53% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Exits to Permanent Destinations	RRH, TH	APR Q23c	less than 54%	54% - 95%	96% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Returns to homelessness: % of participants not returning at 6 months	RRH, TH	Returns to Homelessness Report	less than 87%	87% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Program Outcomes: PSH (maximum points in category: 20)								
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment	PSH	APR Q19a1, row 1 (at annual assessment)	0%	1% - 14%	15% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Annual Assessment	PSH	APR Q19a1, row 5 (at annual assessment)	less than 30%	30% - 78%	79% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit	PSH	APR Q19a2, row 1 (at exit)	0%	1% - 26%	27% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Exit	PSH	APR Q19a2, row 5 (at exit)	less than 34%	34% - 84%	85% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
Housing Stability: 6 months	PSH	APR Q5a1 and Q22a1	less than 86%	86% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Retention or exits to permanent destinations	PSH	APR Q5a and Q23c	less than 81%	81% - 95%	96% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Returns to homelessness: % of participants not returning at 6 months	PSH	Returns to Homelessness Report	less than 76%	76% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Coordinated Entry (maximum points in category: 12 for PSH and RRH, 8 for TH)								
Coordinated entry participation: % of successful referrals	PSH, RRH, TH	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	less than 54% successful referrals	Between 54% and 74%	75% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Coordinated entry participation: LOT from referral to result	PSH, RRH, TH	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	31 days or longer	Between 11 and 30 days	0-10 days	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Coordinated entry participation: LOT from program entry to housed	Scattered site PSH, RRH	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	90 days or longer	Between 46 and 89 days	0-45 days	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Coordinated entry participation: LOT from program entry to housed	Site based PSH	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	31 days or longer	Between 15 and 30 days	0-14 days	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		

Appendix 2

MN-500 Hennepin CoC Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for New Projects

New Project Qualifying Requirements

All projects must meet the following Qualifying Criteria to be considered for funding:

Criterion	Ineligible	Eligible
Eligible Applicant	Entity is NOT a nonprofit organization, state, local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government (as defined in 24CFR5.100), without limitation or exclusion	Entity is a nonprofit organization, state, local government, public housing agency, or instrumentality of a state or local government (as defined in 24CFR5.100), without limitation or exclusion
Eligible Population	- Does NOT meet HUD requirements and/or - Does NOT meet current CoC requirements	- Meets HUD requirements - Meets current CoC requirements (i.e. serving persons meeting the homeless definition under Categories I and IV)
Eligible Service Model	- Does NOT meet HUD requirements and/or - Does NOT meet current CoC requirements	- Meets HUD requirements - Meets current CoC requirements
Submission Deadline	Project application submitted to CoC Coordinator AFTER deadline	Project application submitted to CoC Coordinator on or before deadline
HMIS and Coordinated Entry	Project does NOT have the capacity or an acceptable plan in place to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's	Project has both the capacity and an acceptable plan in place to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Entry System

Criterion	Ineligible	Eligible
	Coordinated Entry System where applicable based on component	where applicable based on component
Organizational Capacity	- Organization does NOT have a mission/purpose statement and bylaws to govern operations - Organization does NOT have an active governing board (e.g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, and does NOT have a formal plan to immediately recruit such a member - Organization does NOT have clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members - Organization does not have adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing	- Organization has a mission/purpose statement and bylaws to govern operations - Organization has an active governing board (e.g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless, or has a formal plan to immediately recruit such a member - Organization has clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members - Organization has adequate levels of, and expertise in, staffing
Project Financial Viability	- Financial information is incomplete and/or - Financial information suggests project is unlikely to be viable	- Financial information is complete - Financial information suggests project is likely to be viable
Financial Audit	- Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is not provided and/or - Audit/management letter contains significant adverse disclosures (as determined by reviewers)	- Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is provided - Audit/management letter contains no significant adverse disclosures (as determined by reviewers)
Drug certification	The project applicant does not certify that they will not operate drug injection sites or “safe consumption sites,” knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs	The project applicant certifies that they will not operate drug injection sites or “safe consumption sites,” knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit

Criterion	Ineligible	Eligible
	on property under their control, or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia.	drugs on property under their control, or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia.
Illegal discrimination certification	The project applicant does not certify that they will not engage in illegal racial discrimination.	The project applicant certifies that they will not engage in illegal racial discrimination.

New Project Evaluation and Scoring

Projects meeting the qualifying criteria listed above will be further evaluated by the Minneapolis/Hennepin County Continuum of Care Funding Committee to identify those that most closely align with the needs, goals, and funding priorities of both the CoC and HUD.

The Committee will award proposals up to the maximum total points in the Proposal Characteristic areas indicated below, with those applications best presenting a feasible plan to address the items listed in the ‘Key Evaluation Criteria’ column receiving higher scores within a given category. To receive the greatest number of points possible, projects are encouraged to provide a clear and detailed description in their application of how their proposal meets the criteria indicated.

Table 1. Transitional Housing

Proposal Characteristic	Key Evaluation Criteria	Application Alignment	Points (Max)
Alignment with HUD priorities	• Prioritizing treatment and recovery: Project demonstrates that it will provide on-site behavioral health treatment and robust wraparound services • Promoting economic self sufficiency: Project demonstrates a plan for helping participants find long-term economic independence, exit to unsubsidized housing, and avoid returns to homelessness	III.B Goals and Objectives	4
Supportive Services	• Project demonstrates they will provide or partner to provide supportive services that are necessary to assist program participants to obtain and maintain housing (e.g. case management, behavioral health care, employment training, etc.), including articulating a plan for providing services 20 hours per week per participant (with certain exceptions) • Project has a plan for how they will assess the service needs of participants and demonstrates how they will develop robust service plans • Project has a plan for how they will implement a supportive services requirement and attaches a supportive services agreement	V.A.5a	5
Performance plans	• Project has demonstrated past success in exiting a majority of participants in transitional housing or another homeless project to positive destinations within 24 months, or has a plan in place to ensure participants exit homelessness within 24 months	V.A.5a	5

Proposal Characteristic	Key Evaluation Criteria	Application Alignment	Points (Max)
	Project has demonstrated past success in connecting a majority of participants in transitional housing or another homeless project to employment income, or has a plan in place to ensure participants exit with employment income.		
Applicant Experience for Proposed Activities	The applicant has prior experience operating transitional housing or other projects that have successfully helped homeless individuals and families exit homelessness within 24 months or has a plan in place to ensure homeless individuals and families will exit homelessness within 24 months.	V.A.5a	2
Leverage	- Extent of outside funding (public or private sources that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs) which can be leveraged by grant (HUD requires a minimum match equal to 25% of the total grant request) - Percent of leveraged funding currently in place	II.C Cost Sharing or Matching	2
Project readiness and cost effectiveness	- Is it feasible this project will be up and running in the necessary timeline? - Average cost per household served is reasonable	V.A.5 V.A.5a	2
Total Points Possible			20

Table 2. SSO - Standalone

Proposal Characteristic	Key Evaluation Criteria	Application Alignment	Points (Max)
Alignment with HUD priorities	- Prioritizing treatment and recovery: Project demonstrates that it will connect participants to behavioral health treatment and robust wraparound services - Promoting economic self sufficiency: Project demonstrates a plan for helping participants find long-term economic independence, exit to unsubsidized housing, and avoid returns to homelessness	III.B Goals and Objectives	4
Alignment with local priorities	- Housing focus: Project demonstrates it will provide services that are focused on helping participants find and maintain housing. - Serving people with disabilities: Project demonstrates a plan for serving and accommodating participants who have disabilities.	(local priorities)	4
Target Population	Project has a strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants, including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services.	V.A.5b	4
Alignment to filling gaps in homeless response system	Project demonstrates that its proposed services are necessary to assist people in exiting homelessness and increasing self-sufficiency.	V.A.5b	4
Leverage	- Extent of outside funding (public or private sources that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs) which can be leveraged by grant (HUD requires a minimum match equal to 25% of the total grant request) - Percent of leveraged funding currently in place	II.C Cost Sharing or Matching	2
Project readiness and cost effectiveness	- Is it feasible this project will be up and running in the necessary timeline? - Average cost per household served is reasonable	V.A.5 V.A.5b	2
Total Points Possible			20

Table 3. SSO - Outreach

Proposal Characteristic	Key Evaluation Criteria	Application Alignment	Points (Max)
Alignment with HUD priorities	Advancing public safety: Project demonstrates past effectiveness or a strategy for partnering with first responders and law enforcement to engage people living in places not meant for human habitation with housing and services	III.B Goals and Objectives	4
Alignment with local priorities	- Project demonstrates past effectiveness or a strategy for helping people successfully exit from places not meant for human habitation to emergency shelter, treatment programs, transitional housing or permanent housing programs. - Serving people with disabilities: Project demonstrates a plan for serving and accommodating participants who have disabilities.	V.A.5c Local priority	8
Target Population	Project has a strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services.	V.A.5c	4
Leverage	- Extent of outside funding (public or private sources that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs) which can be leveraged by grant (HUD requires a minimum match equal to 25% of the total grant request) - Percent of leveraged funding currently in place	II.C Cost Sharing or Matching	2
Project readiness and cost effectiveness	- Is it feasible this project will be up and running in the necessary timeline? - Average cost per household served is reasonable	V.A.5 V.A.5c	2
Total Points Possible			20

Table 4. SSO - Coordinated Entry

Proposal Characteristic	Key Evaluation Criteria	Application Alignment	Points (Max)
Access and assessment	- The proposed project, within the broader Coordinated Entry system, is easily available and reachable for its target population, including people with disabilities and households with the highest needs. - There is a standardized process by which the target population of the proposed project will be assessed, if applicable.	VA.5d	8
Alignment with local priorities	- The proposal clearly demonstrates that its proposed services are aligned with and alleviate gaps in the existing Coordinated Entry System. - The proposal clearly demonstrates how it will collaborate with current stakeholders in the existing Coordinated Entry System	(local priority)	8
Leverage	- Extent of outside funding (public or private sources that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs) which can be leveraged by grant (HUD requires a minimum match equal to 25% of the total grant request) - Percent of leveraged funding currently in place	II.C Cost Sharing or Matching	2
Project readiness and cost effectiveness	- Is it feasible this project will be up and running in the necessary timeline? - Average cost per household served is reasonable	V.A.5 V.A.5d	2
Total Points Possible			20

Appendix 3

MN-500 Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program Renewal Project Ranking Policies and Procedures

Under the FY2026 Continuum of Care Competition and Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program Grants NOFO, HUD required communities with existing Youth Homeless Demonstration Program (YHDP) projects to competitively rank and score those projects. The Hennepin County Youth Action Board (YAB) is the advisory body that provides oversight and recommendation over the Hennepin CoC's YHDP projects, with support from Hennepin County Housing Stability in its role as the Collaborative Applicant.

Ranking for Renewal of Existing Projects

The YAB, in collaboration with Hennepin County Housing Stability, developed the Hennepin County YHDP NOFO Program Scoring Tool (see Attachment 4).

Scoring Tool Description

The Scoring Tool evaluates renewal projects that have been operational for at least one full calendar year. It evaluates along three general performance dimensions –Operational Performance, Program Outcomes, and Coordinated Entry – each of which includes multiple component measures. Each performance measure is in turn based on one or more defined data elements drawn from a specific data source, including individual project applications, annual progress reports (APRs), HMIS, and HUD reports. For each individual measure, the Scoring Tool also defines three ranges of performance – Low, Medium, and High – and identifies for each a number of points awarded to programs whose outcomes fall within that range.

Depending on the component of the project (i.e. whether it is Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing, or Support Services Only) and whether the project takes referrals from Hennepin County's Coordinated Entry System, some measures may not apply. Details can be found in the Appendix.

Operations

- Utilization – the ratio between the persons served at given points throughout the year and the project's stated capacity
- Funding Management: Unspent Funds - the percentage of a project's previous grant which was spent

- HMIS Data Quality - the percentage of missing data elements within the project's HMIS client records

Program Outcomes

- Retention/Exits to Permanent Destinations - the percentage of a project's clients who are retained in the project at the time of data collection, or who have exited to permanent destinations in the past year (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 7b.1, 7b.2)
- Maintain or Increase Employment Income - the percent of eligible adults whose income from employment was maintained or increased at the time of annual assessment relative to employment income at admission (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.1, 4.4)
- Maintain or Increase Other Income- the percent of clients who maintained or increased other income, including non-employment cash benefits, when compared to other income at both annual assessment and at program exit (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 4.2, 4.5)
- Returns to Homelessness – the percent of clients who did not reappear in the homeless response system (as documented in HMIS) within six months following a permanent exit from the program (aligns with HUD System Performance Measures 2a).
- Length of time from program entry to housed - the average length of time from project start to housing move-in (measures the average number of days from the time a participant enters the project until they move into housing placement (this is evaluated relative to like projects (e.g. site based to site based, scattered site to scattered site)

Coordinated Entry

- Coordinated Entry Participation – the percent of received referrals from coordinated entry that end in a successful result (participant accepted into the program)
- Coordinated Entry Participation – the average length of time from referral-to-referral result (measures the average number of days from the time a program receives a referral from Coordinated Entry until the referral result is entered into HMIS)

The Scoring Tool provides the YAB an objective point from which to start its ranking process. From this point, the YAB may consider other project characteristics not incorporated in the Scoring Tool, including (but not limited to): project capacity and expected number of individuals served; type and scope of services provided; client subpopulation(s) targeted by the project; extent to which a project meets existing areas of CoC need; provider performance using the coordinated entry system; changes in project performance over time; cost effectiveness; tenant selection criteria, provider responsiveness, or other factors it deems relevant, to reorder projects and arrive at the CoC's final project ranking list.

It is also imperative to note that the Scoring Tool is intended to provide a relative, rather than an absolute, ranking of projects. While it is expected that a project's rank will be correlated with its overall performance to some degree, at the same time, a low rank on the Scoring Tool is not necessarily an indicator that a project is performing poorly; similarly, it is possible for a high-ranking project to fall short of expectations in one or more performance areas.

The Scoring Tool, as described above and presented in Attachment 1, was approved by the Youth Action Board on **April 16, 2026**.

Scoring Tool Application and Project Ranking Process

Projects were sent the YHDP NOFO Scoring Tool template on **4/13/2026**. Following the submission of the completed YHDP NOFO Scoring Tool template by the deadline of **4/28/2026**, Hennepin County Housing Stability used the YHDP NOFO Scoring Tool to begin to calculate each project's provisional score. These results, including both the overall project score, the score for each component metric within the Scoring Tool, and the raw outcome values from which those scores are calculated were shared with each project individually on **5/1/2026** to ensure there were no data or calculation errors, and to assist all projects in understanding the measures and data from which their score is derived. Following this period for comment and (if necessary) correction, projects submitted formal approval & comments regarding their score to the CoC by **5/8/2026**. The Scoring Tool is then applied to these applications to produce a preliminary score for all renewal projects.

After analysis and confirmation by Hennepin County Housing Stability, the Youth Action Board used the scores to recommend a rank order of projects in their meeting on **July 7, 2026**. Results will be communicated as described in the CoC process above.

Appeals Process

The Appeals Process for YHDP projects is as described in the CoC process above.

Appendix 4

MN-500 Hennepin CoC Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Project Evaluation Requirements and Scoring for YHDP Renewal Projects

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
Operations (maximum points in category: 8)								
Funding management - unspent funds	All	HUD Quarterly Spending Report	less than 85% of grant spent	Between 85% and 99% of grant spent	100% of grant spent	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
HMIS data quality	All	APR Q6c	Less than 84%	84% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Utilization (ratio of average households served at 4 points in time to units proposed in application)	PSH, RRH	APR Q8b, Number of Households served; Fiscal Year 2024 application	Less than 58%	58% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Capacity (ratio of total persons served to total	SSO	APR Q7a, Number of Persons served; FY24 application	less than 80%	Between 80% and 99%	100% or higher	Low: 0 Med: 1		

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
persons served proposed in application)						High: 2		
Coordinated Entry System (CES) participation (maximum points in category: 8 for CES-participating projects; n/a for all others)								
Coordinated entry participation: % of successful referrals	CES participating projects	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	less than 54% successful referrals	Between 54% and 74%	greater than 74%	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Coordinated entry participation: LOT from referral to result	CES participating projects	Housing Provider Referral Monitoring Report	31 days or longer	Between 11 and 30 days	0-10 days	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Program Outcomes (maximum points in category: 22 for RRH and PSH; 16 for SSO)								
Average length of time from program entry to housed	PSH, RRH	APR Q22c, row 11	More than 150 days	62 – 149 days	Less than 62 days	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		
Exits to Permanent Destinations	All	APR Q23c	Less than 65%	65% - 87%	88% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		

Scored Criterion	Project type	Data Source	Low	Med	High	Points	Project's Value	Project's Score
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Annual Assessment	All	APR Q19a1, row 1 (at annual assessment)	Less than 7%	7% - 39%	40% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Annual Assessment	All	APR Q19a1, row 5 (at annual assessment)	Less than 6%	6% - 50%	51% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Maintain or Increase Employment Income at Exit	All	APR Q19a2, row 1 (at exit)	Less than 28%	28% - 67%	68% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Maintain or Increase Other Income at Exit	All	APR Q19a2, row 5 (at exit)	Less than 8%	8% - 35%	35% and higher	Low: 0 Med: 1 High: 2		
Returns to homelessness: % of participants not returning at 6 months	All	Returns to Homelessness Report	Less than 96%	96% - 99%	100%	Low: 0 Med: 2 High: 4		