JANUARY 2026

Administering Emergency Financial Assistance

Understanding the time and costs required to deploy critical housing stability resources

FAMILY HOUSING FUND

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Administering Emergency Financial Assistance: Understanding the time and costs required to deploy critical housing stability resources

As a continuation of our collaborative work to improve access to Minnesota's emergency financial assistance programs, Family Housing Fund set out to understand the cost of program administration for Emergency Assistance (EA), Emergency General Assistance (EGA), and Family Homeless Prevention Assistance Program (FHPAP) with an overarching goal in mind: To understand program administration needs and inform future funding allocations. Through key informant interviews, an online survey, live time-tracking, and program record data, we were able to develop reliable estimates to help answer key questions about program staff time and costs. Our findings are based on input from more than 200 program staff. An advisory committee helped to shape the research, including program representatives from all seven metro area counties, nonprofit community partners who administer funds, and individuals with lived experience as program applicants.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST

For the 7-county metro, the total estimated annual Program Administration costs for EA & EGA and for FHPAP were $12.5M.

TABLE 1. **TOTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS***

7-COUNTY METRO TOTAL ESTIMATED AT $12.5M			
	APPLICATION PROCESSING DIRECT COSTS	PROGRAM OVERSIGHT INDIRECT COSTS	TOTAL
EA + EGA	$5,855,295	$2,133,301	**$7,988,596**
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	$3,042,241	$1,429,558	**$4,471,799**

**These data are for the January 2024 to December 2024 Budget Year for EA, the July 2023 to June 2024 Budget Year for EGA, and the October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year for FHPAP.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION TIME

The median staff touch time spent processing a standard case for EA & EGA was 2 hours and 30 minutes. For FHPAP, it was 3 hours and 15 minutes. This time includes client intake, application handling, data entry, interview, verification, vendor payment, and case closeout.

TABLE 2. **APPLICATION PROCESSING TIME***

	TIME ACROSS ALL STAFF ROLES	
APPLICATION PROCESSING TASKS	**EA & EGA**	**FHPAP HOMELESS PREVENTION**
Client Intake	20 minutes	30 minutes
Application Handling	20 minutes	30 minutes
Data Entry	20 minutes	30 minutes
Interview	30 minutes	30 minutes
Verification	20 minutes	30 minutes
Vendor Payment	20 minutes	25 minutes
Case Closeout	20 minutes	20 minutes
Total Time Per Applicant	**2.5 hours**	**3.25 hours**

Median Time on Task for a Standard Case

Time spent on program oversight and ancillary tasks—indirect costs—comprised 27% of the total program administration costs for EA & EGA and 32% of the total program administration costs for FHPAP. Spread equally across 12 months, the median time spent was 12.5 hours a week for managers and 5 hours a week for direct services workers. For FHPAP, the median time spent was 9 hours a week for managers and 5.5 hours a week for direct service workers.

COST PER APPLICANT

The cost per applicant varied slightly by county with a maximum spread of about 20 dollars. Contributing factors included a difference in average hourly wage rates, total number of applications processed, and number of program staff. The cost to process a denial was about 70% of the cost to process an approval. Numbers for the 7-county metro overall appear below.

TABLE 3. **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT FOR 7-COUNTY METRO***

	APPROVALS	DENIALS
	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT	**PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT**
EA + EGA	$107.21	$74.01
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	$151.72	$107.62

These data are for the January 2024 to December 2024 Budget Year for EA, the July 2023 to June 2024 Budget Year for EGA, and the October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year for FHPAP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

APPLICATION DENIALS VS. APPROVALS

The cost of staff time to process denials across the three programs was nearly $4.2M. Denials make up 75% or more of applications that are processed, increase overall volume, and can reduce the amount of time available for case management. There exists a tension between the benefit of denying applications quickly to issue a denial letter and the benefit of keeping the application open for a full 30-day window, which gives applicants more time to submit the verification documents required for payment approval. More effective pre-screening could reduce this burden, but it would require a policy shift as the current approach is to screen-in, not screen-out.

PROGRAM STAFFING LEVELS

Reflections from program staff shed light on the gap between current staff levels and optimal staff levels. In addition, many program staff reported feeling stressed, being unable to get to all the tasks on their plate, or having to do the work of other staff.

TABLE 4. **PROGRAM STAFF ASSESSMENT OF SUFFICIENCY FOR OPTIMAL PROGRAM OPERATION**

STAFFING AREA	DIRECT SERVICE	SUPPORT	MANAGERIAL
	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT
EA + EGA	83%	62%	40%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	58%	38%	33%

Key Takeaways

- Emergency financial assistance programs require additional, dedicated funding for administration. Underfunding staff costs is underfunding programs overall. The administration of EA, EGA, and FHPAP funds occurs through the dedicated efforts of county and nonprofit agencies who are frequently understaffed and underfunded for this work. State agencies should consider increasing funding for program staff time (including administration and direct service) to more effectively process the current volume of applications

- Application denials are both time-consuming and costly. Due to limited program funding, most applications for help are denied — yet still require significant program administration to process.

- Program administrators would benefit from additional funding for household assistance. Many issues that program administrators grapple with are rooted in funding scarcity. Additional funding would allow for serving more households at existing thresholds, modifying eligibility rules so that programs could provide higher payments to resolve more costly emergencies, and/or to serve households at higher incomes who are increasingly seeking emergency assistance as housing costs have risen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

Background

When families fall behind on housing payments in Minnesota, one of the primary options is to apply for emergency financial assistance from what Family Housing Fund considers to be "housing safety net" programs — longstanding public resources that are intended to help resolve financial crises and preserve housing stability.

In Minnesota, the housing safety net is largely made up of three key programs: the Family Homelessness Prevention and Assistance Program (FHPAP), Emergency Assistance (EA), and Emergency General Assistance (EGA). FHPAP is allocated by the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (Minnesota Housing) to counties and nonprofit community partners who administer these funds. Emergency financial assistance for housing falls under "Family Homeless Prevention," one of four activities funded under this state agency grant. EA and EGA are allocated by the Minnesota Department of Human Services to counties who administer the funds. EA is federally funded — it is a part of the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) — and EGA is funded by the state's general fund.

These programs do not provide ongoing assistance to households but are designed to resolve threats to housing stability by covering the cost of an immediate need, such as recently missed rent payments or utility payments. Eligibility rules and approval processes vary widely across these programs and across county jurisdictions. Navigating this system can be difficult for families in crisis, and there is no guarantee of timely or sufficient payment to preserve housing stability.

Family Housing Fund aspires to improve housing stability and prevent displacement, eviction, and homelessness by strengthening the emergency financial assistance system to better respond to the needs of families in crisis. In 2023, Family

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

Housing Fund led a collaborative engagement and design process to re-imagine these programs and weave a strong safety net for housing stability. This process resulted in several recommendations for improving FHPAP, EA, and EGA, which also complemented recommendations produced by the legislative Workgroup on Expediting Rental Assistance (WERA) in early 2024.

One key theme that surfaced from this work is that program administration is significantly underfunded. Administrators generally feel overwhelmed with cases, and capacity constraints can contribute to wait times. Administrators cannot always provide the level of service for applicants that they want to, causing interactions with applicants to feel more transactional than relational. This high-volume, direct service work can be stressful and lead to burnout for many frontline staff. In turn, high rates of staff turnover can further exacerbate staff shortages. Capacity constraints can also make it hard to employ trauma-informed and culturally responsive approaches to service delivery, which can lead to negative applicant experiences.

Investing more money in program administration could potentially improve the user experience and shorten wait times, which is likely to improve housing outcomes for applicants. However, without reliable data on time spent, it is difficult to articulate program administration costs and the level of new investment required. Organizations that do track time typically focus on the length of time that applications remain open — not the amount of staff touch time necessary to process applications.

To advance the conversation, Family Housing Fund set out to understand the cost of program administration for EA, EGA, and FHPAP. Our goal is to inform future program funding allocations, backed by data, that can strengthen the safety net for housing stability. This research study is a step toward identifying what it would take to fully fund program administration.

> ***"There are many instances where households will apply and not even be interviewed for 3 to 4 weeks due to the backlog of applications. This makes the emergency potentially worse and makes the interaction between the worker and the client more stressful."***
>
> **— EA/EGA Administrator**

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

Research Overview

The aim of this research study was to measure the cost of program administration for Emergency Assistance (EA), Emergency General Assistance (EGA) and Family Homeless Prevention Assistance Program (FHPAP) for the Twin Cities seven-county metro area, including the cost of staff time spent on application processing and staff time spent on program oversight.

The findings presented in this report were informed by the insights of more than 200 staff affiliated with EA, EGA, and FHPAP programs serving the metro area. The work of this study occurred over the period of 12 months—from July 2024 through June 2025. Phase I (Exploration) was focused on the development of a research design to measure program administration costs and identifying opportunities for process improvement. Phase II (Implementation) was focused on the collection of data used to produce valid and reliable time and cost estimates.

This information is intended to support state, county, and nonprofit organizations in advocating for and implementing additional program funding and policy changes. We also intend to support government and nonprofit partners in developing their program budgets and planning for future program needs. It is important to underscore that this study was designed to gather information on staff time and costs; it was not designed to measure program effectiveness or efficiency, although it did uncover some opportunities for program improvement. It also did not identify what the optimal level of staffing would be or how much administration would cost with optimal staffing.

This report is organized into five key sections. Section 1 describes the methods that were used to design and carry out this study. Section 2 describes the research findings on administrative time, administrative cost, and indicators of program overtax. Section 3 describes areas for program improvement that are related to administrative time and costs. Section 4 identifies key takeaways and questions for further research. Section 5, the appendix, includes data caveats, additional information about cost calculations, and acknowledgements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

SECTION ONE

Methods

Phase One focused on the development of a research design to measure program administration costs and identifying opportunities for process improvement. We convened a study advisory group to provide a vehicle for program staff input, reviewed program record data, and conducted in-depth interviews with program managers and direct service staff to gain additional perspective. The following is a detailed description of each activity and the way in which it contributed to the overall research project.

SAFETY NET ADVISORY GROUP MEETINGS

We convened a study advisory group, referred to in this report as the Safety Net Advisory Group, to gather information and feedback. This group included 34 staff from EA, EGA, and FHPAP programs representing all metro area counties and six individuals with lived experience as program applicants. We met with this advisory group three times over Zoom during Phase One.

Session I (July and August 2024): Attendees were given the option to attend the first session on one of two dates. During these meetings, we introduced the purpose of the study and facilitated a discussion about the application process in preparation for interviews with managers and staff. This initial meeting provided invaluable information about the detailed steps in the application process and potential variations by program. The information from this initial meeting was used to structure an initial program data request and interview questions.

Session II (October 2024): During the second meeting, we reviewed and discussed key findings from the 30 key informant interviews with program staff that occurred in September 2024. The information from the interviews informed the design of data collection tools as well as considerations for the analysis of the data.

Session III (November 2024): At this final meeting of Phase One, we reviewed the proposed research design, including roles and responsibilities for Safety Net Advisory Group members. Final adjustments were made to the research design based on input from this meeting, such as ensuring that EA/EGA and FHPAP programs were studied as independent programs and ensuring that data collection processes were not overly burdensome.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF PROGRAM DATA AND MATERIALS

Prior to the interviews, program contacts for EA, EGA, and FHPAP were asked to complete a spreadsheet with information on data collected by the program and its availability, as well as a copy of the program application and eligibility criteria. The purpose of this request was to explore additional data collection needs for the cost calculations as well as inputs that could be produced using available data. A review of applications and local program eligibility criteria was conducted to identify consistencies and differences across departments and agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

INTERVIEWS WITH PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND DIRECT SERVICE STAFF

In total, we conducted 30 interviews with program managers, supervisors and direct service staff. The primary purpose of the interviews was to help us develop data collection tools for calculating the "real cost" of emergency assistance program administration. The interview guide included a set of questions that explored:

- The number of staff involved in application processing, their roles, and their ability to estimate time on task.
- The volume of cases and the percentage of cases that advance to the next stage in the process.
- Factors with the greatest influence on time and resources at each stage in the process.
- Aspects of the application process that presented opportunities for streamlining and process improvement.

The following is a summary of key learnings from Safety Net Advisory Group members and other program staff who participated in key informant interviews. This information was used to develop the research design and data collection tools that were used in Phase Two.

> *"The expectations of staff are unrealistic. I am burnt out, and so are my coworkers... It is very difficult for cases to be 100% accurate when we have so much client contact and barely time to think on a normal day."*
>
> — EA/EGA Administrator

STAFFING & TASK ALLOCATION CONSIDERATIONS

- Multiple staff — sometimes across different agencies — touch each application from client intake to vendor payment. Sometimes a single staff person is assigned to work on a case; other times multiple staff work on a case.
- Few counties have dedicated EA/EGA teams. Staff typically cover multiple Minnesota Family Investment Programs, including food assistance and cash assistance.
- Program teams vary widely in size and full-time employees (FTEs). FHPAP subgrantee organizations add another layer of administrative staff costs to consider when calculating total costs.

APPLICATION PROCESSING/TIME ESTIMATE CONSIDERATIONS

- Processing of applications is variable and often depends on client preparedness, household size, crisis complexity, need for interpretation, and landlord responsiveness. Some applications take one hour, while others may take several hours, or weeks of intermittent effort.
- Verification was almost universally cited as the most time-consuming stage of the application process.

Contributing factors included:

- Large household sizes with multiple incomes
- Need to verify employment, housing costs, and legal emergencies
- Incomplete or missing documentation requiring multiple follow-ups
- Complex household dynamics

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

- Heavy caseloads and tight timelines often limit staff to transactional assistance, limiting the ability to provide in-depth case management services.
- Staff enter the same client data into multiple systems (Excel, PDFs, HMIS ClientTrack, internal trackers), leading to redundant work and inefficiencies. Some counties still rely on manual forms or outdated/disconnected platforms.
- Counties and subgrantees spend a disproportionate amount of time managing budgets, amendments, and reporting — particularly for FHPAP.

PHASE ONE CULMINATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESEARCH DESIGN THAT INCLUDED:

- Identification of all resource inputs (staff, program data, financial and salary data) necessary for calculating the total cost of program administration.
- Data collection tools, including:
  - A survey of all program staff to gather data on time staff spent on core/component program activities
  - Time tracking with a sample of EA, EGA, and FHPAP direct service staff and program managers
  - Program staff lists for the seven counties and FHPAP project sites that offer emergency financial assistance.

The research design was modeled after a "bottom-up" approach developed by researchers[1] studying the cost of social service programs. The approach involved identifying core activities and processes in the delivery of EA, EGA, and FHPAP assistance and categorizing them into 13 key tasks — 7 related to application processing steps and 6 related to program oversight duties. These activities served as the basis for forming administrative time estimates and costs with the data collection occurring in Phase Two.

Phase Two focused on the collection of data used to produce valid and reliable time and cost estimates. These data collection activities included an online survey, time-tracking and record data gathering. The following is a brief description of each activity and how it contributed to the research.

ONLINE SURVEY

We administered an online survey using a contact database of 291 county and nonprofit staff involved in the administration of EA, EGA, and FHPAP programs. The survey, programmed in Qualtrics, was distributed by email, along with a description of the 13 tasks and a short video on how to complete the survey. Participants received up to four reminders to complete the survey which was open during a three-week period from late February to early March 2025. Safety Net Advisory Group members played an important role in encouraging staff cooperation. Overall, 227 program staff completed the survey for a 78% response rate. By industry standards, this is an excellent response rate for an online survey where the average is just 30%. The survey contained questions about staff roles, time spent on 13 key program-related tasks, staff sufficiency, and feeling overtaxed. The survey also included an open-ended question that allowed respondents to provide additional feedback on EA, EGA, or FHPAP program administration. Survey responses were used to develop valid and reliable time measures. Survey responses were also used to attach costs to and provide valuable context about program application volume and staffing needs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

[1] Beecham, 2000; Chamberlain et al., 2011

TIME TRACKING

With the help of Safety Net Advisory Group members, we identified 37 staff from EA, EGA, and FHPAP programs to participate in the live time-tracking aspect of the study. These participants represented a variety of program models, team sizes, and target populations. Participants were asked to log their work activities for three consecutive days during a two-week period in February 2025 using a time log that was created in Microsoft Word. To support uniform time-tracking, participants were provided with directions in print and video format. Participants returned their completed logs either by email or by mail using a self-addressed, pre-posted envelope. We entered each time entry into a database, which allowed for a study of time spent on specific tasks — by program and by staff role. The time log data was used to validate and adjust time measures from the survey. Specifically, the analysis of the time logs validated our decision to use median time for calculating costs; demonstrated that FHPAP application processing tasks took longer than EA/EGA, which confirmed our survey results; and helped us to understand that FHPAP managers spend time on most application processing tasks, whereas EA and EGA managers do not. The time logs also provided useful information for helping us to calculate Ancillary Time for program staff.

RECORD DATA GATHERING

We gathered a number of record documents to support our data collection processes and final calculations. Such records included program staff lists, program budgets, number of application approvals and denials, and reasons for application denials. Safety Net Advisory Group members assisted in providing this information for counties and FHPAP project sites. We also used public data on government employee salaries and MN DEED Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS) data to set hourly wage rates. State agency staff from Minnesota Housing and Minnesota Department of Human Services assisted with verifying information received and filling data gaps.

> *"Team phone lines are often overwhelmed with calls and unscheduled workers must assist in back-up to mitigate long hold times. This takes away from processing time to complete case reviews, follow up work, and determining case eligibility."*
>
> — EA/EGA Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

SECTION TWO

Research Findings

APPLICATION PROCESSING TIME

To estimate program administrative time for these three programs, we used a set of 13 key tasks. Together, these key tasks comprise two main buckets of work — Application Processing and Program Oversight. The first bucket of work — Application Processing — included seven key tasks: 1) Client Intake, 2) Application Handling, 3) Data Entry, 4) Interview, 5) Verification, 6) Vendor Payment, and 7) Case Closeout. These tasks are primarily handled by staff in direct services roles but sometimes include staff in managerial roles.

On the survey, when asked to report time spent, program staff were asked to think about a "standard" case. Using survey data, we then used the sum of the median time reported on each of these tasks to produce an estimation of the total time spent per applicant. Table 1 shows the median staff time spent on these key tasks for Emergency Assistance (EA), Emergency General Assistance (EGA), and the Family Homeless Prevention Assistance Program (FHPAP).

The total median staff time (across all role types) for all application processing related tasks for a "standard" case for EA and EGA was 2 hours and 30 minutes. The total median staff time (across all role types) for all application processing related tasks for a "standard" case for FHPAP was 3 hours and 15 minutes. When a case is more complex, additional staff time spent on case consultation, especially at the client intake and verification stages of an application, can increase the total time spent on application processing. Survey

TABLE 1. **APPLICATION PROCESSING TIME***

	TIME ACROSS ALL STAFF ROLES	
APPLICATION PROCESSING TASKS	EA & EGA	FHPAP HOMELESS PREVENTION
Client Intake	20 minutes	30 minutes
Application Handling	20 minutes	30 minutes
Data Entry	20 minutes	30 minutes
Interview	30 minutes	30 minutes
Verification	20 minutes	30 minutes
Vendor Payment	20 minutes	25 minutes
Case Closeout	20 minutes	20 minutes
Total Time Per Applicant	**2.5 hours**	**3.25 hours**

**Median Time on Task for a Standard Case*

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

responses from program staff suggest that the total staff time spent on a complex case could range from 1.5 to 2 times that of a "standard" case and that the total staff time spent on a simple case could range from 0.5 to 0.75 times that of a "standard" case.

PROGRAM OVERSIGHT TIME

The second bucket of work — Program Oversight — included six key tasks: 1) Coordination and Communication, 2) Budgeting, 3) Reporting, 4) Monitoring, 5) RFP Activities, and 6) Other Program Oversight Duties. These tasks are primarily handled by staff in managerial roles but sometimes include staff in direct services roles.

On the survey, program staff were asked to think about how many weeks out of the year they spend doing these tasks, and in weeks they occur, how much time they spend doing them. Using survey data, we then calculated the median annual time spent on each of these tasks. In addition to these tasks, we considered two other categories of staff time spent. One is Executive Time — that is, time spent on the program by high-level employees who do not work on the program directly, but who might spend nominal time throughout the course of the year as part of their executive duties. The other is Ancillary Time — that is, time spent by employees who work directly on the program that is necessary for employee maintenance but is not core to the program's function. Examples of such activity include getting a workstation ready or taking a restroom break. Key informant interviews and time log reports were used to estimate the typical annual time spent on these activities. For practical purposes, these two categories of staff time were also added to the Program Oversight bucket. To reduce overestimation of time spent, we included direct service time only for tasks that were performed by all direct service workers. Table 2 shows the median staff time spent on Program Oversight for EA and EGA. Table 3 shows the median time spent on Program Oversight for FHPAP.

For EA and EGA, the total median staff time spent on Program Oversight was 655 hours for managerial roles and 260 hours for direct service roles, annually. While much of this work takes place in concentrated periods during the year, when distributed equally across 12 months, this amounts to about 12.5 hours a week for managers and 5 hours a week for direct services workers.

TABLE 2. **EA & EGA PROGRAM OVERSIGHT TIME***

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION TASKS	TIME FOR MANAGERIAL ROLES	TIME FOR DIRECT SERVICE ROLES
Coordination and communication	130 hours	130 hours
Budgeting	78 hours	—
Reporting	62 hours	—
Monitoring	78 hours	—
RFP activities	52 hours	—
Other program duties	120 hours	—
Ancillary time	130 hours	130 hours
Executive time	5 hours	—
Total Time Per Worker	**655 hours**	**260 hours**

** Median Time Spent Annually*

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

TABLE 3. **FHPAP HOMELESS PREVENTION PROGRAM OVERSIGHT TIME***

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION TASKS	TIME FOR MANAGERIAL ROLES	TIME FOR DIRECT SERVICE ROLES
Coordination and communication	104 hours	156 hours
Budgeting	20 hours	—
Reporting	32 hours	—
Monitoring	52 hours	—
RFP activities	16 hours	—
Other program duties	114 hours	—
Ancillary time	130 hours	130 hours
Executive time	5 hours	—
Total Time Per Worker	**473 hours**	**286 hours**

**** Median Time Spent Annually***

For FHPAP, the total median staff time spent on Program Oversight was 473 hours for managerial roles and 286 hours for direct services roles, annually. While much of this work takes place in concentrated periods during the year, when distributed equally across 12 months, this amounts to about 9 hours a week for managers and 5.5 hours a week for direct service workers.

Many program staff also spent time working on other programs or tasks unrelated to EA, EGA or FHPAP. That time was out of scope for this study and was not included in our analysis.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

To estimate the cost of program administrative time for these three programs, we addressed Application Processing Time and Program Oversight Time, separately. To calculate the cost of Application Processing, we included the following inputs: median reported time for a "standard" case (Tasks 1 through 7), average hourly wage rates for managerial roles, accounting roles, and direct service roles, and the total number of program applicants for the most recent, completed budget years.

AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE RATES

To calculate average hourly wage rates, we used job title data provided by program staff who responded to the survey and matched it to public record salary and wage data for metro area counties that administer FHPAP in the metro area. We found that wage rates varied across the metro and thus calculated discrete average wage rates for Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington — each with its own managerial rate, accountant rate, and direct service rate.

We also calculated an average nonprofit managerial rate, nonprofit accountant rate, and nonprofit direct service rate for FHPAP project sites based on wage and salary information from posted employment position ads, salary ranges for position types posted on Indeed, and DEED Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS). We used the average wage rate, rather than the median wage rate, because many workers had salaries that skewed towards the top of their pay range. We then added 30 percent to account for the cost of fringe benefits, such as health insurance, paid time off, and retirement plans. In some organizations, tasks typically

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

TABLE 4. **AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE (INCLUDES 30 PERCENT FRINGE)**

	MANAGERIAL RATE	ACCOUNTANT RATE	DIRECT SERVICE RATE
Anoka	$64.74	$45.24	$42.12
Carver	$57.72	$45.24	$34.32
Dakota	$56.16	$38.22	$39.00
Hennepin	$62.40	$42.90	$49.14
Ramsey	$53.04	$42.12	$32.76
Scott	$57.72	$39.78	$41.34
Washington	$57.72	$36.66	$40.56
Metro Area Nonprofit (administering FHPAP)	$43.68	$43.68	$28.86

performed by a direct service worker were performed by an office admin worker. In those cases, the office admin worker was assigned the direct service wage rate. Table 4 shows the average hourly wage rates (including fringe). It is understood that actual wage rates for individual workers might fall above or below these rates.

PROGRAM APPLICANTS, APPROVALS, AND DENIALS

For purposes of cost calculation, it was important to understand the total number of application approvals and the total number of denials by county for each of the three programs. To obtain this data, we collected records from program advisors representing each of the seven metro area counties and from Minnesota Housing and the Minnesota Department of Human Services. In the case of EA and EGA, approvals and denials are officially tracked in MAXIS, which is the computer system that the state and counties use to determine eligibility and issue benefits.

We used record data for the most recent completed budget years, rather than the current fiscal year, in order to capture seasonality. For EA, the budget year was January 2024 to December 2024, for EGA the budget year July 2023 to June 2024, and for FHPAP the budget year was October 2023 to September 2024. Table 5 shows the actual number of approvals and denials for EA and EGA for the most recent completed budget years for each metro area county. EA and EGA programs are part of a universal application for emergency housing and utility assistance, food assistance, cash assistance, childcare assistance, and group housing assistance. An estimated 85 to 90 percent of applications received are through mnbenefits.mn.gov, the state's online assistance portal; the remainder are paper forms.

In the case of FHPAP, approvals are tracked in HMIS ClientTrack. FHPAP denial tracking is not required by the state or counties, although some project sites do track them. To estimate the number of FHPAP denials, we relied on qualitative feedback from program staff and applied the assumption that the number of approvals reflected 10 percent of the total demand where d=TD-a and a=TD*0.10.

FHPAP utilizes a "no wrong door" approach that allows residents to seek help from any community organization that administers FHPAP funds. These project sites include housing service providers, human service providers, cultural service

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

TABLE 5. **EA & EGA APPROVALS AND DENIALS***

	EA APPROVALS	EA DENIALS	EGA APPROVALS	EGA DENIALS
Anoka	399	719	191	630
Carver	26	347	12	313
Dakota	387	3,265	186	2,975
Hennepin	4,968	11,531	7,536	15,324
Ramsey	1,806	6,841	1,806	6,841
Scott	41	661	18	512
Washington	141	1,288	140	2,330
7-County Metro Total	**7,768**	**24,652**	**9,889**	**28,925**

** January 2024 to December 2024 (EA) and July 2023 to June 2024 (EGA) Budget Years*

TABLE 6. **FHPAP HOMELESS PREVENTION APPROVALS AND DENIALS***

	FHPAP APPROVALS	FHPAP DENIALS**
Anoka	331	2,979
Carver and Scott	202	1,818
Dakota	141	1,269
Hennepin TRC	920	8,280
Hennepin Other	513	4,617
Ramsey	1,378	12,402
Washington	143	1,287
7-County Metro Total	**3,628**	**32,652**

** October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year*

** * Estimated denials were calculated using Total Demand minus approvals where approvals are equal to 10 percent of Total Demand (d=TD-a and a=TD*0.10).*

providers, and Community Action Programs. Hennepin County was the only metro area county that processed applications through a central portal. In Hennepin County, the majority of FHPAP applications were processed by the county's Tenant Resource Center (TRC) during this budget year. For a complete list of the FHPAP project sites included in this study, see the Appendix section of this report.

In the most recent completed budget year for FHPAP (October 2023 to September 2024), there were 25 subgrantee project sites serving metro area counties that reported Homeless Prevention payment approvals to Minnesota Housing. Table 6 shows the number of actual homeless prevention approvals and the estimated number of denials by county. Carver and Scott counties administer a joint FHPAP program, which is represented by a single line item.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

For all three programs — EA, EGA, and FHPAP — 75% or more of processed applications result in a denial. There are several reasons an application may be denied. Some applications are denied simply because there is no funding available at the time. Some applications are never completed — either because the applicant abandoned the application or because they were unable to provide the required documentation. After a period of inactive time in the system, these incomplete applications are denied. Many applications are denied because the applicants do not meet certain eligibility rules — rules that are rooted in scarcity of funds. For example, eligibility rules may require that the crisis must be solvable with the amount of assistance available; an application may be denied if rent arrears are too high, if the applicant cannot show that they will be able to pay rent in upcoming months, or if the household's financial deficit is chronic.

Some assistance programs require that households first apply for help from a different program and receive proof of denial before they are eligible for other assistance. As a result, people often apply for EA, EGA, or FHPAP despite knowing that they are not eligible in order to receive a denial letter that makes them eligible for funding from another source. Though we did not track or study the reasons behind the denials observed in this study, we recognize that this dynamic may be another contributor to the high number of denials.

> *"Additional capacity is needed for direct service. We receive hundreds of phone calls each month and each needs to be individually vetted to determine eligibility for assistance. Some client applications can take hours. Our staff is more than busy, and if anyone needs PTO or is out sick, we are buried."*
>
> — FHPAP Administrator

APPLICATION PROCESSING—DIRECT COSTS

To calculate the cost of administrative staff time, we first addressed the direct costs associated with application processing (Client Intake, Application Handling, Data Entry, Interview, Verification, Vendor Payment and Case Closeout).

To estimate the direct costs associated with application approvals for each of the three programs, we multiplied the median time reported (in minutes) for each of the seven key application processing tasks by the average per-minute cost of the worker or workers who performed the task by the total number of approved applications by county for the most recent, completed budget year. It was assumed that all approvals touched all seven of the tasks. For additional information on how Application Processing Time was allocated across staff roles, see the Appendix section of this report.

To estimate the direct costs associated with application denials for each of the three programs, we multiplied the median time reported (in minutes) for each of the seven key application processing tasks by the average per-minute cost of the worker or workers who performed the task by the total number of denials **that touched that stage of the application process** by county, for the most recent completed budget year.
For EA & EGA, it was assumed that all denials touched Task 1 (Client Intake), Task 2 (Application Handling), Task 3 (Data Entry), and Task 7 (Case Closeout); that 60 percent of denials touched Task 4 (Interview) and Task 5 (Verification); and that zero percent of denials touched Task 6 (Vendor Payment). For FHPAP, it was assumed that all denials touched Task 1 (Client Intake), Task 2 (Application Handling), and Task 7 (Case Closeout); that 50 percent of denials touched Task 3 (Data Entry), Task 4 (Interview), and Task 5 (Verification); and that zero percent of denials touched Task 6 (Vendor Payment). For additional information on how time was allocated across staff roles, see the Appendix section of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

> *"Very few of my applications are approved, but I process multiple applications each week. The time it takes to do everything for a denial or withdrawal is what adds the stress to my inability to process the other applications I receive that actually will be approved."*
>
> — EA/EGA Administrator

Table 7 shows the estimated direct costs associated with processing EA & EGA approvals and denials for the 7-county metro area. Table 8 shows the estimated direct costs associated with processing FHPAP approvals and denials for the 7-county metro area.

It is worth noting that, because most applications result in denials, all three programs spend significant time and resources denying applications — energy spent that does not support a positive housing outcome for applicants.

PROGRAM OVERSIGHT — INDIRECT COSTS

To calculate the cost of administrative staff time, we secondarily addressed the indirect costs associated with application processing (Coordination and Communication, Budgeting, Reporting, Monitoring, RFP Activities, and Other Program Oversight Duties). Unlike the direct costs for application processing which are tied to application numbers, these direct costs are tied to program administrative activities and employee maintenance time that is expected to occur independent of application volume.

To estimate the indirect costs associated with application processing for each of the three programs, we used the median annual time reported (in hours) for each of the six Program Oversight tasks plus the estimated annual hours spent on Executive Time and Ancillary Time. That time was then multiplied by the average hourly wage rates for the workers who performed those tasks and by the number of workers who performed them at the county, and at FHPAP project sites where applicable. We used both survey data reported by program staff and staff rosters to estimate the total number of staff involved in each task.

Table 9 shows the estimated Program Oversight costs for EA and EGA as well as estimated

TABLE 7. **EA & EGA / APPLICATION PROCESSING — DIRECT COSTS**

	APPROVALS	DENIALS
EA	$819,981	$1,805,920
EGA	$1,072,364	$2,157,030
7-County Metro Total	**$1,892,345**	**$3,962,950**

** January 2024 to December 2024 (EA) and July 2023 to June 2024 (EGA) Budget Years*

TABLE 8. **FHPAP HOMELESS PREVENTION APPLICATION PROCESSING — DIRECT COSTS***

	APPROVALS	DENIALS
7-County Metro Total	**$407,479**	**$2,227,284**

** October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year*

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

Program Oversight costs for FHPAP. For additional information on how Program Oversight costs were calculated, see the Appendix section of this report.

TOTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS

To calculate the total program administrative costs for each of the three programs, we added the direct costs associated with Application Processing and the indirect costs associated with Program Oversight. Table 10 shows the estimated Program Administration Costs for EA and EGA and for FHPAP for the 7-county metro area—approximately $12.5M total. Indirect costs comprised 27% of the total program administration costs for EA & EGA and 32% of the total program administration costs for FHPAP.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT

With knowledge of the estimated costs for application processing, the estimated costs for program oversight and the total number of program applicants, we were able to calculate an estimated Program Administration Cost Per Applicant for EA and EGA and FHPAP. While the

TABLE 9. **PROGRAM OVERSIGHT INDIRECT COSTS**

EA + EGA*	$2,133,301
FHPAP Homeless Prevention**	$1,429,558

** January 2024 to December 2024 (EA) and July 2023 to June 2024 (EGA) Budget Years*
*** October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year*

TABLE 10. **TOTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS***

7-COUNTY METRO TOTAL ESTIMATED AT $12.5M			
	APPLICATION PROCESSING DIRECT COSTS	PROGRAM OVERSIGHT INDIRECT COSTS	TOTAL
EA + EGA	$5,855,295	$2,133,301	**$7,988,596**
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	$3,042,241	$1,429,558	**$4,471,799**

**These data are for the January 2024 to December 2024 Budget Year for EA, the July 2023 to June 2024 Budget Year for EGA, and the October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year for FHPAP.*

TABLE 11. **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT FOR 7-COUNTY METRO***

	APPROVALS	DENIALS
	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COST PER APPLICANT
EA + EGA	$107.21	$74.01
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	$151.72	$107.62

**These data are for the January 2024 to December 2024 Budget Year for EA, the July 2023 to June 2024 Budget Year for EGA, and the October 2023 to September 2024 Budget Year for FHPAP.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

overall cost to process an application is relatively low, it is worth noting that the cost to process a denial is about 70 percent of the cost to process an approval. The program administration cost per applicant varied slightly by county with a maximum spread of about 20 dollars. Contributing factors included a difference in average hourly wage rates, total number of applications processed, and number of program staff. Table 11 shows the per applicant cost for the 7-county metro overall.

OBSERVED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS VS. BUDGETED COSTS

Study data indicate that our observed cost of staff time is higher than what was allocated for staff costs within program funding. The difference is the most dramatic for EA and EGA. For FHPAP, some counties are constrained by the administrative cap for staffing costs related to program applications, oversight, and compliance. We requested budget data for the most recent completed budget years from county and state agencies to compare the observed costs in this study to actual program administrative budgets. (shown in Table 12). In requesting these budgets, we learned that:

- The EA Program is part of the MFIP Consolidated Budget, which includes federal pass-through dollars that fund food assistance, childcare assistance, and cash assistance programs. These programs are applied for concurrently, and there is no separate staff budget for the EA program only. There is a 7.5 percent cap on administrative costs for the MFIP Consolidated budget. Some staff positions are exempt from that cap.

- The EGA Program is funded by the State of Minnesota. The state's allocation includes funding for household emergencies, but it does not include funding for program staff costs. We learned that EGA staff costs are often covered by county levies or other human service programs administered by the county.

TABLE 12. **OBSERVED ADMIN COSTS VS. BUDGETED FUNDING**

PROGRAM	ALLOCATION FOR STAFF COSTS	OBSERVED STAFF COSTS	CONCLUSION
FHPAP Homeless Prevention[2]	$4,436,194	$4,471,799	The observed staff costs exceeded the budgeted amount for administrative staff by $35,605.
MFIP Programs, which include EA	$4,848,835 (all MFIP programs)	$3,594,868 for EA only	The observed staff costs for EA alone comprised **three-quarters** of the legislated cap for all MFIP Programs.
EGA	$0	$4,393,728	The state does not budget any staff dollars for EGA.

[2] To aid us with our inquiry, Minnesota Housing staff provided an estimated total of wages and salaries budgeted for Homeless Prevention services only.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

- Together, the observed staff costs of EA and EGA were just under $8 million. As the allocation for staff costs for the entire MFIP budget is just over $4.8 million and the allocation for staff costs in the EGA program are zero, it is clear that staff costs are not sufficiently accounted for within the EA and EGA program budgets.

- The FHPAP budget is funded by the State of Minnesota. The budget includes all FHPAP activities: homeless prevention, rapid rehousing, coordinated entry, and street outreach. For metro area counties, Homeless Prevention — the component of the program that offers emergency financial assistance — comprises the majority of FHPAP expenditures, making up 75 percent of the total.

- The FHPAP budget does include funding for program staff costs. The budget contains two separate line items for staff: one for direct service staff and one for administrative staff. Both direct service staff and administrative staff provide program administration tasks captured in our time study. The FHPAP budget has a 15 percent cap on administrative staff costs. There is no cap on direct service staff costs.

- In the last biennium, two metro area counties were close to reaching the administrative funding cap (each was at 13 percent). The other metro area counties were well below the cap, based on Minnesota Housing estimates. When combined to reflect both types of staffing, the observed costs in this study were largely in line with the budgeted costs.

INDICATORS OF PROGRAM STAFF OVERTAX

We also explored whether program staff felt if staffing levels for EA, EGA, and FHPAP are sufficient to adequately meet the demand for service. On the survey, program staff were asked to assess the staffing sufficiency of their program in three areas: direct service, support, and managerial. Specifically, respondents were asked, "Are program staffing levels sufficient for optimal program operation?" Table 13 shows how program staff rated their staffing sufficiency in each area. Their responses suggest that the direct service staff need is most acute, followed by the need for more support staff and more managerial staff. Across the board, more EA and EGA staff rated staffing levels as insufficient than did FHPAP staff.

To further assess the staff capacity of current programs, we surveyed program staff about their personal experiences with four proxy measures of

TABLE 13. **PROGRAM STAFF ASSESSMENT OF SUFFICIENCY FOR OPTIMAL PROGRAM OPERATION**

STAFFING AREA	DIRECT SERVICE	SUPPORT	MANAGERIAL
	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT	STAFFFING LEVEL IS INSUFFICIENT
EA + EGA	83%	62%	40%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	58%	38%	33%

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

TABLE 14. **IN A TYPICAL MONTH, HOW OFTEN DO YOU...?**

	FEW OR NO DAYS	LESS THAN HALF THE DAYS	MORE THAN HALF THE DAYS	EVERY DAY OR MOST DAYS
FEEL STRESSED OUT DUE TO A HIGH WORKLOAD?				
EA + EGA	20%	21%	34%	25%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	32%	33%	21%	14%
FEEL UNABLE TO GET TO ALL THE TASKS ON MY PLATE?				
EA + EGA	24%	16%	31%	29%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	32%	33%	21%	14%
DO THE WORK OF OTHER STAFF IN ADDITION TO MY OWN?				
EA + EGA	51%	28%	13%	8%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	46%	25%	13%	6%
WORK OFF THE CLOCK OR BEYOND SCHEDULED HOURS?				
EA + EGA	37%	32%	20%	11%
FHPAP Homeless Prevention	51%	23%	16%	10%

program overtax. Specifically, respondents were asked, "In a typical month, how often do you 1) Feel stressed out due to a high workload, 2) Not get to all of the tasks on your plate, 3) Work off the clock or beyond scheduled work hours, and 4) Do the work of other staff in addition to your own?" Table 14 shows the frequency at which staff reported these issues. Respondents reported a range of experiences with some staff indicating that these issues happen "Every day or most days" and some staff indicating that these issues happen "Few or no days" in a typical month. Overall, their responses provide evidence that these programs—from a staff standpoint—are not sufficiently staffed. This is an important consideration to keep in mind and raises the question: What is the difference between observed staff costs and optimal staff costs?

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

SECTION THREE

Areas for Program Improvement to Time and Costs

The key informant interviews with program staff in Phase One of the study and open-ended responses from program staff on the survey uncovered some potential opportunities for program improvement that relate to administrative staff time and costs, including:

A need for better client communication systems. Staff noted that the ability to send clients text notifications and reminders about important deadlines could increase efficiency and improve overall communication, especially with clients who prefer texts to phone calls.

A need to simplify reporting requirements. Staff described reporting requirements as being inefficient and overly cumbersome. Subsequently, they noted that the administrative time associated with reporting expends program funds that could, instead, be used to assist households.

A need to improve the application process itself. Staff noted the use of pre-screening as a way to reduce time spent on program denials. Some staff expressed interest in creating a universal verification packet (for EA and EGA) and a universal application (for FHPAP) to streamline the client intake process and reduce administration time.

A need for more modernized data systems. First, to reduce the time spent on duplicate data entry. Second, to support data sharing for verification purposes. Staff mentioned the need to enter applicants' information in multiple places across multiple data systems. With regard to data sharing, staff noted that having access to participants' social security and public benefit information could significantly enhance the verification process and reduce administrative delays. Staff also expressed interest in facilitating better data sharing with utility companies, financial institutions, and landlords.

> *"The data and reporting systems are overly complicated. Most of us who oversee or coordinate the Family Homeless Prevention Assistance Program as part of our job don't have adequate time to meet all of the expectations."*
>
> — FHPAP Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

SECTION FOUR

Key Takeaways and Questions for Further Research

We reconvened the Safety Net Study Advisory Group in May 2025 to review and discuss the research results. The following is a summary of their key takeaways.

These programs require additional, dedicated funding for administration; underfunding staff costs is underfunding programs overall. The administration of EA, EGA, and FHPAP funds occurs through the dedicated efforts of county and nonprofit agencies who are frequently understaffed and underfunded for this work. State agencies should consider increasing funding for program staff time (including administration and direct service) to more effectively process the current volume of applications. Additional funding could be used to increase staffing levels or provide households with more intensive case management and could potentially reduce applicant wait times.

Application denials are both time-consuming and costly. The cost of staff time to process denials across the three programs was nearly $4.2M. Denials make up the bulk of applications that are processed, increase overall volume, and can reduce the amount of time available for case management. The demand for emergency financial assistance has continued to steadily increase and frequently exceeds available funding. Limited program funding means that with more applications come more denials — and the costs associated with the staff time required to process those denials. Denied applicants are still required to complete many of the processing steps in order to receive a denial letter, which is frequently required in order to unlock other funding sources available for household emergencies. For program staff, there exists a tension between the benefit of denying applications quickly to issue a denial letter and the benefit of keeping the application open for full 30-day window, which gives applicants more time to submit the verification documents required for payment approval. The need to reapply after an application has closed also increases application processing costs. More effective pre-screening would reduce this burden, but it would require a policy shift as the current approach is to screen-in, not screen-out.

In addition to dedicated administration funding, program administrators would benefit from additional funding for household assistance. This research surfaced multiple potential uses for additional funds, reflecting different priorities and perspectives among program staff. Additional funding could allow for serving more households at existing thresholds, modifying eligibility rules so that programs could provide higher payments to resolve more costly emergencies, and/or serving households at higher incomes who are increasingly seeking emergency assistance as housing costs have risen. Each funding priority has trade-offs and calls for strategic policy decisions to be made.

> *"More effective pre-screening and communication on available programs and requirements may be helpful in preventing from bogging down the system."*
>
> — EA/EGA Administrator

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While undertaking this study, additional questions surfaced about safety net programs that would benefit from further research inquiry. Answers to these questions could assist program staff and other key decision-makers in implementing changes designed to optimize program quality, efficiency, and effectiveness.

1. How much would it cost to fund staff at optimal levels to process the current volume of applications?

2. With optimal staff levels in mind, can we identify the number of new staff needed for every percentage increase in funding for households?

3. We now know that the staff "touch time" for a standard application is 2.5 to 3.25 hours. What can we learn about the "wait time" that leads to an average of 30 days to close? How does that inform optimal staffing levels to minimize the days to close?

4. Does pre-screening reduce the staff time and costs associated with denials?

5. Among applicants who are denied due to lack of funds, can we estimate the percentage who would otherwise meet eligibility criteria?

6. For EA and EGA, do specialized benefits teams save time?

7. Is a centralized door approach more effective than a no wrong door approach for FHPAP?

8. How can we decrease time-consuming or duplicative parts of the process so that direct service staff can spend more quality time with households seeking assistance?

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

APPENDIX

Data Caveats

Hennepin County Tenant Resource Center

The approach used to calculate the cost of FHPAP applications processed by the Hennepin County Tenant Resource Center was adjusted to reflect a notable difference in reported time on task. Time on task for activities 2, 3, 4, and 5 was reduced by five to ten minutes based on survey responses provided by Hennepin County program staff.

Application Processing and Case Complexity

This study used the median time on task for a "standard" case to calculate costs. Additional time spent on case consultation, especially at the client intake and verification stages of an application, can increase the cost of application processing. Survey responses from program staff suggest that the total staff time spent on a complex case could range from 1.5 to 2 times that of a "standard" case and that the total staff time spent on a simple case could range from 0.5 to 0.75 times that of a "standard" case. If all cases were extremely complex and took 2 times that of a "standard" case, the total direct costs associated with application processing would increase by 100 percent. And, if all cases were very simple, and took half the time of a "standard" case, the total direct costs associated with application processing would be reduced by 50 percent. While the true distribution of case complexity is unknown, qualitative information from program staff suggests that complex cases occur with some regularity and that few cases are "simple" ones.

Program Oversight Time and Costs

The program oversight time and cost estimates in this report are conservative. It does not capture the time of direct service staff who do budgeting, reporting, monitoring, RFPs or other program oversight — only managers are included here. Subsequently, it might not capture all of the finance staff involved in vendor payment or all of the executive level staff who play a nominal role in program oversight. The staff numbers used in our calculations were derived from program staff rosters provided by county and nonprofit staff. Organizations varied in their ability to provide us with comprehensive staff lists. Additionally, we were also limited in their knowledge of how program oversight tasks are shared.

Calculation Methods

EA and EGA- Cost of Approvals

The number of approvals reflects actual payment approvals for Emergency Assistance and Emergency General Assistance reported to Minnesota Department of Human Services. We assumed that all approvals touched each of the seven key application processing tasks. For purposes of cost calculation, EA and EGA team leads were included in the managerial category. Task 1 (Client Intake) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 2 (Application Handling) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 3 (Data Entry) was performed by manager 10 percent of time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 4 (Interview) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 5 (Verification) was a shared task that included primarily direct service time, but also manager time for 15 percent of the cases handled. Task 6 (Vendor Payment) was a shared task that included both manager time and direct service time. Task 7 (Case Closeout) was a shared task that included both manager time and direct service time.

EA and EGA- Cost of Denials

The number of denials reflects actual denials for Emergency Assistance and Emergency General Assistance reported to the Minnesota Department of Human Services. We assumed that all denials touched Task 1 (Client Intake), Task 2 (Application Handling), Task 3 (Data Entry), and Task 7 (Case Closeout); that 60 percent of denials touched Task 4 (Interview) and Task 5 (Verification); and that zero percent of denials touched Task 6 (Vendor Payment). Task 1 (Client Intake) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 2 (Application Handling) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 3 (Data Entry) was performed by a manager 10 percent of time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 4 (Interview) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 5 (Verification) was a shared task that included primarily direct service time, but also manager time for 15 percent of the cases handled. Task 6 (Vendor Payment) did not occur. Task 7 (Case Closeout) was a shared task that included both manager time and direct service time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

APPENDIX

FHPAP- Cost of Approvals

The number of approvals reflects actual payment approvals for FHPAP Homeless Prevention reported to Minnesota Housing. We assumed that all approvals touched each of the seven key application processing tasks. Task 1 (Client Intake) was performed by a manager 20 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 80 percent of the time. Task 2 (Application Handling) was a shared task that included both manager time and direct service time. Task 3 (Data Entry) was performed by a manager 20 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 80 percent of the time. Task 4 (Interview) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 5 (Verification) was a shared task that included primarily direct service time, but also manager time for 15 percent of the cases handled. Task 6 (Vendor Payment) was a shared task that included direct service time, manager time, and accountant time. Task 7 (Case Closeout) was a shared task that included some manager time and some direct service time.

FHPAP- Cost of Denials

The number of denials assumes that FHPAP Homeless Prevention payment approvals reported to Minnesota Housing reflect 10 percent of the total demand where d=TD-a and a=TD*0.10. We assumed that all denials touched Task 1 (Client Intake), 2 (Application Handling), and 7 (Case Closeout); that 50 percent of denials touched Task 3 (Data Entry), Task 4 (Interview), and Task 5 (Verification), and that zero percent of denials touched Task 6 (Vendor Payment). Task 1 (Client Intake) was performed by a manager 20 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 80 percent of the time. Task 2 (Application Handling) was a shared task that included both manager time and direct service time. Task 3 (Data Entry) was performed by a manager 20 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 80 percent of the time. Task 4 (Interview) was performed by a manager 10 percent of the time and by a direct service worker 90 percent of the time. Task 5 (Verification) was a shared task that included primarily direct service time, but also manager time for 15 percent of the cases handled. Task 6 (Vendor Payment) did not occur. Task 7 (Case Closeout) was a shared task that included some manager time and some direct service time.

Program Oversight Costs

Program Oversight costs include coordination and communication time and ancillary time for all staff. To reduce measurement error, we included only managerial staff in the calculation of costs associated with budgeting, reporting, monitoring, RFPs and other program oversight duties. Program Oversight costs for FHPAP included both county managers and FHPAP project site managers. Program Oversight costs for FHPAP project sites that served more than one county were allocated across counties based on actual homeless prevention payments recorded.

REFERENCES

Beecham, Jennifer. (2000.) "Unit costs: not exactly child's play. A guide to estimating unit costs for children's social care." PSSRU, the Department of Health and Dartington Social Research Unit, London.

Chamberlain P, Snowden LR, Padgett C, Saldana L, Roles J, Holmes L, Ward H, Soper J, Reid J, Landsverk J. A strategy for assessing costs of implementing new practices in the child welfare system: adapting the English cost calculator in the United States. *Administrative Policy and Mental Health*. 2011 Jan;38(1):24-31. doi: 10.1007/s10488-010-0318-8

Calculating the Costs of Child Welfare Services Workgroup. (2013.) "Cost analysis in program evaluation: A guide for child welfare researchers and service providers." Washington, DC: Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS >>

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the following organizations and individuals who contributed their time and expertise to this study.

REPORT AUTHORS

Ela Rausch, PhD, *Otto Rausch Consulting*
Kim Skobba, PhD, *Proficient Owl Group*

WITH SUPPORT FROM:

Andrea Inouye, *Family Housing Fund*
Micah Norman-Pace, *Family Housing Fund*
Karyssa Scheck, *Family Housing Fund*

SAFETY NET ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

Amanda Conroy, *Dakota County*
Amy Blair, *Washington County*
Carrie Hamilton, *Dakota County*
Cindy Fahland, *Hennepin County*
George Borell, *Anoka County*
Heather West, *SHiP Collaborative*
Heidi Boyd, *Hennepin County*
Jason Jedin, *Hennepin County*
Jen Romero, *Carver County*
Jennifer Crotteau, *Anoka County*
Jennifer Kielas, *Carver County*
Jenny Mason, *Washington County*
Jessica Leth, *Anoka County*
Jojean Ziegler, *Ramsey County*
Jolene Rice, *Anoka County*
Kate Probert, *Carver County*
Kelly Polasky, *YMCA Youth and Family Services*
Kristyn Stephens, *Washington County*
Loni Aadalen, *Hennepin County*
Madeline Kastler, *Dakota County*
Megan Swenson, *Washington County*
Monique Moore, *Hennepin County*
Ms. Jewelean Jackson, *SHiP Collaborative*
Natalie Gnerer, *360 Communities*
Patty Paulson, *Neighborhood House*
Peter Goldstein, *Scott County*
Ranee Rock, *SHiP Collaborative*
Rebecca Bowers, *Dakota County*
Renee Theese, *Ramsey County*
Rico Morales
Sarah Tripple, *Washington County*
Scott Hoemke, *Ramsey County*
Shirley Jackson
Sister Janelle Dodd, *SHiP Collaborative*
Tawnya Ward, *Scott County*
Tim Koerner, *Washington County*
Timothy Carroll, *Anoka County*
Will Lehman, *Hennepin County*

STATE AGENCY STAFF ADVISORS

Jeremy Galley, *Minnesota Department of Human Services*
Hattie Hiler, *Minnesota Housing*
John Patterson, *Minnesota Housing*
John Petroskas, *Minnesota Department of Human Services*