

Characteristics of December 2000 Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and Child-Only Assistance Cases and Eligible Adults

Program Assessment and Integrity Division Minnesota Department of Human Services May 2001

Prepared by Leslie Crichton, Ph.D. Senior Research Analysis Specialist (651) 215-9520 / leslie.crichton@state.mn.us.

Characteristics of December 2000 Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and Child-Only Assistance Cases and Eligible Adults

This is the fourth in a series of annual reports providing a snapshot of the universe of participants in Minnesota's public assistance programs for families. This report describes characteristics of eligible adults and active cases receiving family public assistance in December 2000¹ in either the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) or Child-Only Assistance, both funded by the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). There is information on the demographics of adult recipients, family composition and residence, and the economic status for family assistance cases in Minnesota in that month for the state, counties, and regions.² Tables with the data are in an appendix. Extensive footnotes accompany the tables and are essential for their interpretation.

The first caseload characteristics report described eligible recipients and paid cases in December 1997, the month before the start of the program change from Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to statewide MFIP. The subsequent two reports described MFIP participants and cases in December 1998 and December 1999.

The next report in this series will describe the family assistance caseload in December 2001. Input from readers is invited, both reactions to this report and suggestions for indicators in future reports.

Findings paralleling the state results in this report for racial/ethnic groups and the major immigrant groups in Minnesota will be released as part of the Department of Human Service's series on *Welfare Reform Outcomes for Racial/Ethnic and Immigrant Groups in Minnesota* in June 2001.

Statewide Results

During the past two years, two programs were split off from MFIP. The Mille Lacs American Indian Tribal Council took over administration of cases in their jurisdiction in January 1999 (Tribal TANF). Cases in which only the children and not the adult caregivers are eligible for assistance became a separate program (Child-Only Assistance)

¹ Cases receiving a grant are known as "paid cases"; excluded are cases suspended for the month (often for income higher than the cut-off for eligibility) and cases recouped to zero (entire grant applied to a debt to the state, for example for an overpayment in a previous month). The working rate among suspended cases is typically higher than among the general caseload.

² Whole percentages for caseload subgroups sometimes add to 99% or 101% in the text due to rounding.

in July 2000. There were 40,761 cases receiving assistance from the three programs in December 2000,³ compared with 41,534 cases in December 1999. This was a caseload reduction of 1.8 percent over the one-year period.

Table 1 gives the numbers of cases in each program, dividing MFIP cases according to whether one or two adults eligible for payment were included in the case. Table 1 also gives the numbers of eligible adults and eligible children in each program. The number of child-only cases increased by 6.7 percent over the December 1999 figure (7,777), while the number of cases with one eligible adult decreased by 4.8 percent (from 29,114) and the number of cases with two eligible adults was practically unchanged with a 0.4 percent decrease from 4,643.

Table 1. Family assistance paid cases in December 2000

		MFIP				All Family
December 2000	One Eligible	Two Eligible	AII MFIP	Child Only	Tribal TANF	Assistance Paid
	Adult	Adults	Cases	Assistance	Cases	Cases
Paid	27,731	4,624	32,355	8,298	108	40,761
Cases	68.0%	11.3%	79.4%	20.4%	0.3%	100%
Eligible	27,731	9,248	36,979	0	133	37,112
Adults	74.7%	24.9%	99.6%	0.0%	0.4%	100%
Eligible	55,583	13,183	68,766	15,275	246	84,287
Children	65.9%	15.6%	81.6%	18.1%	0.3%	100%

These year 2000 caseload figures continued the post-AFDC trends of the number of child-only cases increasing and the number of cases with eligible adults going down. The cases with no eligible adult have increased by 20 percent since July 1998 (when the transition from AFDC to MFIP had been completed) when there were 6,939 such cases. Meanwhile, the number of cases with eligible adults decreased by 20 percent since July 1998 when there were 40,594 cases with eligible adults. ⁴

Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 gives demographic characteristics of all eligible adults and also groups these adults according to whether there were one or two adults receiving the payment. Characteristics reported include age, gender, education, marital status, ethnicity, and citizenship. This table shows the diversity of the caseload. It also shows demographic patterns similar to those reported in the earlier profiles for age, gender, education, and marital status. However, racial/ethnic and citizen distributions have shifted.

³ Data for this report were extracted from the DHS data warehouse in February 2001 after data through January 2001 had been uploaded.

⁴ July 1998 is the base month reported in the monthly DHS MFIP Trends Reports (the March 2001 report is the source of these data).

- Most recipients were in their twenties (44 percent) or thirties (30 percent), while nearly a tenth were teens and more than 200 were at least 60 years old.
- Most eligible adults were women; less than a fifth were men.
- Lack of education was an issue for many, with 44 percent lacking high school credentials. This was a small increase over December 1998 when 42 percent of eligible adults had not finished high school or a GED.
- More than half of all eligible adults (56 percent) were listed as never having been married. On cases with two eligible adults, 59 percent of the adults were recorded as married and living with a spouse; this was the situation for only 5 percent of cases with one eligible adult.
- Whites were the largest racial/ethnic group (46 percent) and blacks the second largest (32 percent), while the other three groups accounted for less than 10 percent of the caseload each. Comparing absolute numbers of eligible adults with those in December 1998, the number was up slightly for blacks (4 percent) and down slightly for Hispanics (-2 percent). More dramatically, the number of eligible adults was down 27 percent for Asians, down 17 percent for whites, and down 10 percent for American Indians.
- Sixteen percent of all eligible adults lacked U.S. citizenship (at least at the time of application for assistance), ranging from 77 percent of Asian adult participants to less than one percent of American Indians. The biggest change in percent of non-citizens over the two years was among blacks; eligible black non-citizens increased from 14 percent to 24 percent of black participants. Asian non-citizen participants decreased slightly (from 81 percent to 77 percent) and the other racial/ethnic groups were steady. In absolute numbers of non-citizens eligible for MFIP, there were nearly 500 more blacks than Asians.

Note that characteristics with no bearing on eligibility may not have been routinely updated after application. This includes education, marital status, and citizenship so, for example, high school graduation and citizenship may be underreported. DHS is currently informing line workers of the importance of the data they enter for purposes beyond eligibility.

Family Composition and Residence

Table 3 reports statistics on characteristics for families receiving Child-Only Assistance or MFIP. Cases were divided into family types according to whether adults cared for their own children (including natural, adopted, and step children), adults cared for other relative children only, or the adult applicant was a pregnant woman responsible for no other children in the household.

Fifty-nine percent of Child-Only Assistance cases were headed by the children's own parents; 40 percent were headed by relative caregivers. Among child-only cases headed by parents, 46 percent (of all child-only cases) had one or both parents receiving disability payments (Supplemental Security Income [SSI]) in December 2000, 10 percent had parents who were undocumented non-citizens, and 2 percent had adults disqualified from receiving MFIP.

Ninety-six percent of MFIP cases included parents and their own children, less than 3 percent were pregnancy-only cases, and 1 percent were eligible relative caregiver cases. These percentages were comparable to those found in the December 1999 profile although absolute numbers have decreased.

A second caregiver is an adult who lives in the household and is either a second parent (i.e., has a child in common with the applicant and the child lives with them), or the spouse of the caregiver who applied for assistance, or both. Some cases with one eligible adult may be two-parent families, with one parent ineligible. Two-caregiver families accounted for 23 percent of child-only cases, 6 percent of MFIP families with one eligible adult and, of course, all families with two eligible adults. This was a small increase over December 1999 for child-only cases (from 17 percent) and steady for MFIP families.

Table 3 also describes adult caregivers not eligible for assistance. Forty-five percent of all caregivers on child-only cases (all of whom were ineligible for assistance) were relative caregivers; the rest were parents, including 43 percent who were receiving SSI payments, 10 percent undocumented non-citizens, and 2 percent disqualified for fraud or some other reason. Among the 27,731 MFIP cases with one eligible adult, there were 1,670 two-caregiver families (nearly all two-parent families, only 1 percent relative caregivers). Ninety percent of the ineligible parents were receiving SSI, nearly 8 percent were undocumented non-citizens, and under 2 percent had been disqualified.

The number of children in the family and living in the household is given for eligible children, ineligible children (most receiving SSI payments) and for the total of all minor children, eligible and not. MFIP families tended to be small, with two children on the average. Nearly 80 percent of Child-Only Assistance families and 66 percent of MFIP families had only one or two children. Families with no children included pregnant women with no other children in the household and also some cases that were transitioning on or off assistance. There were few very large families; around 2 percent of all families had more than six children. Families with two eligible adults tended to have more children, on the average, than the other families. Six percent of both Child-Only Assistance and MFIP families had one or more children receiving SSI payments.

The age of the youngest child is given for all children in the family. MFIP families tended to have young children. Two-thirds of all MFIP families included a child under the age of six. The average age of the youngest child was 4.5 years. Families with two eligible adults tended to have younger children. The youngest children on Child-Only

Assistance cases were older, averaging over eight years old, with one-third under six and one-fourth teens.

Finally, Table 3 tells where families receiving assistance lived by region: Hennepin County, Ramsey County, Twin Cities metro suburban counties (Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Isanti, Scott, Sherburne, Washington, and Wright), or greater Minnesota (the remaining 76 counties). Residential patterns were similar for the Child-Only Assistance and MFIP cases, with roughly one-third of each in Hennepin County and in greater Minnesota, a fifth in Ramsey County, and a tenth in the metro suburban counties. As noted last year, relatively more families with two eligible adults lived outside the Twin Cities metro area and relatively less lived in Hennepin County.

The urban counties, Hennepin and Ramsey, had a greater share of the welfare population than they did of the general population, and the other regions a smaller share than their population percentages. The 2000 census showed that 23 percent of Minnesotans lived in Hennepin County, 10 percent in Ramsey County, 25 percent in the metropolitan area suburbs, and 42 percent in the rest of the state. The differences between the percentages of the welfare population and the general population in December 2000 were +9 percent in Hennepin County, +10 percent in Ramsey County, -13 percent in the metro suburbs, and -5 percent in the rest of the state.

Economic Characteristics

Table 4 reports the following economic characteristics of Child-Only Assistance and MFIP paid cases in December 2000:

- the number of months the case was active in Minnesota on either AFDC, Family General Assistance (FGA), MFIP, or Child-Only Assistance in the nine-year period between January 1992 and December 2000,⁵
- the number of counted TANF months (i.e., months of MFIP assistance and assistance in other states which counted toward the 60-month lifetime limit) for the eligible adult on the case with the greater number of counted months,⁶
- number of MFIP food-only cases (i.e., cases which received food assistance but no cash assistance),

⁵ Administrative records on the current system (MAXIS) go back to 1991, but the nine-year period was used to provide a comparison with the welfare-length results in the December 1999 report.

⁶ Minnesota and most other states started counting TANF months in July 1997; some states started counting as early as September 1996.

- the number of December 2000 cases which were new to welfare in Minnesota in the year 2000 and how many applicants on these cases had moved to Minnesota during the year,
- earned income in the case budget that produced the grant for December 2000 based on verified income earned in October if available, otherwise on prospective earnings for December (prospective earnings are estimates typically used for new and migrant cases),
- total household income earned by adults financially responsible for the children in the month of December 2000,
- the number of hours worked by adults financially responsible for the children in the month,
- Employment Services exemptions from work and work requirements,
- sanctions reducing grants, and
- child support disbursements, both current and arrears.

Welfare use. Twenty-three percent of cases with two eligible adults, 34 percent of cases with one eligible adult, and 47 percent of Child-Only Assistance cases had been active cases in Minnesota for more than 60 months total in the previous nine years. Compared with December 1999, the percentage of long-term cases was down slightly for cases with eligible adults (-1.7 percent). The percentage of cases with more than five years of welfare use accumulated in the previous nine years was up slightly for child-only cases (+1.4 percent).

Time limit. Eighteen percent of the MFIP cases had already used up more than three and one-half years of TANF grants, the most a continual Minnesota resident receiving TANF could have used by December 2000. Because some states started counting months of assistance toward the TANF 60-month lifetime limit earlier, some December 2000 cases could reach the time limit as early as September 2001. Two hundred forty-six of these cases could potentially reach the limit before July 2002 when the first large group of Minnesotans will reach the limit.

New cases. Twenty-one percent of the MFIP cases and 15 percent of the Child-Only Assistance cases were new cases in 2000 (defined as cases that were not active in Minnesota at any time from 1991 through 1999). Families making up 32 percent of new MFIP cases and 21 percent of new Child-Only Assistance cases had moved into the state during the year 2000.

Forty-four percent of the families in the December 2000 MFIP cases newly opened since the start of TANF in Minnesota in July 1997 had come to Minnesota from another state

or country. The comparable percentage for the Child-Only Assistance cases was 49 percent. These percentages include families returning to Minnesota after an absence.

Food-only cases. MFIP grants include both a cash grant to be spent at the family's discretion and funds that can be spent only for food. As families work their way toward leaving assistance, their cash grant is decreased first, so that some families receive only money for food and the month is not counted toward the TANF lifetime limit. Sometimes cases with small cash grants opt out of the cash portion so the month will not be counted; they still receive the food portion. Nine percent of MFIP cases in December 2000 were food-only cases.

Working. Budgetable counted earnings exclude certain kinds and percentages of earnings and are used, along with family size, to determine the size of the MFIP grant. Thirty-six percent of MFIP cases had earnings budgeted to reduce the MFIP grant in December 2000. Reporting any income, a measure of working, showed that 39 percent of cases with one eligible adult and 62 percent of cases with two eligible adults had an adult working in December 2000. Eight percent of cases with one eligible adult and 24 percent of cases with two eligible adults reported 160 or more hours worked that month.

Exemptions. Twelve percent of adults eligible for MFIP had a non-employment related exemption from Employment Services activities in December 2000. The most frequent reasons were to care for a child under the age of one (5 percent of all eligible adults) or because the adults were ill or incapacitated (3 percent) or because they cared for an ill or incapacitated family member (2 percent). These rates of exemption were the same as reported in December 1999. This section of the table is in terms of numbers of eligible adults, except for the last row that consolidates adults into cases subject to sanction. Cases subject to sanction had an eligible adult on the case who was required to work or to participate in employment-related activities. Eighty-nine percent of MFIP cases were subject to sanction.

Sanctions. Nine percent of all MFIP cases were in sanction status in December 2000; this was 11 percent of cases that were subject to sanction. Sanctions occurred in 12 percent of cases with two eligible adults that were subject to sanction and 10 percent of such cases with one eligible adult; none of the Child-Only Assistance cases were subject to sanction.

Child support. In December 2000, \$1.4 million collected as child support was disbursed on behalf of MFIP families. Seventy-three percent of this amount was disbursed for current child support and the rest for arrears. Support for months in which the custodial family received assistance was retained by the state and federal governments as reimbursement. In December 2000, child support was paid on behalf of children in 16

7

⁷Employment-related exemptions were included in earlier reports, but are not here because data on employment – earnings and work hours – are more reliable indicators of work effort. Employment-related exemptions are granted based on prospective work hours; if those hours are not actually worked, the case can be sanctioned.

percent of MFIP families and 16 percent of Child-Only Assistance cases. Current child support paid to MFIP families was \$100 or less for 21 percent of the cases with payments, between \$100 and \$500 for 75 percent of these cases, and over \$500 for 4 percent of these cases. For Child-Only Assistance cases, the distribution was very similar, with 25 percent of those getting a current child support payment receiving \$100 or less and 2 percent receiving \$500 or more. Starting January 1, 2001, current child support payments are being passed through to families and deducted from grant amounts.

County and Regional Results

Table 5 gives the total number of MFIP paid cases and numbers of each type of case by county and economic region. For example, Anoka County had 1,340 MFIP cases, 86 percent with one and 14 percent with two eligible adults; these cases represented 4.1 percent of all state MFIP cases. This county also had 319 Child-Only Assistance cases, 3.8 percent of the state's Child-Only Assistance cases.

Table 6 through Table 10⁹ contain selected summary data for cases with one eligible adult (a group including 86 percent of MFIP cases). Table 11 gives economic data for cases with two eligible adults. The reader should refer to footnotes in the related state tables ¹⁰ for information needed to interpret findings in these tables. Percentages and means will be less stable from year to year for counties with small caseloads; extreme values are often found for small counties. There is less variability for regional findings.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 6 gives data on age, gender, education, and marital status of MFIP adult participants who were the only eligible adult on their case for all counties and economic regions. The percentages of teens varied across counties from a low of none to a high of 23 percent (vs. between 8 percent and 13 percent for the regions and 10 percent statewide). Percentages of these adults age 30 or older ranged from 14 percent to 80 percent for counties (between 39 percent and 48 percent regionally and 46 percent statewide). Most caregivers (92 percent) were mothers (or grandmothers, aunts, older sisters, etc.), and the range for percentage of females was between 79 percent and 100 percent in the counties. While 43 percent of the eligible adults in this group did not have high school credentials, counties had caseloads with between 14 percent and 60 percent lacking both a high school diploma and a GED. Statewide, nearly two-thirds had never

⁸ The percent of all active MFIP cases with a child support obligation that had disbursements in this month was higher (23%) than the percents reported above because not every MFIP case requires a referral for child support services.

⁹ Means and medians for groups fewer than five are not reported.

 $^{^{10}}$ See Table 2 for notes relating to Tables 6 and 7, Table 3 for Tables 8 and 9, and Table 4 for Tables 10 and 11.

been married (63 percent); this figure was as low as 33 percent and as high as 76 percent in the counties.

Table 7 gives racial/ethnic distributions for the seven largest counties and regions only because of the small numbers in some counties. Percentages of people of color in county caseloads ranged from none to 86 percent compared to 55 percent statewide. Percentages of non-citizens in the individual county caseloads ranged from none to 39 percent compared to 13 percent statewide.

Family Composition and Residence

Table 8 shows the distribution of types of families. Most MFIP families with one eligible adult (95 percent) were caring for their own children. Cases with a pregnant woman and no other children, which made up 3 percent of these cases statewide, ranged from none to 14 percent in the counties. The relative care cases represented between none and 5 percent in the counties, compared to 1 percent statewide. Two-caregiver MFIP families were 6 percent of cases with one adult eligible statewide, and between none and 21 percent in the separate counties.

Table 9 gives statistics on children in MFIP families headed by one eligible adult, including eligible plus ineligible minor children in the family. Percentages of families with one child, two children, three children, and four or more children are given in the left section of the table. The largest families represented between 0 percent and 26 percent of county cases (13 percent statewide). The right section of the table gives data on the age of the youngest child in families, with between 0 percent and 34 percent of families in counties having a child under one year of age (18 percent statewide).

Economic Characteristics

Table 10 gives the following economic measures for welfare use, work and income, exemptions, sanctions, and child support for cases with one eligible adult, and Table 11 gives the same information for cases with two eligible adults:

- the average number of months of family assistance in 1992 through 2000 and the number and percentage of cases with more than 60 months during that time,
- the average number of TANF counted months and the number and percentage of cases with more than 36 months accumulated as of December 2000,
- the number and percentage of all cases which were new to Minnesota family assistance in 2000 and the number and percentage of all cases which were both new and had moved to Minnesota during 2000,
- the number and percentage of food-only cases,

- the number and percentage of cases with earnings counted toward determining the size of the MFIP grant and the average of these budgeted earnings,
- the number and percentage of cases with reported income and the average amount of total income for these cases.
- the number and percentage of cases with reported work hours and the average number of hours worked by employed adults,
- the number and percentage of persons (not cases) with Employment Services nonemployment related exemptions (identical to the percentage of cases for cases with one eligible adult, but equal to the number of exempt persons divided by the total number of eligible adults – two times the number of cases – for cases with two eligible adults),
- the number and percentage of cases with sanctions, and
- the number and percentage of cases with current child support disbursements and the median payment.

As observed for demographic and family composition measures, there was considerable variability in these measures across counties and less variability across regions. For example, the percentage of cases with more than three years of TANF eligibility used was 19 percent statewide and ranged between 0 percent and 33 percent for the counties and between 11 percent and 24 percent for the economic regions. Also, while 39 percent of eligible adults on cases with one eligible adult were working statewide, the counties varied between 21 percent and 68 percent of these cases reporting income. Regions varied between 34 percent and 51 percent of these cases reporting income.

Appendix: Statewide and County/Regional Tables

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of eligible adults on MFIP paid cases in December 2000
Table 3. Family composition and residence of MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases in December 2000.
Table 4. Economic characteristics of MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases in December 2000
Table 5. December 2000 MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases by county and region
Table 6. County and regional demographics of eligible adults on December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult: age, gender, education, and marita status
Table 7. County and regional demographics of eligible adults on December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult: ethnicity and citizenship29
Table 8. Family types of December 2000 MFIP families with one eligible adult by county and region
Table 9. All children in December 2000 MFIP families with one eligible adult by county and region
Table 10. Economic characteristics of December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult by county and region
Table 11. Economic characteristics of December 2000 MFIP paid cases with two eligible adults by county and region

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of eligible adults on MFIP paid cases in December 2000

		[N	/IFIP Paid Case	s
		One	Two	All
Adult Characteristics		Eligible	Eligible	MFIP
		Adult	Adults	Cases
Eligible	Number	27,731	9,248	36,979
Adults	Percent of Total	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Age of Adults	Mean	30.0	30.7	30.1
	Median	28	29	29
	Minimum	12	15	12
	Maximum	83	81	83
Frequency	< 18	605	64	669
		2.2%	0.7%	1.8%
	18 - 19	2,189	512	2,701
		7.9%	5.5%	7.3%
	20 - 29	12,276	4,099	16,375
		44.3%	44.3%	44.3%
	30 - 39	8,075	3,090	11,165
		29.1%	33.4%	30.2%
	40 - 49	3,636	1,174	4,810
		13.1%	12.7%	13.0%
	50 - 59	793	250	1,043
		2.9%	2.7%	2.8%
	60 and over	157	59	216
		0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
Gender	Female	25,639	4,624	30,266
		92.5%	50.0%	81.8%
	Male	2,092	4,624	6,713
		7.5%	50.0%	18.2%
Education	None or Pre-1st Grade	1,741	1,077	2,818
	or Unknown	6.3%	11.6%	7.6%
	Grade School	1,708	739	2,447
		6.2%	8.0%	6.6%
	Some High School	8,473	2,642	11,115
		30.6%	28.6%	30.1%
	High School Graduate	13,177	4073	17,250
		47.5%	44.0%	46.6%
	Some Post-Secondary	2,248	569	2,817
		8.1%	6.2%	7.6%
	College Graduate	227	81	308
		0.8%	0.9%	0.8%
	Graduate Degree	157	67	224
		0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
	High School Graduate or	15,809	4,790	20,599
	Higher	57.0%	51.8%	55.7%

Table 2 (Part 2)

		\(\(\frac{1}{2}\)	MFIP Paid Case	S
Adu	ılt Characteristics	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All MFIP Cases
Marital	Divorced	2,983	207	3,190
Status		10.8%	2.2%	8.6%
	Legally Separated	77	13	90
		0.3%	0.1%	0.2%
	Married, Living with Spouse	1,479	5,469	6,948
		5.3%	59.1%	18.8%
	Never Married	17,590	3,044	20,634
		63.4%	32.9%	55.8%
	Married, Separated	5,239	506	5,745
		18.9%	5.5%	15.5%
	Widowed	363	9	372
		1.3%	0.1%	1.0%
Race/Ethnicity	Asian/Pacific Islander	1,690	1,260	2,950
		6.1%	13.6%	7.9%
	Black	9,686	2,050	11,736
		34.9%	22.2%	31.7%
	Hispanic	1,353	633	1,986
	•	4.9%	6.8%	5.4%
	American Indian	2,547	870	3,417
		9.2%	9.4%	9.2%
	White	12,435	4,425	16,860
		44.8%	47.8%	45.6%
Citizenship	Non-U.S.	3,541	2,540	6,081
		12.8%	27.5%	16.4%
	U.S.	24,190	6,708	30,898
		87.2%	72.5%	83.6%
Non-citizens	Asian	1,230	1,036	2,266
	Percent of All Asians	73.0%	83.1%	77.3%
	Black	1,884	875	2,759
	Percent of All Blacks	19.4%	42.7%	23.5%
	Hispanic	274	132	406
	Percent of All Hispanics	20.3%	20.9%	20.4%
	White .	139	471	610
	Percent of All Whites	1.1%	10.6%	3.6%

Notes: Education: This information may not be reliably entered or updated on MAXIS. Some persons with a code for no education/pre-first grade at application later have that code changed. Increases in education may not be recorded unless they affect eligibility or MFIP requirements (e.g., high school completion for teens). Post-secondary includes some college and/or vocational/technical/business training. Marital status: This information may not be reliably updated on MAXIS after application.

Race/Ethnicity: Ethnicity was missing for 30 eligible adults. The Asian and Pacific Islander categories were combined because of the low number of the latter and the possibility that some were still classified as Asian (the former Asian/Pacific Islander category). A new racial/ethnic coding method which follows the U.S. Census methodology was initiated for new applicants to MAXIS in December 2000; all ongoing recipients will be asked to update their racial choice (yes or no for each of the five racial categories: American Indian, Asian, black, Pacific Islander, white) and ethnicity (Hispanic or not) within one year. Tribal TANF recipients (133 eligible adults, 93% of whom were American Indian) were not included.

Citizenship: Attainment of U.S. citizenship may not be recorded unless it affects eligibility (e.g., an undocumented non-citizen becoming a U.S. citizen) so the number of non-citizens may include some current citizens.

Non-citizens: Percent of all people in the racial/ethnic group for the type of case. Less than 1% of American Indians were non-citizens.

Table 3. Family composition and residence of MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases in December 2000

	Assistance paid cases	Child		IP Paid Cas	es
		Only	One	Two	All
Fan	nily Composition	Paid	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP
		Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases
Cases	Count	8,298	27,731	4,624	32,355
Percen	t of All MFIP & Child-Only Cases	20.4%	68.2%	11.4%	79.6%
Family Type	Natural/Adopted/Step Children	4,929	26,436	4,582	31,018
Count of Cases		59.4%	95.3%	99.1%	95.9%
	Pregnant Only	0	832	23	855
		0.0%	3.0%	0.5%	2.6%
	Relative Care	3,339		10	393
		40.2%	1.4%	0.2%	1.2%
Two-caregiver	Count of Cases	1,890		4,624	6,294
Families	Percent of Cases in Column	22.8%	6.0%	100.0%	19.5%
Ineligible	Relative Caregivers	4,585	19		
Caregivers:		45.0%	1.1%		
Count of Persons	SSI	4,344	1,498		
		42.6%	89.7%		
	Undocumented Non-citizens	993	127		
		9.7%	7.6%		
	Disqualified	218	26		
		2.1%	1.6%		
	Others	48	0		
		0.5%	0.0%		
	Count of Ineligible Caregivers	10,188			
Number of	Mean	1.8	2.0	2.9	2.1
Eligible Children in	Count of Cases	8,298		4,624	32,355
Family &	Median	1	2	2	2
Household	Minimum	0	0	0	0
F	Maximum	13	16	14	16
Frequency of Cases	0	28 0.3%	1,217 4.4%	51 1.1%	1,268 3.9%
	1	4,454		1,138	3.9% 12,618
	1	53.7%		24.6%	39.0%
	2	2,157	7,532	1,271	8,803
	2	26.0%	27.2%	27.5%	27.2%
	3	898	4,077	852	4,929
		10.8%	14.7%	18.4%	15.2%
	4 - 6	653	3,037	1,050	4,087
		7.9%	11.0%	22.7%	12.6%
	7 - 9	99	358	235	593
	-	1.2%	1.3%	5.1%	1.8%
	10 or More	9	30	27	57
		0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%
	Count of Eligible Children	15,275	55,583	13,183	68,766

Table 3 (Part 2)

	Table 3 (F	Child	MF	IP Paid Cas	es
		Only	One	Two	All
Fan	nily Composition	Paid	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP
		Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases
Number of	Frequency of Cases 0	7,800	26,106	4,371	30,477
Ineligible	. ,	94.0%	94.1%	94.5%	94.2%
Children in	1	418	1,458	220	1,678
Family & Household		5.0%	5.3%	4.8%	5.2%
	2	61	144	31	175
		0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%
	3 or More	19	23	2	25
		0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
	Count of Ineligible Children	604	1,818	288	2,106
	Percent of All Children in Column	3.8%	3.2%	2.1%	3.0%
Number of	Mean	1.9	2.1	2.9	2.2
Children in	Count of Cases	8,298	27,731	4,624	32,355
Family &	Median	1	2	2	2
Household	Minimum	0	0	0	0
(All Children)	Maximum	15	16	14	16
Frequency of Cases	0	26	911	32	943
		0.3%	3.3%	0.7%	2.9%
	1	4,238	11,276	1,107	12,383
		51.1%	40.7%	23.9%	38.3%
	2	2,195	7,622	1,255	8,877
		26.5%	27.5%	27.1%	27.4%
	3	977	4,217	872	5,089
		11.8%	15.2%	18.9%	15.7%
	4 - 6	739	3,269	1,081	4,350
		8.9%	11.8%	23.4%	13.4%
	7 - 9	112	400	246	646
		1.3%	1.4%	5.3%	2.0%
	10 or more	11	36	31	67
		0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	0.2%
	Count of All Children	15,879	57,401	13,471	70,872
Age of	Mean	8.5	4.8	3.0	4.5
Youngest Child	Count of Cases	8,272		4,592	31,412
(All Children)	Median	8	3	1	3
	Minimum	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	19	19	18	19
Frequency of Cases	< 1 year old	563	4,959	1,545	6,504
		6.8%	18.5%	33.6%	20.7%
	1-5 years old	2,241	12,349	2,127	14,476
	0.40	27.1%	46.0%	46.3%	46.1%
	6-10 years old	2,236		613	6,155
	44.40	27.0%		13.3%	19.6%
	11-12 years old	917	1,467	118	1,585
	42.45	11.1%	5.5%	2.6%	5.0%
	13-15 years old	1,363		127	1,758
	N45	16.5%	6.1%	2.8%	5.6%
	>15 years old	952	872	62	934
		11.5%	3.3%	1.4%	3.0%

Table 3 (Part 3)

	,	Child	MFIP Paid Cases		
		Only	One	Two	All
	Family Composition	Paid	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP
		Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases
Region	Hennepin County	2,804	9,075	1,148	10,223
		33.8%	32.7%	24.8%	31.6%
	Ramsey County	1,751	5,586	744	6,330
		21.1%	20.1%	16.1%	19.6%
	Metro Suburban	885	3,451	493	3,944
		10.7%	12.4%	10.7%	12.2%
	Greater Minnesota	2,858	9,619	2,239	11,858
		34.4%	34.7%	48.4%	36.6%

Notes:

Data in table reflect the number and percentage of cases except as noted for counts of ineligible caregivers and counts of ineligible children; these entries are counts of people.

Missing cases: There were 855 cases with no children which had only a pregnant woman and sometimes a spouse eligible; these cases were missing for age of youngest child. There were 119 cases with no administrative link to a child or pregnancy; these cases were missing for family type and child variables. Reasons included such things as parent panels dropped because all children were leaving the household, pregnancy panels not yet entered, parents of minor parents or minor pregnant applicants who were on their own case, missing data panels, and coding errors (0.3% of all cases).

Caregivers: Included (1) all eligible adults including parents, pregnant women and their spouses with no other children in the family, and relative caregivers who were included in the grant, (2) parents linked to eligible children and in the household according to administrative records who were themselves receiving SSI, were undocumented non-citizens, or were disqualified (e.g., for a fraud conviction), and (3) relative caregivers and their resident spouses who were not included in the MFIP case. Thus, among the cases with one eligible adult, there were 1,670 two-caregiver families (19 with two relative caregivers, the rest with two parents); 90% had one parent eligible for MFIP and the other receiving disability payments. Among the 4,585 ineligible relative caregivers, 260 were receiving SSI and 2 were undocumented non-citizens.

Ineligible children: These were children not included on the MFIP grant, primarily children receiving SSI payments, but also including 16 foster care children. There were 327 cases with ineligible children only.

Duplicate cases: There were 30 children who were eligible and included on two cases, typically during a transition between cases.

Two-caregiver families. Adults (caregivers or not) associated with child-only cases are coded as not unit members. Thus, while the applicant caregiver is known to be in the household, records concerning spouses of the applicant (both marital status and absence) may not always be updated so that the number of two-relative caregiver families is less reliable than comparable numbers for MFIP cases.

Table 4. Economic characteristics of MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases in December 2000

		Child	MFIP Paid Cases			
		Only	One	Two	All	
Economic Characteristics of Cases		Paid	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP	
		Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases	
Cases	Count	8,298	27,731	4,624	32,355	
	Percent of Total Assistance Cases	20.4%	68.0%	11.3%	79.4%	
Welfare in Minnesota (Months):	Mean	56.9	45.7	36.3	44.3	
1992 - 2000	Median	55	36	26	34	
Frequency of Cases	1 - 12 Months	1,369	6,632	1,407	8,039	
		16.5%	23.9%	30.4%	24.8%	
	13 - 24 Months	990	4,127	833	4,960	
		11.9%	14.9%	18.0%	15.3%	
	25 - 36 Months	816	3,294	586	3,880	
		9.8%	11.9%	12.7%	12.0%	
	37- 48 Months	644	2,215	393	2,608	
		7.8%	8.0%	8.5%	8.1%	
	49 - 60 Months	592	1,997	323	2,320	
		7.1%	7.2%	7.0%	7.2%	
	Over 60 Months	3,887	9,466	1,082	10,548	
		46.8%	34.1%	23.4%	32.6%	
TANF Time (Months):	Mean		20.3	17.8	20.0	
Maximum for Eligible Adult	Median		20	15	19	
Sept. 1996 to Dec. 2000	Maximum		52	52	52	
Frequency of Cases	No TANF Months		2,060	200	2,260	
			7.4%	4.3%	7.0%	
	1 - 6 Months		4,710	1,044	5,754	
			17.0%	22.6%	17.8%	
	7 - 12 Months		3,533	747	4,280	
			12.7%	16.2%	13.2%	
	13 - 18 Months		3,074	622	3,696	
			11.1%	13.5%	11.4%	
	19 - 24 Months		2,765	535	3,300	
			10.0%	11.6%	10.2%	
	25 - 30 Months		3,296	488	3,784	
			11.9%	10.6%	11.7%	
	31 - 36 Months		2,963	431	3,394	
			10.7%	9.3%	10.5%	
	37 - 42 Months		5,131	510	5,641	
			18.5%	11.0%	17.4%	
	43 - 48 Months		111	25	136	
			0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	
	49 - 52 Months		88	22	110	
			0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	
New Welfare Cases in 2000	Minnesota Residents	976	4,042	657	4,699	
	Percent of New Cases	78.8%	70.6%	54.2%	67.7%	
	Moved into State	263	1,681	556	2,237	
	Percent of New Cases	21.2%	29.4%	45.8%	32.3%	
	Total of New Cases	1,239	5,723	1,213	6,936	
	Percent of All Cases	14.9%	20.6%	26.2%	21.4%	

Table 4 (Part 2)

	Table 4 (Par	Child	М	FIP Paid Cas	es
Economic Ch	aracteristics of Cases	Only Paid Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All MFIP Cases
MFIP Payments	Food-Only Cases	78	2,302	725	3,027
•	Percent of All Cases	0.9%	8.3%	15.7%	9.4%
December Budgeted Earnings	Mean		\$406	\$543	\$437
	Median		\$375	\$511	\$400
	Count of Cases		8,981	2,569	11,550
	Percent of All Cases		32.4%	55.6%	35.7%
December Total Income	Mean		\$845	\$1,158	\$910
	Median		\$748	\$1,042	\$800
Income per Case / Working	Count of Cases		10,830	2,848	13,678
	Percent of All Cases		39.1%	61.6%	42.3%
December Monthly Work Hours	Mean		100	135	107
-	Median		100	136	103
Work Hours per Case	Count of Cases		10,711	2,827	13,538
	Percent of All Cases		38.6%	61.1%	41.8%
	1 - 79 Hours		4,086	721	4,807
			14.7%	15.6%	14.9%
	80 - 119 Hours		2,413	458	2,871
			8.7%	9.9%	8.9%
	120 - 159 Hours		2,112	543	2,655
			7.6%	11.7%	8.2%
	160 Hours or More		2,100	1,105	3,205
			7.6%	23.9%	9.9%
Employment Services Exemption	s Non-employment Related		3,418	1,104	4,522
Count of Adults	Percent of Eligible Adults		12.2%	11.9%	12.3%
	Age 60 or Older		150	59	209
			0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
	Pregnancy/Incapacitated		116	18	134
			0.4%	0.2%	0.4%
	III/Incapacitated More than 30 Days		744	312	1,056
			2.7%	3.4%	2.9%
	Care of III/Incapacitated Family		650	154	804
	Member		2.3%	1.7%	2.2%
	Personal/Family Crisis		289	59	348
			1.0%	0.6%	0.9%
	Care of Child under 1 Year Old		1,357	501	1,858
			4.9%	5.4%	5.0%
	Domestic Violence Safety Plan		112	1	113
			0.4%	0.0%	0.3%
	Cases Subject to Sanction	0	24,249	4,534	28,783
	Percent of All Cases	0.0%	87.4%	98.1%	89.0%
Employment Services Sanctions	Cases with ES Sanctions		2,507	551	3,058
	Percent of All Cases		9.0%	11.9%	9.5%
50.0	Percent Cases Subject to Sanction		10.2%	12.1%	10.5%
ES Sanction	10%		803	146	949
Percent of All Cases	200/		2.9%	3.2%	3.0%
ES Sanction	30%		1,704	405	2,109
Percent of All Cases			6.1%	8.8%	6.5%

Table 4 (Part 3)

		Child	MFIP Paid Cases		es
		Only	One	Two	All
Economic Ch	naracteristics of Cases	Paid	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP
		Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases
Child Support Disbursements	Current Mean	\$186	\$214	\$172	\$212
	Median	\$163	\$183	\$144	\$180
	Count	1,261	4,662	251	4,913
	Percent of Cases	15.2%	16.8%	5.4%	15.2%
	Sum	\$234,050	\$998,702	\$43,248	\$1,041,950
	Arrears Mean	\$115	\$115	\$112	\$115
	Median	\$58	\$62	\$68	\$62
	Count	800	3,124	171	3,295
	Percent of Cases	9.6%	11.3%	3.7%	10.2%
	Sum	\$92,340	\$360,482	\$19,188	\$379,669
	Total Mean	\$240	\$270	\$228	\$267
	Median	\$193	\$218	\$194	\$216
	Count	1,358	5,035	274	5,309
	Percent of Cases	16.4%	18.2%	5.9%	16.4%
	Sum	\$325,365	\$1,357,413	\$62,436	\$1,419,849

Notes:

Welfare: The total length of time on MFIP, AFDC, and FGA in Minnesota during the years 1992 through 2000. This was the number of months the case was active in a family cash assistance program (FGA, AFDC, MFIP, or Child Only Assistance) from January 1992 to December 2000. A nine-year period was chosen for comparison with the table in last year's report. Record-keeping on the MAXIS system started in 1991.

TANF time: Maximum number of months of counted eligibility for TANF between July 1997 and December 2000 of any adult eligible on the case; the lifetime limit of TANF eligibility as of December 2000 was 60 months. Minnesota started counting TANF time in July 1997; several other states started counting sooner, as early as September 1996. Totals include months counted in other states.

New welfare cases: New welfare cases for 2000 were December 2000 cases active in a family cash assistance program in Minnesota for one or more months in 2000 but active for zero months in 1991 through 1999. Cases new to the state had a former state with a 2000 state entry date in MAXIS; Minnesota residents were either lifelong residents or had moved into the state before 2000. (This definition is consistent with the December 1999 report definition, but different from that used in the 1997 and 1998 reports.) The 2,500 persons on new welfare cases who were also new to Minnesota in 2000 came from 49 states, two territories, and the District of Columbia; 572 came directly from a foreign country. States with the most such in-migrants on MFIP in the December 2000 caseload included Illinois (341), California (285), Texas (175), and Wisconsin (159), historically the main sources of new cases moving into the state.

Budgeted earnings: The case budget excludes some income in setting the level of the grant. These budgeted earnings are the amount on the December budget for the case, whether retrospective (based on income reported as earned in October) or prospective (based on projected income for December for cases in the first two months on MFIP or with a significant change in income and for most migrants). Budgeted earnings equal the actual or projected earnings less child support payments and other allocations, less expenses for self-employment income, less work study earnings, less earnings of students under age 20 attending school at least half-time, and then less a 38% disregard. Budgeted earnings are deducted from the grant level which is based on the number of family members eligible. Mean budgeted earnings were computed for cases which had budgeted earnings greater than zero. Very rarely are earnings for child-only cases used in computing the grant (0.2% of Child Only Assistance cases).

Total income: Total income was either actual or projected December 2000 income of eligible adults. The amount used was either verified retrospective earnings in February 2001 or zero for cases still active in February 2001 with no income reported for December 2000 or as prospective December 2000 total income otherwise and for all migrant cases (only 9 in December). Total income was gross income except for the self-employed where it was gross income less expenses, with a minimum of zero. Mean total income excluded cases with no verified or expected income from eligible adults in December 2000. This amount was labeled "gross income" in previous reports.

Table 4 Notes (Continued)

Work hours: The hours for eligible adults corresponding to total income: February 2001 retrospective hours or December 2000 prospective hours, as for total income. The hours are totals for the case. Some cases with income reported were missing hours. Mean hours included cases with any hours reported for eligible adults.

Employment Services (ES) exemptions: A person with a non-work related ES exemption in a month is not required to work or do other work-related activities during that month. (Note that the ES exemption does not stop the month counting toward use of TANF time.) The rest of the eligible persons were either mandated to participate in ES activities or were exempt because they anticipated working the required number of hours or did not have an ES assignment. For this variable, the percentages are of eligible adults rather than cases because exemptions are granted to individuals, not cases (this is the same thing for cases with one eligible adult). Adults with child-only cases are not subject to ES requirements, so do not need exemptions. The last line in this section gives the number of cases which were subject to sanction; this includes cases with at least one eligible adult either mandated to participate in ES or exempt for anticipated work hours. Excluded cases include those which only have persons with the exemptions listed above or who had not yet been assigned (64 persons on one-eligible adult cases and 18 persons on cases with two eligible adults). Sanctions may be applied in cases where the person does not perform the ES activities or work the anticipated hours.

Sanctions: For one eligible adult not complying in 2000, the first ES sanction was 10%, while the first sanction for two eligible adults both not complying was 30%. If not fixed, the sanction was increased to the maximum of 30%. Nineteen of the cases listed as having a 10% ES sanction also had a child support sanction, bringing their sanction for the month to 25%. Before the percentage of sanctionable cases which had sanctions was computed, cases with a person having both sanction and exemption recorded in the same month (24 cases with one eligible adult and 4 cases with two eligible adults) were subtracted from the number of sanctions because these cases were not included in the number of sanctionable cases. (Note that the first sanction for not cooperating with child support enforcement is 25%.)

Child Support: Disbursements made in December 2000 from payments made to Child Support Enforcement Division on behalf of children in MFIP families. Includes both current payments and payments made for arrears on past months. In 2000, current payments were retained by the state for current MFIP expenses and arears were retained if arears were owed to the state. Starting January 1, 2001, current payments were passed through to the non-custodial parent and counted against the MFIP grant.

Table 5. December 2000 MFIP and Child-Only Assistance paid cases by county and region

	Child-Or	nly Cases	MFIP Paid Cases				
		Percent	One	Two	All	Percent	
County/Region	Paid	of State	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP	of State	
	Cases	Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases	Cases	
Aitkin	28		78	27	105		
		0.3%	74.3%	25.7%	100.0%	0.3%	
Anoka	319		1,149	191	1,340		
		3.8%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	4.1%	
Becker	81		245	62	307		
		1.0%	79.8%	20.2%	100.0%	0.9%	
Beltrami	286		800	185	985		
		3.4%	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%	3.0%	
Benton	31		145	26	171		
		0.4%	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%	0.5%	
Big Stone	3		24	10	34		
		0.0%	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%	0.1%	
Blue Earth	43		225	53	278		
		0.5%	80.9%	19.1%	100.0%	0.9%	
Brown	16		65	20	85		
		0.2%	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%	0.3%	
Carlton	61		177	29	206		
		0.7%	85.9%	14.1%	100.0%	0.6%	
Carver	29		77	14	91		
		0.3%	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%	0.3%	
Cass	98		277	69	346		
		1.2%	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%	1.1%	
Chippewa	7		34	8	42		
		0.1%	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%	0.1%	
Chisago	28		127	28	155		
		0.3%	81.9%	18.1%	100.0%	0.5%	
Clay	92		351	96	447		
		1.1%	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%	1.4%	
Clearwater	29	2 20/	65	32	97		
		0.3%	67.0%	33.0%	100.0%	0.3%	
Cook	3	0.00/	5	3	8	0.00/	
Cattanina	20	0.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	0.0%	
Cottonwood	20	0.20/	43	9	52	0.20/	
Crow Wing	98	0.2%	82.7% 237	17.3% 54	100.0% 291	0.2%	
Crow wing	96	1.2%	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%	0.9%	
Dakota	239	1.2%	900	90	990	0.9%	
Dakota	239	2.9%	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	3.1%	
Dodge	11	2.976	41	5	46	J. 1 76	
Douge	11	0.1%	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%	0.1%	
Douglas	20	0.170	110	22	132	0.170	
Jougius		0.2%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.4%	
Faribault	9	J. 2 70	47	12	59	5,170	
- willowit		0.1%	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%	0.2%	
Fillmore	15	3.170	36	12	48	5.270	
		0.2%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.1%	
Freeborn	43	5.270	173	40	213	5,170	
	, -	0.5%	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%	0.7%	

Table 5 (Part 2)

	Child-Or	ly Cases	5 (Part 2) MFIP Paid Cases					
		Percent	One	Two	All	Percent		
County/Region	Paid	of State	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP	of State		
	Cases	Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases	Cases		
Goodhue	22	Cases	127	15	142	Cases		
Goodilde	22	0.3%	89.4%	10.6%	100.0%	0.4%		
Grant	3	0.5%	15	10.6%	19	0.4 %		
Grain	3	0.0%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.1%		
Hennepin	2.804	0.0%	9,075	1148	100.0%	0.176		
Пеннерш	2,804	33.8%	88.8%	11.2%	100.0%	31.6%		
Houston	7	33.070	47	8	55	31.070		
liouston	,	0.1%	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%	0.2%		
Hubbard	36	O. 1 76	96	29	125	0.276		
liubbaiu	30	0.4%	76.8%	23.2%	100.0%	0.4%		
lsanti	30	0.470	134	30	164	0.4 70		
	30	0.4%	81.7%	18.3%	100.0%	0.5%		
Itasca	93	J. 70	216	46	262	0.070		
	33	1.1%	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%	0.8%		
Jackson	9	1, 1 70	21	11	32	0.070		
		0.1%	65.6%	34.4%	100.0%	0.1%		
Kanabec	25	O . 1 70	69	16	85	0.170		
Ranabee	25	0.3%	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%	0.3%		
Kandiyohi	64	0.570	256	68	324	0.070		
Kanaiyom	0 4	0.8%	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%	1.0%		
Kittson	1	0.070	7 7	4	11	1.070		
Taltison	'	0.0%	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%	0.0%		
Koochiching	23	0.070	79	24	103	0.070		
Rooding	2.5	0.3%	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%	0.3%		
Lac Qui Prarie	2	0.570	14	3	17	0.070		
Luo Qui i iuno	_	0.0%	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%	0.1%		
Lake	9	3.370	25	3	28	5.170		
Luno		0.1%	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%	0.1%		
Lake of Woods	1	3.170	16	2	18	5.170		
		0.0%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.1%		
Le Sueur	23	0,070	66	11	77	51175		
		0.3%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.2%		
Lincoln	1	0,070	17	2	19	5.275		
		0.0%	89.5%	10.5%	100.0%	0.1%		
Lyon	31	27272	77	24	101			
		0.4%	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%	0.3%		
McLeod	18		78	22	100			
		0.2%	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%	0.3%		
Mahnomen	36		97	16	113			
		0.4%	85.8%	14.2%	100.0%	0.3%		
Marshall	7		28	8	36			
		0.1%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.1%		
Martin	31		82	19	101			
		0.4%	81.2%	18.8%	100.0%	0.3%		
Meeker	23		66	11	77			
		0.3%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.2%		
Mille Lacs	60		126	23	149			
		0.7%	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%	0.5%		
Morrison	30		109	24	133			
		0.4%	82.0%	18.0%	100.0%	0.4%		

Table 5 (Part 3)

Table 5 (Part 3) Child-Only Cases MFIP Paid Cases										
	Child-Or				es					
		Percent	One	Two	All	Percent				
County/Region	Paid	of State	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP	of State				
	Cases	Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases	Cases				
Mower	44		175	34	209					
		0.5%	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%	0.6%				
Murray	5		18	5	23					
		0.1%	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%	0.1%				
Nicollet	29		114	28	142					
		0.3%	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%	0.4%				
Nobles	32		100	25	125					
		0.4%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.4%				
Norman	11		24	13	37					
		0.1%	64.9%	35.1%	100.0%	0.1%				
Olmsted	135		481	96	577					
		1.6%	83.4%	16.6%	100.0%	1.8%				
Otter Tail	53		186	62	248					
		0.6%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.8%				
Pennington	14		51	11	62					
		0.2%	82.3%	17.7%	100.0%	0.2%				
Pine	36		168	44	212					
		0.4%	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%	0.7%				
Pipestone	8		29	13	42					
		0.1%	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%	0.1%				
Polk	35		227	78	305					
		0.4%	74.4%	25.6%	100.0%	0.9%				
Pope	9		17	5	22					
		0.1%	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%	0.1%				
Ramsey	1,751		5,586	744	6,330					
		21.1%	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%	19.6%				
Red Lake	1		14	1	15					
		0.0%	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%	0.0%				
Redwood	16		53	10	63					
		0.2%	84.1%	15.9%	100.0%	0.2%				
Renville	18		53	21	74					
		0.2%	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%	0.2%				
Rice	57		170	25	195					
		0.7%	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%	0.6%				
Rock	10		22	5	27					
_		0.1%	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%	0.1%				
Roseau	9	0.407	22	3	25	0.40/				
		0.1%	88.0%	12.0%	100.0%	0.1%				
St. Louis	410	4.007	1,532	309	1,841	F 70'				
6	4-7	4.9%	83.2%	16.8%	100.0%	5.7%				
Scott	47	0.007	158	24	182	0.00/				
Sharburra	26	0.6%	86.8%	13.2%	100.0%	0.6%				
Sherburne	36	0.407	167	18	185	0.00/				
Sibloy	40	0.4%	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%	0.6%				
Sibley	12	0.40/	41 75.00/	13	54	0.20/				
Stoorno	114	0.1%	75.9%	24.1%	100.0%	0.2%				
Stearns	114	4.407	438	78	516	4.00/				
Stoolo	22	1.4%	84.9%	15.1%	100.0%	1.6%				
Steele	33	0.40/	163	40	203	0.60/				
Stavono	6	0.4%	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%	0.6%				
Stevens	6	0.40/	21	4	25	0.40/				
<u></u>		0.1%	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	0.1%				

Table 5 (Part 4)

	Child-Or	nly Cases	<u> </u>	IP Paid Cas	ses	
		Percent	One	Two	All	Percent
County/Region	Paid	of State	Eligible	Eligible	MFIP	of State
	Cases	Cases	Adult	Adults	Cases	Cases
Swift	10		34	6	40	
		0.1%	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	0.1%
Todd	41		87	25	112	
		0.5%	77.7%	22.3%	100.0%	0.3%
Traverse	4		18	2	20	
		0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.1%
Wabasha	18		40	9	49	
		0.2%	81.6%	18.4%	100.0%	0.2%
Wadena	24		79	25	104	
		0.3%	76.0%	24.0%	100.0%	0.3%
Waseca	14		87	20	107	
\A/ - !4	407	0.2%	81.3%	18.7%	100.0%	0.3%
Washington	107	4.00/	504	65	569	4.007
Watenwar	20	1.3%	88.6%	11.4%	100.0%	1.8%
Watonwan	30	0.40/	47	17	64	0.20/
\A/:11::		0.4%	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%	0.2%
Wilkin	6	0.40/	31	6	37	0.40/
\a_r.		0.1%	83.8%	16.2%	100.0%	0.1%
Winona	59	0.70/	141	32	173	0.50/
VA/vii aula 4	50	0.7%	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%	0.5%
Wright	50	0.00/	235	33	268	0.00/
Vallani Madiaina		0.6%	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%	0.8%
Yellow Medicine	6	0.40/	24	7	31	0.10/
N41 4	70	0.1%	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%	0.1%
Northwest	78	0.00/	373	118	491	4.50/
West Central	953	0.9%	76.0%	24.0% 724	100.0% 3,581	1.5%
west Central	955	11.5%	2,857 79.8%	20.2%	100.0%	11.1%
Northeast	627	11.570	2,112	441	2,553	11.170
Northeast	027	7.6%	82.7%	17.3%	100.0%	7.9%
Central	533	7.570	2,062	418	2,480	7.570
Contrai	000	6.4%	83.1%	16.9%	100.0%	7.7%
Southwest	160	0.470	510	138	648	7.770
Coddinioot	100	1.9%	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%	2.0%
South Central	207	11070	774	193	967	
		2.5%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	3.0%
Southeast	444		1,594	316	1,910	
		5.4%	83.5%	16.5%	100.0%	5.9%
Metro Suburban	741		2,788	384	3,172	
		8.9%	87.9%	12.1%	100.0%	9.8%
Core Metro	4,555		14,661	1,892	16,553	
		54.9%	88.6%	11.4%	100.0%	51.2%
Minnesota	8,298		27,731	4,624	32,355	
		100.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6. County and regional demographics of eligible adults on December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult: age, gender, education, and marital status

0 (0 : /					Status	110		ı		
County/Region/		001	30 or			HS or			Never	041
State	Teens	20's	Older	Female	< HS	GED	> HS		Married	
Aitkin	6	32	40	68	27	42	9	5	36	37
	7.7%	41.0%	51.3%	87.2%	34.6%	53.8%	11.5%	6.4%	46.2%	47.4%
Anoka	113	587	449	1,085	381	642	126	39	762	348
	9.8%	51.1%	39.1%	94.4%	33.2%	55.9%	11.0%	3.4%	66.3%	30.3%
Becker	27	96	122	215	90	137	18	11	135	99
	11.0%	39.2%	49.8%	87.8%	36.7%	55.9%	7.3%	4.5%	55.1%	40.4%
Beltrami	80	363	357	732	359	375	66	13	584	203
	10.0%	45.4%	44.6%	91.5%	44.9%	46.9%	8.3%	1.6%	73.0%	25.4%
Benton	18	85	42	134	51	83	11	5	97	43
	12.4%	58.6%	29.0%	92.4%	35.2%	57.2%	7.6%	3.4%	66.9%	29.7%
Big Stone	4	6	14	20	11	10	3	0	11	13
	16.7%	25.0%	58.3%	83.3%	45.8%	41.7%	12.5%	0.0%	45.8%	54.2%
Blue Earth	25	113	87	212	76	112	37	10	131	84
	11.1%	50.2%	38.7%	94.2%	33.8%	49.8%	16.4%	4.4%	58.2%	37.3%
Brown	15	33	17	63	25	34	6	3	38	24
	23.1%	50.8%	26.2%	96.9%	38.5%	52.3%	9.2%	4.6%	58.5%	36.9%
Carlton	12	87	78	163	37	114	26	10	87	80
	6.8%	49.2%	44.1%	92.1%	20.9%	64.4%	14.7%	5.6%	49.2%	45.2%
Carver	10	37	30	72	36	35	6	5	39	33
	13.0%	48.1%	39.0%	93.5%	46.8%	45.5%	7.8%	6.5%	50.6%	42.9%
Cass	17	95	165	240	123	132	22	11	177	89
	6.1%	34.3%	59.6%	86.6%	44.4%	47.7%	7.9%	4.0%	63.9%	32.1%
Chippewa	6	9	19	33	9	20	5	0	21	13
	17.6%	26.5%	55.9%	97.1%	26.5%	58.8%	14.7%	0.0%	61.8%	38.2%
Chisago	8	70	49	119	48	67	12	8	73	46
	6.3%	55.1%	38.6%	93.7%	37.8%	52.8%	9.4%	6.3%	57.5%	36.2%
Clay	34	163	154	314	139	170	42	18	198	135
	9.7%	46.4%	43.9%	89.5%	39.6%	48.4%	12.0%	5.1%	56.4%	38.5%
Clearwater	3	30	32	60	26	35	4	0	36	29
	4.6%	46.2%	49.2%	92.3%	40.0%	53.8%	6.2%	0.0%	55.4%	44.6%
Cook	0	3	2	5	1	3	1	0	3	2
	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Cottonwood	6	21	16	39	19	20	4	3	19	21
	14.0%	48.8%	37.2%	90.7%	44.2%	46.5%	9.3%	7.0%	44.2%	48.8%
Crow Wing	25	119	93	222	79	128	30	10	130	97
_	10.5%	50.2%	39.2%	93.7%	33.3%	54.0%	12.7%	4.2%	54.9%	40.9%
Dakota	80	454	366	859	296	472	132	26	570	304
	8.9%	50.4%	40.7%	95.4%	32.9%	52.4%	14.7%	2.9%	63.3%	33.8%
Dodge	4	17	20	37	20	19	2	3	23	15
_	9.8%	41.5%	48.8%	90.2%	48.8%	46.3%	4.9%	7.3%	56.1%	36.6%
Douglas	17	56	37	107	23	74	13	1	66	43
_	15.5%	50.9%	33.6%	97.3%	20.9%	67.3%	11.8%	0.9%	60.0%	39.1%
Faribault	8	20	19	41	13	30	4	5	25	17
	17.0%	42.6%	40.4%	87.2%	27.7%	63.8%	8.5%	10.6%	53.2%	36.2%
Fillmore	3	24	9	35	14	22	0	2	23	11
	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%	97.2%	38.9%	61.1%	0.0%	5.6%	63.9%	30.6%
Freeborn	19	75	79	159	83	75	15	10	91	72
	11.0%	43.4%	45.7%	91.9%	48.0%	43.4%	8.7%	5.8%	52.6%	41.6%

Table 6 (Part 2)

				abie 6 (rait Zj			_		
County/Region/			30 or			HS or			Never	
State	Teens	20's	Older	Female	< HS	GED	> HS	Married	Married	Others
Goodhue	6	66	55	114	37	82	8	4	76	47
	4.7%	52.0%	43.3%	89.8%	29.1%	64.6%	6.3%	3.1%	59.8%	37.0%
Grant	1	2	12	15	4	8	3	1	5	9
	6.7%	13.3%	80.0%	100.0%	26.7%	53.3%	20.0%	6.7%	33.3%	60.0%
Hennepin	903	3887	4,285	8,476	4,345	3,967	763	383	6,314	2,378
	10.0%	42.8%	47.2%	93.4%	47.9%	43.7%	8.4%	4.2%	69.6%	26.2%
Houston	3	23	21	42	8	31	8	3	26	18
	6.4%	48.9%	44.7%	89.4%	17.0%	66.0%	17.0%	6.4%	55.3%	38.3%
Hubbard	12	36	48	91	42	42	12	3	51	42
	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	94.8%	43.8%	43.8%	12.5%	3.1%	53.1%	43.8%
Isanti	18	70	46	129	38	75	21	1	78	55
	13.4%	52.2%	34.3%	96.3%	28.4%	56.0%	15.7%	0.7%	58.2%	41.0%
ltas ca	15	85	116	189	55	141	20	10	108	98
	6.9%	39.4%	53.7%	87.5%	25.5%	65.3%	9.3%	4.6%	50.0%	45.4%
Jackson	2	12	7	20	8	11	2	1	9	11
	9.5%	57.1%	33.3%	95.2%	38.1%	52.4%	9.5%	4.8%	42.9%	52.4%
Kanabec	9	28	32	65	31	34	4	2	33	34
	13.0%	40.6%	46.4%	94.2%	44.9%	49.3%	5.8%	2.9%	47.8%	49.3%
Kandiyohi	36	118	102	226	142	93	21	22	126	108
	14.1%	46.1%	39.8%	88.3%	55.5%	36.3%	8.2%	8.6%	49.2%	42.2%
Kittson	1	5	1	7	3	3	1	1	4	2
	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	100.0%	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%
Koochiching	6	33	40	72	28	48	3	9	38	32
J	7.6%	41.8%	50.6%	91.1%	35.4%	60.8%	3.8%	11.4%	48.1%	40.5%
Lac Qui Prarie	3	3	8	11	3	7	4	3	7	4
·	21.4%	21.4%	57.1%	78.6%	21.4%	50.0%	28.6%	21.4%	50.0%	28.6%
Lake	2	7	16	23	7	12	6	1	11	13
	8.0%	28.0%	64.0%	92.0%	28.0%	48.0%	24.0%	4.0%	44.0%	52.0%
Lake of Woods	2	5	9	15	6	10	0	2	8	6
	12.5%	31.3%	56.3%	93.8%	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%
Le Sueur	7	34	25	58	29	33	4	3	36	27
	10.6%	51.5%	37.9%	87.9%	43.9%	50.0%	6.1%	4.5%	54.5%	40.9%
Lincoln	3	5	9	15	6	10	1	1	6	10
	17.6%	29.4%	52.9%	88.2%	35.3%	58.8%	5.9%	5.9%	35.3%	58.8%
Lyon	11	36	30	73	35	21	21	8	40	29
	14.3%	46.8%	39.0%	94.8%	45.5%	27.3%	27.3%	10.4%	51.9%	37.7%
McLeod	12	38	28	71	38	36	4	5	43	30
	15.4%	48.7%	35.9%	91.0%	48.7%	46.2%	5.1%	6.4%	55.1%	38.5%
Mahnomen	9	47	41	87	33	54	10	2	68	27
	9.3%	48.5%	42.3%	89.7%	34.0%	55.7%	10.3%	2.1%	70.1%	27.8%
Marshall	3	11	14	25	9	17	2	2	14	12
	10.7%	39.3%	50.0%	89.3%	32.1%	60.7%	7.1%	7.1%	50.0%	42.9%
Martin	7	39	36	80	22	52	8	4	38	40
	8.5%	47.6%	43.9%	97.6%	26.8%	63.4%	9.8%	4.9%	46.3%	48.8%
Meeker	7	26	33	62	20	38	8	1	32	33
	10.6%	39.4%	50.0%	93.9%	30.3%	57.6%	12.1%	1.5%	48.5%	50.0%
Mille Lacs	12	53	61	111	37	83	6	4	65	57
-	9.5%	42.1%	48.4%	88.1%	29.4%	65.9%	4.8%	3.2%	51.6%	45.2%
Morrison	17	42	50	105	39	62	8	0	56	53
	15.6%	38.5%	45.9%	96.3%	35.8%	56.9%	7.3%	0.0%	51.4%	48.6%
	13.070	03.070	10.070	00.070	00.070	00.070	7.070	3.0 70	01.770	13.070

Table 6 (Part 3)

				abie 6 (rait 3)					
County/Region/			30 or			HS or			Never	
State	Teens	20's	Older	Female	< HS	GED	> HS	Married	Married	Others
Mower	24	89	62	164	71	88	16	12	111	52
	13.7%	50.9%	35.4%	93.7%	40.6%	50.3%	9.1%	6.9%	63.4%	29.7%
Murray	3	6	9	15	6	10	2	2	7	9
	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	83.3%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	11.1%	38.9%	50.0%
Nicollet	10	61	43	110	42	54	18	6	64	44
	8.8%	53.5%	37.7%	96.5%	36.8%	47.4%	15.8%	5.3%	56.1%	38.6%
Nobles	9	41	50	85	60	32	8	16	4 5	39
	9.0%	41.0%	50.0%	85.0%	60.0%	32.0%	8.0%	16.0%	45.0%	39.0%
Norman	2	8	14	23	8	14	2	1	10	13
	8.3%	33.3%	58.3%	95.8%	33.3%	58.3%	8.3%	4.2%	41.7%	54.2%
Olmsted	57	179	245	440	249	205	27	42	206	233
	11.9%	37.2%	50.9%	91.5%	51.8%	42.6%	5.6%	8.7%	42.8%	48.4%
Otter Tail	19	75	92	162	71	91	24	12	81	93
	10.2%	40.3%	49.5%	87.1%	38.2%	48.9%	12.9%	6.5%	43.5%	50.0%
Pennington	3	19	29	48	18	26	7	1	27	23
_	5.9%	37.3%	56.9%	94.1%	35.3%	51.0%	13.7%	2.0%	52.9%	45.1%
Pine	16	69	83	150	55	95	18	10	78	80
	9.5%	41.1%	49.4%	89.3%	32.7%	56.5%	10.7%	6.0%	46.4%	47.6%
Pipestone	4	12	13	26	13	12	4	0	15	14
•	13.8%	41.4%	44.8%	89.7%	44.8%	41.4%	13.8%	0.0%	51.7%	48.3%
Polk	25	96	106	212	80	123	24	12	125	90
	11.0%	42.3%	46.7%	93.4%	35.2%	54.2%	10.6%	5.3%	55.1%	39.6%
Pope	0	10	7	15	6	9	2	1	8	8
<u>.</u>	0.0%	58.8%	41.2%	88.2%	35.3%	52.9%	11.8%	5.9%	47.1%	47.1%
Ramsey	554	2,333	2,699	5,097	2,746	2,344	496	516	3,690	1,380
ŗ	9.9%	41.8%	48.3%	91.2%	49.2%	42.0%	8.9%	9.2%	66.1%	24.7%
Red Lake	1	8	5	13	2	11	1	1	9	4
	7.1%	57.1%	35.7%	92.9%	14.3%	78.6%	7.1%	7.1%	64.3%	28.6%
Redwood	5	25	23	48	25	18	10	4	26	23
	9.4%	47.2%	43.4%	90.6%	47.2%	34.0%	18.9%	7.5%	49.1%	43.4%
Renville	4	32	17	48	23	27	3	5	25	23
	7.5%	60.4%	32.1%	90.6%	43.4%	50.9%	5.7%	9.4%	47.2%	43.4%
Rice	18	84	68	159	79	80	11	3	99	68
	10.6%	49.4%	40.0%	93.5%	46.5%	47.1%	6.5%	1.8%	58.2%	40.0%
Rock	5	11	6	22	8	12	2	1	14	7
	22.7%	50.0%	27.3%	100.0%	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	4.5%	63.6%	31.8%
Roseau	1	13	8	21	9	12	1	1	10	11
	4.5%	59.1%	36.4%	95.5%	40.9%	54.5%	4.5%	4.5%	45.5%	50.0%
St. Louis	132	730	670	1,396	435	913	184	64	916	552
	8.6%	47.7%	43.7%	91.1%	28.4%	59.6%	12.0%	4.2%	59.8%	36.0%
Scott	10	70	78	149	59	78	21	3	95	60
	6.3%	44.3%	49.4%	94.3%	37.3%	49.4%	13.3%	1.9%	60.1%	38.0%
Sherburne	17	91	59	159	50	99	18	2	96	69
	10.2%	54.5%	35.3%	95.2%	29.9%	59.3%	10.8%	1.2%	57.5%	41.3%
Sibley	4	24	13	38	20	18	3	2	24	15
·-· ,	9.8%	58.5%	31.7%	92.7%	48.8%	43.9%	7.3%	4.9%	58.5%	36.6%
Stearns	49	201	188	404	160	231	47	15	265	158
23000	11.2%	45.9%	42.9%	92.2%	36.5%	52.7%	10.7%	3.4%	60.5%	36.1%
Steele	21	58	84	152	88	69	6	9	72	82
2.0010	12.9%	35.6%	51.5%	93.3%	54.0%	42.3%	3.7%	5.5%	44.2%	50.3%
	12.970	33.0%	31.3%	90.070	J 4 .070	42.370	3.170	5.5%	44.Z70	30.370

Table 6 (Part 4)

0 ()				able 6	ו מונ ד	,				
County/Region/	_	001	30 or			HS or		l	Never	0.11
State	Teens	20's	Older	Female	< HS	GED	> HS		Married	
Stevens	3	12	6	19	7	11	3	0	16	5
	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	90.5%	33.3%	52.4%	14.3%	0.0%	76.2%	23.8%
Swift	3	13	18	28	19	12	3	1	14	19
	8.8%	38.2%	52.9%	82.4%	55.9%	35.3%	8.8%	2.9%	41.2%	55.9%
Todd	7	40	40	81	18	52	17	11	40	36
	8.0%	46.0%	46.0%	93.1%	20.7%	59.8%	19.5%	12.6%	46.0%	41.4%
Traverse	0	4	14	15	4	9	5	1	10	7
	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%	83.3%	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%	5.6%	55.6%	38.9%
Wabasha	3	19	18	36	20	20	0	3	16	21
	7.5%	47.5%	45.0%	90.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	7.5%	40.0%	52.5%
Wadena	10	38	31	76	30	42	7	4	47	28
	12.7%	48.1%	39.2%	96.2%	38.0%	53.2%	8.9%	5.1%	59.5%	35.4%
Waseca	9	40	38	81	41	44	2	3	46	38
	10.3%	46.0%	43.7%	93.1%	47.1%	50.6%	2.3%	3.4%	52.9%	43.7%
Washington	53	236	215	481	193	261	50	11	334	159
	10.5%	46.8%	42.7%	95.4%	38.3%	51.8%	9.9%	2.2%	66.3%	31.5%
Watonwan	8	18	21	44	23	21	3	4	18	25
	17.0%	38.3%	44.7%	93.6%	48.9%	44.7%	6.4%	8.5%	38.3%	53.2%
Wilkin	3	14	14	30	9	15	7	2	16	13
	9.7%	45.2%	45.2%	96.8%	29.0%	48.4%	22.6%	6.5%	51.6%	41.9%
Winona	13	64	64	129	59	60	22	15	78	48
	9.2%	45.4%	45.4%	91.5%	41.8%	42.6%	15.6%	10.6%	55.3%	34.0%
Wright	39	118	78	224	96	123	16	6	159	70
	16.6%	50.2%	33.2%	95.3%	40.9%	52.3%	6.8%	2.6%	67.7%	29.8%
Yellow Medicine	3	9	12	23	9	15	0	3	11	10
	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	95.8%	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	12.5%	45.8%	41.7%
Northwest	36	160	177	349	129	206	38	19	199	155
	9.7%	42.9%	47.5%	93.6%	34.6%	55.2%	10.2%	5.1%	53.4%	41.6%
West Central	286	1,247	1,324	2,601	1,108	1,456	293	103	1,732	1,022
	10.0%	43.6%	46.3%	91.0%	38.8%	51.0%	10.3%	3.6%	60.6%	35.8%
Northeast	173	977	962	1,916	590	1,273	249	99	1,199	814
	8.2%	46.3%	45.5%	90.7%	27.9%	60.3%	11.8%	4.7%	56.8%	38.5%
Central	245	999	818	1,902	789	1,084	189	86	1,170	806
	11.9%	48.4%	39.7%	92.2%	38.3%	52.6%	9.2%	4.2%	56.7%	39.1%
Southwest	67	209	234	458	231	210	69	43	245	222
	13.1%	41.0%	45.9%	89.8%	45.3%	41.2%	13.5%	8.4%	48.0%	43.5%
South Central	93	382	299	727	291	398	85	40	420	314
	12.0%	49.4%	38.6%	93.9%	37.6%	51.4%	11.0%	5.2%	54.3%	40.6%
Southeast	171	698	725	1,467	728	751	115	106	821	667
	10.7%	43.8%	45.5%	92.0%	45.7%	47.1%	7.2%	6.6%	51.5%	41.8%
Metro Suburban	266	1,384	1,138	2,646	965	1,488	335	84	1,800	904
	9.5%	49.6%	40.8%	94.9%	34.6%	53.4%	12.0%	3.0%	64.6%	32.4%
Core Metro	1,457	6,220	6,984	13,573	7,091	6,311	1,259	899	10,004	3,758
	9.9%	42.4%	47.6%	92.6%	48.4%	43.0%	8.6%	6.1%	68.2%	25.6%
Minnesota	2,794	12,276	12,661	25,639	11,922	13,177	2,632	1,479	17,590	8,662
	10.1%	44.3%	45.7%	92.5%	43.0%	47.5%	9.5%	5.3%	63.4%	31.2%

Table 7. County and regional demographics of eligible adults on December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult: ethnicity and citizenship

County/Region/	Asian/			American		Non-US
State	Pacific	Black	Hispanic	Indian	White	Citizens
Anoka	28	204	21	47	849	75
	2.4%	17.8%	1.8%	4.1%	73.9%	6.5%
Beltrami	1	2	2	623	172	0
	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	77.9%	21.5%	0.0%
Dakota	32	233	45	31	559	72
	3.6%	25.9%	5.0%	3.4%	62.1%	8.0%
Hennepin	575	5,821	206	705	1,766	1,760
	6.3%	64.1%	2.3%	7.8%	19.5%	19.4%
Olmsted	52	199	18	5	206	186
	10.8%	41.4%	3.7%	1.0%	42.8%	38.7%
Ramsey	881	2,532	317	185	1,669	1,029
	15.8%	45.3%	5.7%	3.3%	29.9%	18.4%
St. Louis	12	110	14	179	1,214	16
	0.8%	7.2%	0.9%	11.7%	79.2%	1.0%
Northwest	1	6	74	29	261	10
	0.3%	1.6%	19.8%	7.8%	70.0%	2.7%
West Central	17	45	88	1,144	1,559	30
	0.6%	1.6%	3.1%	40.0%	54.6%	1.1%
Northeast	13	112	17	282	1,685	20
	0.6%	5.3%	0.8%	13.4%	79.8%	0.9%
Central	27	113	190	49	1,680	70
	1.3%	5.5%	9.2%	2.4%	81.5%	3.4%
Southwest	23	24	68	28	366	55
	4.5%	4.7%	13.3%	5.5%	71.8%	10.8%
South Central	6	103	119	13	533	85
	0.8%	13.3%	15.4%	1.7%	68.9%	11.0%
Southeast	70	346	171	22	982	305
	4.4%	21.7%	10.7%	1.4%	61.6%	19.1%
Metro Suburban	77	584	103	90	1,934	177
	2.8%	20.9%	3.7%	3.2%	69.4%	6.3%
Core Metro	1,456	8,353	523	890	3,435	2,789
	9.9%	57.0%	3.6%	6.1%	23.4%	19.0%
Minnesota	1,690	9,686	1,353	2,547	12,435	3,541
	6.1%	34.9%	4.9%	9.2%	44.8%	12.8%

Table 8. Family types of December 2000 MFIP families with one eligible adult by county and region

u		Family Type		Two
County/Region/	Own		Relative	Care-
State	Children	Only	Care	givers
Aitkin	72	3	2	7
AILKIII	92.3%	3.8%	2.6%	9.0%
Anoka	1,097	3.6%	6	9.0% 45
Alloka			-	
Becker	95.5%	3.8%	0.5%	3.9%
вескег	225	9	10	7
Daltmana:	91.8%	3.7%	4.1%	2.9%
Beltrami	751	25	19	18
5 .	93.9%	3.1%	2.4%	2.3%
Benton	135	9	1	8
	93.1%	6.2%	0.7%	5.5%
Big Stone	22	2	0	0
	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Blue Earth	218	4	3	11
	96.9%	1.8%	1.3%	4.9%
Brown	61	4	0	4
	93.8%	6.2%	0.0%	6.2%
Carlton	166	11	0	11
	93.8%	6.2%	0.0%	6.2%
Carver	75	2	0	6
	97.4%	2.6%	0.0%	7.8%
Cass	261	5	9	12
	94.2%	1.8%	3.2%	4.3%
Chippewa	34	0	0	2
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Chisago	120	6	1	8
	94.5%	4.7%	0.8%	6.3%
Clay	339	7	5	28
	96.6%	2.0%	1.4%	8.0%
Clearwater	57	5	3	0
	87.7%	7.7%	4.6%	0.0%
Cook	5	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cottonwood	37	4	0	3
	86.0%	9.3%	0.0%	7.0%
Crow Wing	227	8	2	11
J	95.8%	3.4%	0.8%	4.6%
Dakota	866	23	9	24
	96.2%	2.6%	1.0%	2.7%
Dodge	40	1	0	2
	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	4.9%
Douglas	100	10	0	1
	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.9%
Faribault	43	2	0	5
	91.5%	4.3%	0.0%	10.6%
Fillmore	35	1	0.070	10.070
	97.2%	2.8%	0.0%	2.8%
Freeborn	164	6	2	13
i iccoulli	94.8%	3.5%	1.2%	7.5%
	34 070	3.376	1.2/0	7.570

Table 8 (Part 2)

	la:	Two		
Carrete //Danian/	Own	amily Type	Relative	
County/Region/		Pregnant		Care-
State	Children	Only	Care	givers
Goodhue	120	6	1	6
	94.5%	4.7%	0.8%	4.7%
Grant	14	1	0	1
	93.3%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
Hennepin	8,630	233	175	439
	95.1%	2.6%	1.9%	4.8%
Houston	44	3	0	4
	93.6%	6.4%	0.0%	8.5%
Hubbard	88	5	3	5
	91.7%	5.2%	3.1%	5.2%
Isanti	121	11	2	1
	90.3%	8.2%	1.5%	0.7%
Itasca	209	4	3	13
	96.8%	1.9%	1.4%	6.0%
Jackson	21	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Kanabec	67	2	0	1
	97.1%	2.9%	0.0%	1.4%
Kandiyohi	247	6	3	28
	96.5%	2.3%	1.2%	10.9%
Kittson	7	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Koochiching	76	3	0	9
Ĭ	96.2%	3.8%	0.0%	11.4%
Lac Qui Prarie	13	1	0	3
	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%
Lake	22	2	1	0
	88.0%	8.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Lake of Woods	16	0	0	2
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Le Sueur	63	3	0	5
20 0404.	95.5%	4.5%	0.0%	7.6%
Lincoln	17	0	0	1
Linooni	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Lyon	72	5	0	8
Lyon	93.5%	6.5%	0.0%	10.4%
McLeod	71	5	1	3
Molecou	91.0%	6.4%	1.3%	3.8%
Mahnomen	92	3	2	2
Maintonien	94.8%	3.1%	2.1%	2.1%
Marshall	26	2	0	2.176
iviai Silali	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%
Martin			1	3
iviai uiii	73 89.0%	7 8.5%	1.2%	3.7%
Meeker	64	6.5% 1	1.2%	3.7%
INICERCI		•	·	
Mille Lacs	97.0%	1.5%	1.5%	3.0%
IVIIIIe Lacs	125	1	0	6
Manuia	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	4.8%
Morrison	106	3	0	2
	97.2%	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%

Table 8 (Part 3)

		e 8 (Part amily Type		Two
County/Region/	Own	Pregnant	Relative	Care-
State	Children	Only	Care	givers
Mower				
wower	167	7	1	17
	95.4%	4.0%	0.6%	9.7%
Murray	18	0	0	2
AP: 11 4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Nicollet	106	7	1	4
	93.0%	6.1%	0.9%	3.5%
Nobles	95	4	1	18
	95.0%	4.0%	1.0%	18.0%
Norman	23	1	0	1
	95.8%	4.2%	0.0%	4.2%
Olmsted	453	12	15	37
	94.2%	2.5%	3.1%	7.7%
Otter Tail	180	4	1	11
	96.8%	2.2%	0.5%	5.9%
Pennington	49	1	0	2
	96.1%	2.0%	0.0%	3.9%
Pine	159	9	0	13
	94.6%	5.4%	0.0%	7.7%
Pipestone	26	2	0	0
	89.7%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	214	10	3	12
	94.3%	4.4%	1.3%	5.3%
Pope	16	1	0	2
	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	11.8%
Ramsey	5,387	113	73	563
	96.4%	2.0%	1.3%	10.1%
Red Lake	14	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Redwood	50	3	0	5
	94.3%	5.7%	0.0%	9.4%
Renville	51	1	1	4
	96.2%	1.9%	1.9%	7.5%
Rice	164	5	1	9
	96.5%	2.9%	0.6%	5.3%
Rock	19	3	0	2
T. GOIL	86.4%	13.6%	0.0%	9.1%
Roseau	20	2	0	0.170
1100000	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Louis	1,463	59	8	78
on Louis	95.5%	3.9%	0.5%	5.1%
Scott	155	2	1	7
Scott	98.1%	1.3%	0.6%	4.4%
Sherburne	158	9		3
Silei buille		5.4%	0.0%	1.8%
Sibloy	94.6%			
Sibley	38	3	0	5
Ctoorus-	92.7%	7.3%	0.0%	12.2%
Stearns	422	12	2	23
	96.3%	2.7%	0.5%	5.3%
Steele	155	5	3	7
	95.1%	3.1%	1.8%	4.3%

Table 8 (Part 4)

				Two
County/Region/	Own	amily Type Pregnant		Care-
State	Children	Only	Care	givers
Stevens	21	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Swift	33	1	0	3
	97.1%	2.9%	0.0%	8.8%
Todd	82	4	1	13
	94.3%	4.6%	1.1%	14.9%
Traverse	18	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Wabasha	39	1	0	4
	97.5%	2.5%	0.0%	10.0%
Wadena	75	2	1	4
	94.9%	2.5%	1.3%	5.1%
Waseca	83	4	0	2
	95.4%	4.6%	0.0%	2.3%
Washington	492	11	1	11
- 	97.6%	2.2%	0.2%	2.2%
Watonwan	46	1	0	3
	97.9%	2.1%	0.0%	6.4%
Wilkin	28	2	1	1
	90.3%	6.5%	3.2%	3.2%
Winona	136	4	1	18
	96.5%	2.8%	0.7%	12.8%
Wright	207	26	1	6
	88.1%	11.1%	0.4%	2.6%
Yellow Medicine	20	3	1	3
	83.3%	12.5%	4.2%	12.5%
Northwest	353	16	3	19
	94.6%	4.3%	0.8%	5.1%
West Central	2,696	94	57	121
	94.4%	3.3%	2.0%	4.2%
Northeast	2,013	82	14	118
	95.3%	3.9%	0.7%	5.6%
Central	1,947	98	13	106
	94.4%	4.8%	0.6%	5.1%
Southwest	477	28	2	51
	93.5%	5.5%	0.4%	10.0%
South Central	731	35	5	42
	94.4%	4.5%	0.6%	5.4%
Southeast	1,517	51	24	118
	95.2%	3.2%	1.5%	7.4%
Metro Suburban	2,685	82	17	93
	96.3%	2.9%	0.6%	3.3%
Core Metro	14,017	346	248	1,002
	95.6%	2.4%	1.7%	6.8%
Minnesota	26,436	832	383	1,670
	95.3%	3.0%	1.4%	6.0%

Note: Cases with no link to a child or pregnancy in administrative data were missing for family type.

Table 9. All children in December 2000 MFIP families with one eligible adult by county and region

County/Region/			per of Chi		oounty c			ngest Chi	ld
State	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	13-17
Aitkin	4	35	26	7	6	17	22	24	11
	5.1%	44.9%	33.3%	9.0%	7.7%	23.0%	29.7%	32.4%	14.9%
Anoka	46	548	322	147	86	192	557	274	80
	4.0%	47.7%	28.0%	12.8%	7.4%	17.4%	50.5%	24.8%	7.2%
Becker	10	102	65	44	24	31	109	67	28
	4.1%	41.6%	26.5%	18.0%	9.8%	13.2%	46.4%	28.6%	11.9%
Beltrami	29	303	218	142	108	152	342	204	73
	3.6%	37.9%	27.3%	17.8%	13.5%	19.7%	44.4%	26.5%	9.5%
Benton	9	73	41	20	2	31	74	23	8
	6.2%	50.3%	28.3%	13.8%	1.4%	22.8%	54.4%	16.9%	5.8%
Big Stone	2	9	8	2	3	3	9	6	4
J	8.3%	37.5%	33.3%	8.3%	12.5%	13.6%	40.9%	27.2%	18.1%
Blue Earth	4	104	70	26	21	43	112	52	14
	1.8%	46.2%	31.1%	11.6%	9.3%	19.5%	50.7%	23.5%	6.3%
Brown	4	33	17	6	5	16	32	12	1
	6.2%	50.8%	26.2%	9.2%	7.7%	26.2%	52.5%	19.7%	1.6%
Carlton	11	78	51	25	12	20	78	52	16
	6.2%	44.1%	28.8%	14.1%	6.8%	12.0%	47.0%	31.3%	9.6%
Carver	2	41	17	12	5	22	28	16	9
	2.6%	53.2%	22.1%	15.6%	6.5%	29.3%	37.3%	21.4%	12.0%
Cass	7	116	73	57	24	45	114	77	34
	2.5%	41.9%	26.4%	20.6%	8.7%	16.7%	42.2%	28.5%	12.6%
Chippewa	0	19	6	5	4	4	19	5	6
	0.0%	55.9%	17.6%	14.7%	11.8%	11.8%	55.9%	14.7%	17.7%
Chisago	6	49	38	22	12	24	55	32	10
J	4.7%	38.6%	29.9%	17.3%	9.5%	19.8%	45.5%	26.4%	8.3%
Clay	7	160	94	52	38	50	168	98	28
•	2.0%	45.6%	26.8%	14.8%	10.8%	14.5%	48.8%	28.5%	8.2%
Clearwater	5	19	20	10	11	12	30	13	5
	7.7%	29.2%	30.8%	15.4%	16.9%	20.0%	50.0%	21.7%	8.4%
Cook	0	1	1	2	1	0	3	2	0
	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%
Cottonwood	6	11	13	2	11	7	20	6	4
	14.0%	25.6%	30.2%	4.7%	25.6%	18.9%	54.1%	16.2%	10.8%
Crow Wing	8	96	79	35	19	47	116	49	17
J	3.4%	40.5%	33.3%	14.8%	8.0%	20.5%	50.7%	21.4%	7.5%
Dakota	25	399	264	132	80	161	442	210	62
	2.8%	44.3%	29.3%	14.7%	8.9%	18.4%	50.5%	24.0%	7.1%
Dodge	1	23	11	4	2	10	13	11	6
J	2.4%	56.1%	26.8%	9.8%	4.9%	25.0%	32.5%	27.5%	15.0%
Douglas	10	55	30	10	5	25	44	25	6
Ĭ	9.1%	50.0%	27.3%	9.1%	4.5%	25.0%	44.0%	25.0%	6.0%
Faribault	4	22	13	4	4	14	16	8	5
	8.5%	46.8%	27.7%	8.5%	8.5%	32.6%	37.2%	18.6%	11.7%
Fillm ore	1	21	10	2	2	12	16	4	3
	2.8%	58.3%	27.8%	5.6%	5.6%	34.3%	45.7%	11.4%	8.6%
Freeborn	7	76	55	20	15	31	69	46	20
	4.0%	43.9%	31.8%	11.6%	8.7%	18.7%	41.6%	27.7%	12.0%
	1.370	10.070	01.070	11.070	5.170	10.170	11.070	L 1.170	12.070

Table 9 (Part 2)

County/Region/		Numb	er of Chi		e 9 (Part 2		ge of You	ngest Chi	ld
State	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	13-17
Goodhue	6	48	36	27	10	21	53	36	11
	4.7%	37.8%	28.3%	21.3%	7.9%	17.4%	43.8%	29.8%	9.1%
Grant	1	4	7	2	1	1	4	8	1
	6.7%	26.7%	46.7%	13.3%	6.7%	7.1%	28.6%	57.1%	7.1%
Hennepin	270	3,522	2,414	1,421	1,448	1,626	3,931	2,361	887
	3.0%	38.8%	26.6%	15.7%	16.0%	18.5%	44.6%	26.8%	10.1%
Houston	3	18	15	10	1	5	21	16	2
	6.4%	38.3%	31.9%	21.3%	2.1%	11.4%	47.7%	36.4%	4.5%
Hubbard	5	47	29	14	1	15	39	26	11
	5.2%	49.0%	30.2%	14.6%	1.0%	16.5%	42.9%	28.6%	12.1%
Isanti	11	59	41	20	3	18	63	32	10
	8.2%	44.0%	30.6%	14.9%	2.2%	14.6%	51.2%	26.1%	8.1%
Itasca	4	92	56	43	21	28	90	66	28
	1.9%	42.6%	25.9%	19.9%	9.8%	13.2%	42.5%	31.1%	13.2%
Jackson	0	9	7	5	0	2	14	3	2
	0.0%	42.9%	33.3%	23.8%	0.0%	9.5%	66.7%	14.3%	9.6%
Kanabec	2	24	23	13	7	8	38	15	6
	2.9%	34.8%	33.3%	18.8%	10.1%	11.9%	56.7%	22.3%	9.0%
Kandiyohi	6	121	68	35	26	58	108	58	26
,	2.3%	47.3%	26.6%	13.7%	10.2%	23.2%	43.2%	23.2%	10.4%
Kittson	0	4	2	1	0	1	5	0	1
	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	71.4%	0.0%	14.3%
Koochiching	3	40	16	14	6	10	38	21	7
	3.8%	50.6%	20.3%	17.7%	7.6%	13.2%	50.0%	27.6%	9.2%
Lac Qui Prarie	1	5	5	1	2	4	3	5	1
	7.1%	35.7%	35.7%	7.1%	14.3%	30.8%	23.1%	38.5%	7.7%
Lake	2	13	8	1	1	2	9	9	3
	8.0%	52.0%	32.0%	4.0%	4.0%	8.7%	39.1%	39.1%	13.0%
Lake of Woods	0	9	1	6	0	2	9	4	1
	0.0%	56.3%	6.3%	37.5%	0.0%	12.5%	56.3%	25.0%	6.3%
Le Sueur	3	30	18	9	6	12	29	16	6
	4.5%	45.5%	27.3%	13.6%	9.1%	19.0%	46.0%	25.4%	9.5%
Lincoln	0	7	7	3	0	4	5	4	4
	0.0%	41.2%	41.2%	17.6%	0.0%	23.5%	29.4%	23.5%	23.5%
Lyon	5	33	20	13	6	15	32	18	7
_,	6.5%	42.9%	26.0%	16.9%	7.8%	20.8%	44.4%	25.0%	9.8%
McLeod	6	29	27	8	8	17	33	19	3
	7.7%	37.2%	34.6%	10.3%	10.3%	23.6%	45.8%	26.4%	4.2%
Mahnomen	3	44	27	14	9	17	43	22	12
	3.1%	45.4%	27.8%	14.4%	9.3%	18.1%	45.7%	23.4%	12.8%
Marshall	2	8	9	4	5	5	10	9	2
	7.1%	28.6%	32.1%	14.3%	17.9%	19.2%	38.5%	34.6%	7.7%
Martin	8	31	23	13	7	12	34	21	7
	9.8%	37.8%	28.0%	15.9%	8.5%	16.2%	45.9%	28.4%	9.5%
Meeker	1	37	16	8	4	11	28	16	10
	1.5%	56.1%	24.2%	12.1%	6.1%	16.9%	43.1%	24.7%	15.4%
Mille Lacs	1.370	55	42	20	8	18	52	43	12.470
	0.8%	43.7%	33.3%	15.9%	6.3%	14.4%	41.6%	34.4%	9.6%
Morrison	3	44	42	13.370	7	26	41	27	12
	2.8%	40.4%	38.5%	11.9%	6.4%	24.5%	38.7%	25.4%	11.3%
	2.070	40.470	30.370	11.970	0.4 /0	24.070	30.7 /0	25.4 /0	11.370

Table 9 (Part 3)

State 0 1 2 3 4 or more < 1 year	l	gest Chile	e of Your	Ag	(Number of Children				
Murray 0 7 7 2 2 2 3 8 5 0.0% 38.9% 38.9% 11.1% 11.1% 16.7% 44.4% 27.8% Nicollet 7 60 28 9 10 17 51 24 6.1% 52.6% 24.6% 7.9% 8.8% 15.99% 47.7% 22.5% Nobles 4 32 25 23 16 18 48 21 4.0% 32.0% 25.0% 23.0% 16.0% 18.8% 50.0% 21.9% Norman 1 10 7 3 3 3 6 6 7 7 4.2% 41.7% 29.2% 12.5% 12.5% 26.1% 26.1% 26.1% Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 40.5% 30.2% 20.4% 21.6% 59% 99 190 134 Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.0% 11.8% 64% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 59 112 66 49 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 59% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31.11 3 10 19 11 Pipestone 1 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58.7% 19.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 3 10 19 19 Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58.7% 19.8% Ramsey 126 2,056 14.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Ramsey 128 23% 38.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.8% 17.7% 57.7% 19.2% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 0.9% 11.8% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 0.3 7 3 7 3 Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 0 3 7 3 7 3 Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 0 3 7 3 10 15 Red Lake 1 18 19 7 8 15 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 Red Lake 1 18 19 7 8 15 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 0 3 7 7 3 Red Lake 1 18 19 7 8 15 50.0% 21.4% Red Lake 1 18 19 7 8 15 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 Red Lake 5 9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 50.0% 21.4% Red Lake 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 33 10 5 79 25 13 Rock 3 12 3 3 1 5 5 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	13-17	6-12	1-5	< 1 year	4 or more	3	2	1	0	· · · · · ·
Murray 0 7 7 2 2 3 8 5 Nicollet 7 60 28 9 11.1% 11.5% 14.4% 27.8% Nobles 4 52.6% 24.6% 7.9% 8.8% 15.9% 47.7% 22.5% Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 7 Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 7 Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 <td>17</td> <td>23</td> <td>79</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>55</td> <td>76</td> <td>7</td> <td>Mower</td>	17	23	79		18	19	55	76	7	Mower
Murray 0 7 7 2 2 3 8 5 Nicollet 7 60 38.9% 38.9% 11.1% 11.7% 16.7% 44.4% 27.8% Nicollet 7 60 28 9 10 17 51 24 6.1% 52.6% 24.6% 7.9% 8.8% 15.9% 47.7% 22.5% Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 7 Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 7 Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 27% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 27% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9%	10.2%	13.7%	47.0%	29.2%	10.3%	10.9%	31.4%	43.4%	4.0%	
Nicollet 0 0% 38.9% 38.9% 11.1% 11.1% 16.7% 44.4% 27.8%	2	5	8	3	2	2		7	0	Murray
Nobles 6.1% 52.6% 24.6% 7.9% 8.8% 15.9% 47.7% 22.5% A 32 25 23 16 18 48 21 A 0% 32.0% 25.0% 23.0% 16.0% 18.8% 50.0% 21.9% Norman	11.2%	27.8%	44.4%	16.7%	11.1%	11.1%	38.9%	38.9%	0.0%	, i
Nobles 6.1% 52.6% 24.6% 7.9% 8.8% 15.9% 47.7% 22.5% A 32 25 23 16 18 48 21 A 0% 32.0% 25.0% 23.0% 16.0% 18.8% 50.0% 21.9% Norman	15	24	51	17	10	9	28	60	7	Nicollet
Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 6 7 4 2% 41.7% 29 2% 12.5% 26.1% 26.1% 30.4% Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2 .7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2 .7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3 .9% 39.2% 29 4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 63 50 5 .4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10 .3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 3 0.1% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1,475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Red Lake 0 9 9 2 3 0 0 3 7 3 Red Lake 1 0 99 26 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 12 1 14 8 7 7 8 15 15 28 7 19 Redwood 3 21 14 8 19 7 8 15 15 10 28 86 50.0% 13.5% 15 86 50 60 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	14.0%	22.5%	47.7%	15.9%	8.8%	7.9%	24.6%	52.6%	6.1%	
Norman 1 10 7 3 3 6 6 6 7 4 2% 41.7% 29 2% 12.5% 26.1% 26.1% 30.4% Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2 .7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2 .7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3 .9% 39.2% 29 4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 63 50 5 .4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10 .3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 3 0.1% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1,475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Red Lake 0 9 9 2 3 0 0 3 7 3 Red Lake 1 0 99 26 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 21 14 8 8 7 9 5 25 13 Redwood 3 12 1 14 8 7 7 8 15 15 28 7 19 Redwood 3 21 14 8 19 7 8 15 15 10 28 86 50.0% 13.5% 15 86 50 60 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	9	21	48	18	16	23	25	32	4	Nobles
Olmsted 4 .2% 41 .7% 29 .2% 12 .5% 12 .5% 26 .1% 26 .1% 30 .4% Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pine 9 63 26 23 36 97 58 <t< td=""><td>9.4%</td><td>21.9%</td><td>50.0%</td><td>18.8%</td><td>16.0%</td><td>23.0%</td><td>25.0%</td><td>32.0%</td><td>4.0%</td><td></td></t<>	9.4%	21.9%	50.0%	18.8%	16.0%	23.0%	25.0%	32.0%	4.0%	
Olmsted 4 .2% 41 .7% 29 .2% 12 .5% 12 .5% 26 .1% 26 .1% 30 .4% Olmsted 13 195 112 65 96 99 190 134 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pine 9 63 26 23 36 97 58 <t< td=""><td>4</td><td>7</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>10</td><td>1</td><td>Norman</td></t<>	4	7	6	6	3	3	7	10	1	Norman
Otter Tail 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 5.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 9 69 26 23 36 97 58	17.4%	30.4%	26.1%	26.1%	12.5%	12.5%	29.2%	41.7%	4.2%	
Otter Tail 2.7% 40.5% 23.3% 13.5% 20.0% 21.2% 40.6% 28.6% Otter Tail 5 90 57 22 12 29 74 56 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 5.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 9 69 26 23 36 97 58	45	134	190	99	96	65	112	195	13	Olmsted
Pennington 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 5.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 18.8% <td>9.6%</td> <td>28.6%</td> <td>40.6%</td> <td>21.2%</td> <td>20.0%</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>23.3%</td> <td>40.5%</td> <td>2.7%</td> <td></td>	9.6%	28.6%	40.6%	21.2%	20.0%	13.5%	23.3%	40.5%	2.7%	
Pennington 2.7% 48.4% 30.6% 11.8% 6.4% 16.0% 40.9% 30.9% Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 5.4% 33.75% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 18.8% </td <td>22</td> <td>56</td> <td>74</td> <td>29</td> <td>12</td> <td>22</td> <td>57</td> <td>90</td> <td>5</td> <td>Otter Tail</td>	22	56	74	29	12	22	57	90	5	Otter Tail
Pennington 2 20 15 11 3 10 19 11 Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pipestone 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456	12.2%	30.9%	40.9%	16.0%	6.4%	11.8%	30.6%	48.4%	2.7%	
Pine 3.9% 39.2% 29.4% 21.6% 5.9% 20.4% 38.8% 22.4% Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 5.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3	9		19	10	3	11		20		Pennington
Pine 9 63 54 31 11 26 63 50 15.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Pipestone 3 14 6 2 4 2 15 5 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 8.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1,054 967 2.575 1,456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% <t< td=""><td>18.3%</td><td>22.4%</td><td>38.8%</td><td>20.4%</td><td>5.9%</td><td>21.6%</td><td>29.4%</td><td>39.2%</td><td>3.9%</td><td>Ĭ</td></t<>	18.3%	22.4%	38.8%	20.4%	5.9%	21.6%	29.4%	39.2%	3.9%	Ĭ
Pipestone 5.4% 37.5% 32.1% 18.5% 6.5% 16.4% 39.6% 31.4% Polk 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 5.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2,575 1.456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 Quitable 11 18 19 7 8 15 20.0%	20									Pine
Polk 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 5.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1,475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1,456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0%	12.5%	31.4%	39.6%	16.4%	6.5%	18.5%	32.1%	37.5%	5.4%	
Polk 10.3% 48.3% 20.7% 6.9% 13.8% 7.7% 57.7% 19.2% Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 5.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 Quality 11 4 3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3	4	5	15	2	4	2	6	14	3	Pipestone
Polk 10 99 69 26 23 36 97 58 4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 5.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2,056 1,475 875 1,054 967 2,575 1,456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Re	15.3%	19.2%				6.9%	20.7%			· ·
4.4% 43.6% 30.4% 11.5% 10.1% 16.6% 44.7% 26.8% Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 5.9% 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5%<	26							99		Polk
Pope 1 3 8 3 2 1 11 3 Ramsey 126 2.056 1.475 875 1.054 967 2.575 1.456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9	12.0%									
Ramsey 17.6% 47.1% 17.6% 11.8% 6.3% 68.8% 18.8% Ramsey 126 2.056 1,475 875 1,054 967 2,575 1,456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4%	1			1				3		Pope
Ramsey 126 2,056 1,475 875 1,054 967 2,575 1,456 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4%	6.3%									1
Red Lake 2.3% 36.8% 26.4% 15.7% 18.9% 17.7% 47.2% 26.7% 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% <	462									Ramsev
Red Lake 0 9 2 3 0 3 7 3 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Rock <td< td=""><td>8.4%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td></td<>	8.4%									,
Redwood 0.0% 64.3% 14.3% 21.4% 0.0% 21.4% 50.0% 21.4% Renville 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0%	1									Red Lake
Redwood 3 21 14 8 7 9 25 13 5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis	7.1%	21.4%	50.0%	21.4%	0.0%	21.4%	14.3%			
5.7% 39.6% 26.4% 15.1% 13.2% 18.0% 50.0% 26.0% Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6%	3		25		7	8		21	3	Redwood
Renville 1 18 19 7 8 15 26 7 Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	6.0%	26.0%	50.0%	18.0%	13.2%	15.1%	26.4%	39.6%	5.7%	
Rice 1.9% 34.0% 35.8% 13.2% 15.1% 28.8% 50.0% 13.5% Frame 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	4		26		8		19	18		Renville
Rice 5 71 48 27 19 46 75 32 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	7.7%	13.5%	50.0%		15.1%	13.2%	35.8%	34.0%	1.9%	
Rock 2.9% 41.8% 28.2% 15.9% 11.2% 27.9% 45.5% 19.4% 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	12		75							Rice
Rock 3 12 3 3 1 3 10 5 Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	7.3%	19.4%	45.5%	27.9%		15.9%	28.2%	41.8%	2.9%	
Roseau 13.6% 54.5% 13.6% 13.6% 4.5% 15.8% 52.6% 26.4% 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	1	5	10	3	1	3	3	12	3	Rock
Roseau 2 6 7 6 1 5 12 3 9.1% 27.3% 31.8% 27.3% 4.5% 25.0% 60.0% 15.0% St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	5.3%	26.4%	52.6%	15.8%	4.5%	13.6%	13.6%	54.5%	13.6%	
St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	0									Roseau
St. Louis 61 700 473 197 101 258 674 392 4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	0.0%	15.0%		25.0%		27.3%	31.8%	27.3%	9.1%	
4.0% 45.7% 30.9% 12.9% 6.6% 17.5% 45.8% 26.6% Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	147									St. Louis
Scott 2 66 45 29 16 36 67 42	10.0%								4.0%	
	11								2	Scott
	7.0%	27.0%		23.1%		18.4%	28.5%	41.8%	1.3%	
Sherburne 9 65 69 17 7 31 78 41	8			31						Sherburne
5.4% 38.9% 41.3% 10.2% 4.2% 19.6% 49.4% 26.0%	5.1%				4.2%			38.9%	5.4%	
Sibley 3 15 10 8 5 9 20 8	1			9					3	Siblev
7.3% 36.6% 24.4% 19.5% 12.2% 23.7% 52.6% 21.0%	2.6%									
Stearns 14 190 128 72 34 86 208 92	38									Stearns
3.2% 43.4% 29.2% 16.4% 7.7% 20.3% 49.1% 21.7%	9.0%									
Steele 5 49 41 34 34 26 88 27	17									Steele
3.1% 30.1% 25.2% 20.9% 20.8% 16.5% 55.7% 17.1%	10.8%									

Table 9 (Part 4)

County/Region/		Numl	per of Chi		(Part 4)	Ac	e of You	ngest Chi	ld
State	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	13-17
Stevens	0	10	9	2	0	6	9	5	10 17
Stevens	0.0%	47.6%	42.9%	9.5%	0.0%	28.6%	42.9%	23.8%	4.8%
Ciff				9.5%	0.0% 7				
Swift	1	16	6			8	12	9	4 40.40/
T- 44	2.9%	47.1%	17.6%	11.8%	20.5%	24.2%	36.4%	27.3%	12.1%
Todd	4	35	29	14	5	16	34	22	11
_	4.6%	40.2%	33.3%	16.1%	5.7%	19.3%	41.0%	26.5%	13.2%
Traverse	0	5	9	3	1	1	9	6	2
	0.0%	27.8%	50.0%	16.7%	5.6%	5.6%	50.0%	33.3%	11.1%
Wabasha	1	17	11	7	4	11	14	9	5
	2.5%	42.5%	27.5%	17.5%	10.0%	28.2%	35.9%	23.1%	12.9%
Wadena	3	43	16	12	5	14	34	22	6
	3.8%	54.4%	20.3%	15.2%	6.3%	18.4%	44.7%	29.0%	7.9%
Waseca	4	33	19	13	18	21	36	24	2
	4.6%	37.9%	21.8%	14.9%	20.7%	25.3%	43.4%	28.9%	2.4%
Washington	11	225	131	88	49	92	245	122	34
	2.2%	44.6%	26.0%	17.5%	9.7%	18.7%	49.7%	24.8%	6.9%
Watonwan	1	16	14	11	5	9	24	11	2
	2.1%	34.0%	29.8%	23.4%	10.6%	19.6%	52.2%	23.9%	4.3%
Wilkin	2	18	7	2	2	4	14	8	3
	6.5%	58.1%	22.6%	6.5%	6.5%	13.8%	48.3%	27.5%	10.3%
Winona	4	60	31	24	22	36	60	32	9
	2.8%	42.6%	22.0%	17.0%	15.5%	26.3%	43.8%	23.3%	6.5%
Wright	27	116	55	24	13	42	104	43	19
	11.5%	49.4%	23.4%	10.2%	5.5%	20.2%	50.0%	20.6%	9.1%
Yellow Medicine	3	9	7	5	0	2	8	7	4
	12.5%	37.5%	29.2%	20.8%	0.0%	9.5%	38.1%	33.3%	19.1%
Northwest	17	156	111	54	35	66	156	91	43
	4.6%	41.8%	29.8%	14.5%	9.4%	18.5%	43.8%	25.6%	12.1%
West Central	103	1,203	820	457	274	494	1,244	742	274
	3.6%	42.1%	28.7%	16.0%	9.6%	17.9%	45.2%	26.9%	9.9%
Northeast	85	959	631	289	148	335	914	566	212
Nonthouse	4.0%	45.4%	29.9%	13.7%	7.0%	16.5%	45.1%	27.9%	10.5%
Central	102	899	621	297	143	385	930	471	174
Central	4.9%	43.6%	30.1%	14.4%	6.9%	19.6%	47.4%	24.0%	8.9%
Southwest	31	204	134	78	63	84	228	112	55
Journwest	6.1%	40.0%	26.3%	15.3%	12.4%	17.5%	47.6%	23.4%	11.5%
South Central	38	344	20.3%	99			354	176	53
South Central					81	153			
Couthooot	4.9%	44.4%	27.4%	12.8%	10.5%	20.8%	48.1%	24.0%	7.2%
Southeast	53	654	425	239	223	346	678	370	147
Matua Code code a	3.3%	41.0%	26.7%	15.0%	14.0%	22.5%	44.0%	24.0%	9.5%
Metro Suburban	86	1,279	779	408	236	503	1,339	664	196
	3.1%	45.9%	27.9%	14.6%	8.5%	18.6%	49.6%	24.6%	7.3%
Core Metro	396	5,578	3,889	2,296	2,502	2,593	6,506	3,817	1,349
	2.7%	38.0%	26.5%	15.7%	17.0%	18.2%	45.6%	26.7%	9.5%
Minnesota	911	11,276	7,622	4,217	3,705	4,959	12,349	7,009	2,503
	3.3%	40.7%	27.5%	15.2%	13.3%	18.5%	46.0%	26.2%	9.4%

Table 10. Economic characteristics of December 2000 MFIP paid cases with one eligible adult by county and region

			191010	aduit b	y oou.	Welfa		••			
County/Region/	Number	Δc	tive Mon	ths	T/	NF Mont		N	ew Cases	in 2000	
State	of		Over 60		.,		Months		tal	Out of	
	Cases	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Prcnt
Aitkin	78	37	19	24%	15	6	8%	18	23%	3	4%
Anoka	1,149	42	360	31%	18	162	14%	257	22%	48	4%
Becker	245	49	97	40%	18	19	8%	41	17%	5	2%
Beltrami	800	56	370	46%	15	88	11%	96	12%	20	3%
Benton	145	34	28	19%	15	15	10%	42	29%	5	3%
Big Stone	24	40	7	29%	19	6	25%	9	38%	3	13%
Blue Earth	225	37	53	24%	18	32	14%	58	26%	15	7%
Brown	65	24	8	12%	12	1	2%	25	38%	8	12%
Carlton	177	44	57	32%	18	22	12%	31	18%	5	3%
Carver	77	31	18	23%	14	9	12%	25	32%	5	6%
Cass	277	53	117	42%	20	57	21%	39	14%	6	2%
Chippewa	34	40	10	29%	18	4	12%	11	32%	1	3%
Chisago	127	44	40	31%	20	18	14%	29	23%	2	2%
Clay	351	39	93	26%	19	69	20%	77	22%	33	9%
Clearwater	65	48	23	35%	19	11	17%	16	25%	3	5%
Cook	5	9	0	0%	2	0	0%	2	40%		0%
Cottonwood	43	33	7	16%	16	6	14%	12	28%	5	12%
Crow Wing	237	42	73	31%	18	28	12%	50	21%	7	3%
Dakota	900	41	259	29%	19	127	14%	209	23%	49	5%
Dodge	41	34	11	27%	15	6	15%	17	41%	4	10%
Douglas	110	34	21	19%	16	14	13%	30	27%	1	1%
Faribault	47	37	10	21%	17	9	19%	14	30%	1	2%
Fillmore	36	25	3	8%	11	0	0%	13	36%	2	6%
Freeborn	173	36	39	23%	17	26	15%	46	27%	9	5%
Goodhue	127	37	31	24%	16	16	13%	30	24%	4	3%
Grant	15	47	4	27%	21	4	27%	1	7%		0%
Hennepin	9,075	49	3,409	38%	22	2,042	23%	1,766	19%	710	8%
Houston	47	30	8	17%	15	3	6%	16	34%	10	21%
Hubbard	96	42	28	29%	18	15	16%	23	24%	8	8%
Isanti	134	32	18	13%	16	12	9%	36	27%	8	6%
Itasca	216	45	77	36%	20	45	21%	34	16%	6	3%
Jackson	21	32	4	19%	15	2	10%	5	24%		0%
Kanabec	69	37	16	23%	15	5	7%	17	25%		0%
Kandiyohi	256	33	52	20%	15	27	11%	78	30%	21	8%
Kittson	7	41	1	14%	19	1	14%	1	14%		0%
Koochiching	79	41	21	27%	20	11	14%	14	18%	4	5%
Lac Qui Parle	14	34	4	29%	13	1	7%	5	36%	1	7%
Lake	25	38	7	28%	19	6	24%	8	32%	1	4%
Lake of the Woods	16	30	2	13%	14	1	6%	5	31%		0%
Le Sueur	66	33	17	26%	13	5	8%	18	27%	4	6%
Lincoln	17	35	5	29%	11	1	6%	9	53%	2	12%
Lyon	77	32	16	21%	17	13	17%	22	29%	11	14%
McLeod	78	26	12	15%	12	6	8%	25	32%	7	9%
Mahnomen	97	50	40	41%	18	2	2%	13	13%	1	1%
Marshall	28	37	7	25%	17	4	14%	7	25%	1	4%
Martin	82	40	23	28%	17	11	13%	20	24%	3	4%
Meeker	66	38	16	24%	16	6	9%	11	17%	1	2%
Mille Lacs	126	49	51	40%	18	10	8%	15	12%	2	2%

Table 10 (Part 2)

				able it	- (1 a.10	—/ Welfa	re				
County/Region/	Number	Ac	tive Mon	ths	TA	NF Mont	hs	Ne	ew Cases	in 2000	
State	of		Over 60	Months		Over 36	Months	То	tal	Out-of	-State
	Cases	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Prcnt
Morrison	109	38	28	26%	14	6	6%	27	25%		0%
Mower	175	36	45	26%	16	19	11%	50	29%	14	8%
Murray	18	17	2	11%	10	0	0%	12	67%	5	28%
Nicollet	114	31	19	17%	18	15	13%	39	34%	11	10%
Nobles	100	35	20	20%	17	12	12%	31	31%	12	12%
Norman	24	46	10	42%	22	8	33%	5	21%	1	4%
Olmsted	481	34	94	20%	18	74	15%	134	28%	60	12%
Otter Tail	186	37	45	24%	17	27	15%	45	24%	14	8%
Pennington	51	37	10	20%	18	11	22%	9	18%	2	4%
Pine	168	42	52	31%	17	20	12%	33	20%	4	2%
Pipestone	29	25	2	7%	15	2	7%	6	21%		0%
Polk	227	41	62	27%	19	37	16%	52	23%	15	7%
Роре	17	35	3	18%	15	2	12%	3	18%	2	12%
Ramsey	5,586	53	2,333	42%	23	1,474	26%	894	16%	278	5%
Red Lake	14	37	2	14%	18	1	7%	3	21%	1	7%
Redwood	53	39	16	30%	19	9	17%	14	26%	3	6%
Renville	53	22	6	11%	11	3	6%	23	43%	10	19%
Rice	170	32	33	19%	15	14	8%	49	29%	10	6%
Rock	22	27	3	14%	13	1	5%	6	27%	2	9%
Roseau	22	31	4	18%	14	1	5%	8	36%	1	5%
St. Louis	1,532	46	524	34%	21	309	20%	310	20%	45	3%
Scott	158	40	43	27%	18	22	14%	40	25%	7	4%
Sherburne	167	35	40	24%	13	9	5%	46	28%	8	5%
Sibley	41	26	4	10%	12	2	5%	13	32%	4	10%
Stearns	438	40	121	28%	18	67	15%	104	24%	23	5%
Steele	163	28	19	12%	15	21	13%	50	31%	24	15%
Stevens	21	33	4	19%	18	4	19%	5	24%		0%
Swift	34	33	6	18%	14	2	6%	6	18%	2	6%
Todd	87	41	25	29%	16	2	2%	19	22%	1	1%
Traverse	18	32	3	17%	13	0	0%	4	22%	3	17%
Wabasha	40	31	9	23%	14	4	10%	13	33%	5	13%
Wadena	79	38	21	27%	16	10	13%	22	28%	3	4%
Waseca	87	26	15	17%	14	9	10%	40	46%	17	20%
Washington	504	42	145	29%	20	96	19%	123	24%	22	4%
Watonwan	47	36	10	21%	17	7	15%	9	19%	3	6%
Wilkin	31	30	6	19%	15	2	6%	9	29%	4	13%
Winona	141	37	32	23%	19	23	16%	37	26%	9	6%
Wright	235	34	54	23%	14	19	8%	74	31%	5	2%
Yellow Medicine	24	30	4	17%	13	2	8%	10	42%	6	25%
Northwest	373	40	96	26%	18	63	17%	85	23%	21	6%
West Central	2,857	46	1,003	35%	17	361	13%	525	18%	111	4%
Northeast	2,112	45	705	33%	20	399	19%	417	20%	64	3%
Central	2,062	37	506	25%	16	217	11%	533	26%	96	5%
Southwest	510	33	106	21%	16	61	12%	158	31%	53	10%
South Central	774	33	159	21%	16	91	12%	236	30%	66	9%
Southeast	1,594	34	324	20%	17	206	13%	455	29%	151	9%
Metro Suburban	2,788	41	825	30%	19	416	15%	654	23%	131	5%
Core Metro	14,661	50	5,742	39%	23	3,516	24%	2,660	18%	988	7%
Minnesota	27,731	46	9,466	34%	20	5,330	19%	5,723	21%	1,681	6%

Table 10 (Part 3)

	Wa	elfare	<u> </u>	able 10	•	Work and	d Incom	Δ		
County/Region/		d-Only	Buda	eted Ear			tal Inco		Work	Hours
State		u-Only IFIP	Buug	eleu Lai	iiiigs	'	rtai iiico	IIIC	VVOIK	ilouis
	Count	Pront	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Mean
Aitkin	5	6%	21	27%	\$370	27	35%	\$773	26	101
Anoka	85	7%	380	33%	\$376	477	42%	\$868	471	100
Becker	15	6%	95	39%	\$346	103	42%	\$705	102	96
Beltrami	76	10%	264	33%	\$440	315	39%	\$772	310	109
Benton	7	5%	45	31%	\$293	55	38%	\$588	54	82
Big Stone	0	0%	8	33%	\$330	9	38%	\$782	9	148
Blue Earth	24	11%	100	44%	\$357	117	52%	\$826	115	95
Brown	8	12%	29	45%	\$413	39	60%	\$862	39	115
Carlton	19	11%	59	33%	\$355	69	39%	\$735	69	93
Carver	5	6%	21	27%	\$330	30	39%	\$761	30	81
Cass	24	9%	96	35%	\$412	98	35%	\$761	98	103
Chippewa	2	6%	18	53%	\$262	21	62%	\$431	21	72
Chisago	7	6%	32	25%	\$395	54	43%	\$881	54	102
Clay	38	11%	167	48%	\$397	183	52%	\$763	178	105
Clearwater	4	6%	25	38%	\$342	26	40%	\$699	26	97
Cook	0	0%	2	40%	\$297	2	40%	\$1,079	2	60
Cottonwood	6	14%	19	44%	\$428	24	56%	\$713	24	99
Crow Wing	22	9%	91	38%	\$422	117	49%	\$758	114	100
Dakota	82	9%	309	34%	\$425	373	41%	\$910	372	102
Dodge	5	12%	13	32%	\$459	19	46%	\$951	19	111
Douglas	13	12%	49	45%	\$335	56	51%	\$638	55	90
Faribault	8	17%	22	47%	\$417	25	53%	\$537	25	66
Fillmore	2	6%	11	31%	\$206	12	33%	\$782	12	85
Freeborn	17	10%	69	40%	\$371	71	41%	\$797	71	99
Goodhue	10	8%	47	37%	\$412	47	37%	\$1,024	47	111
Grant	2	13%	8	53%	\$472	10	67%	\$812	10	107
Hennepin	636	7%	2,342	26%	\$429	2,927	32%	\$892	2,886	100
Houston	3	6%	21	45%	\$260	26	55%	\$668	26	80
Hubbard	10	10%	43	45%	\$355	48	50%	\$646	48	90
Isanti	6	4%	51	38%	\$293	59	44%	\$708	56	83
Itasca	22	10%	90	42%	\$414	99	46%	\$766	99	103
Jackson	1	5%	9	43%	\$409	12	57%	\$617	12	103
Kanabec	9	13%	27	39%	\$374	31	45%	\$842	30	109
Kandiyohi	24	9%	104	41%	\$387	133	52%	\$745	132	101
Kittson	1	14%	4	57%	\$281	3	43%	\$1,274	3	148
Koochiching	9	11%	40	51%	\$333	40	51%	\$633	39	93
Lac Qui Parle	0	0%	7	50%	\$276	3	21%	\$8,362	3	125
Lake	2	8%	12	48%	\$298	12	48%	\$462	12	69
Lake of the Woods	1	6%	5	31%	\$335	8	50%	\$721	8	90
Le Sueur	6	9%	32	48%	\$379	27	41%	\$863	27	98
Lincoln	5	29%	11	65%	\$397	10	59%	\$887	10	106
Lyon	7	9%	35	45%	\$362	36	47%	\$749	36	102
McLeod	7	9%	31	40%	\$392	38	49%	\$716	37	88
Mahnomen	7	7%	39	40%	\$333	47	48%	\$696	47	97
Marshall	2	7%	11	39%	\$419	12	43%	\$689	12	98
Martin	7	9%	36	44%	\$359	47	57%	\$779	45	107
Meeker	5	8%	28	42%	\$300	27	41%	\$605	26	72
Mille Lacs	14	11%	48	38%	\$398	56	44%	\$739	56	90
iic Lacs	I 17	1 1 /0		30 /0	ψυσυ		17 /0	Ψίου		30

Table 10 (Part 4)

	We	Ifare	<u> </u>	able 10		Work and	d Incom	e		
County/Region/		d-Only	Buda	eted Ear			tal Inco		Work	Hours
State		FIP		,	9					
	Count	Pront	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Mean
Morrison	13	12%	58	53%	\$386	62	57%	\$766	62	94
Mower	17	10%	73	42%	\$387	95	54%	\$753	95	90
Murray	4	22%	9	50%	\$379	11	61%	\$677	11	99
Nicollet	9	8%	39	34%	\$339	49	43%	\$730	49	96
Nobles	11	11%	44	44%	\$360	56	56%	\$759	56	106
Norman	4	17%	11	46%	\$393	13	54%	\$726	13	89
Olmsted	66	14%	197	41%	\$461	239	50%	\$983	239	116
Otter Tail	16	9%	94	51%	\$356	104	56%	\$748	104	100
Pennington	7	14%	26	51%	\$410	26	51%	\$841	26	119
Pine	15	9%	61	36%	\$353	72	43%	\$709	69	102
Pipestone	2	7%	9	31%	\$333	11	38%	\$811	11	102
Polk	29	13%	102	45%	\$371	114	50%	\$740	113	101
Pope	0	0%	6	35%	\$242	9	53%	\$471	9	69
Ramsey	483	9%	1,645	29%	\$450	2,029	36%	\$937	2,010	104
Red Lake	1	7%	6	43%	\$372	9	64%	\$883	9	121
Redwood	5	9%	19	36%	\$442	25	47%	\$729	25	95
Renville	4	8%	20	38%	\$398	25	47%	\$662	25	86
Rice	16	9%	63	37%	\$394	72	42%	\$882	72	103
Rock	4	18%	12	55%	\$515	15	68%	\$799	15	105
Roseau	4	18%	11	50%	\$475	12	55%	\$847	12	129
St. Louis	127	8%	608	40%	\$352	701	46%	\$702	698	96
Scott	7	4%	46	29%	\$331	62	39%	\$720	61	84
Sherburne	10	6%	56	34%	\$373	76	46%	\$777	76	95
Sibley	6	15%	17	41%	\$450	21	51%	\$852	19	100
Stearns	32	7%	160	37%	\$356	190	43%	\$785	188	97
Steele	20	12%	62	38%	\$475	77	47%	\$1,032	77	124
Stevens	3	14%	8	38%	\$375	11	52%	\$603	11	85
Swift	4	12%	11	32%	\$400	14	41%	\$797	14	102
Todd	10	11%	36	41%	\$334	39	45%	\$697	39	102
Traverse	3	17%	13	72%	\$314	11	61%	\$767	11	100
Wabasha	1	3%	11	28%	\$268	14	35%	\$634	14	101
Wadena	9	11%	41	52%	\$369	41	52%	\$665	40	94
Waseca	4	5%	33	38%	\$363	41	47%	\$826	39	98
Washington	48	10%	163	32%	\$389	198	39%	\$930	195	93
Watonwan	4	9%	28	60%	\$405	25	53%	\$762	24	104
Wilkin	4	13%	15	48%	\$329	11	35%	\$640	11	113
Winona	10	7%	56	40%	\$420	64	45%	\$832	62	108
Wright	17	7%	77	33%	\$357	95	40%	\$720	93	88
Yellow Medicine	3	13%	9	38%	\$385	11	46%	\$808	11	110
Northwest	48	13%	171	46%	\$386	189	51%	\$772	188	106
West Central	270	9%	1,153	40%	\$389	1,299	45%	\$736	1,283	101
Northeast	184	9%	832	39%	\$357	950	45%	\$708	945	96
Central	157	8%	740	36%	\$359	911	44%	\$742	896	94
Southwest	54	11%	220	43%	\$377	258	51%	\$816	258	102
South Central	76	10%	336	43%	\$375	391	51%	\$793	382	98
Southeast	167	10%	623	39%	\$415	736	46%	\$898	734	107
Metro Suburban	227	8%	919	33%	\$391	1,140	41%	\$882	1,129	98
Core Metro	1,119	8%	3,987	27%	\$437	4,956	34%	\$911	4,896	101
Minnesota	2,302	8%	8,981	32%	\$406	10,830	39%	\$845	10,711	100

Table 10 (Part 5)

	Exemptions			tions	Child Support			
County/Region/		on-	Sanc	Percent		ent Payn		
State		yment		of All	Curre	ent Payn	ients	
State	Count	Percent	Count	Cases	Count	Percent	Median	
Aitkin	14	18%	7	9%	22	28%	\$220	
Anoka	176	15%	134	12%	235	20%	\$220	
Becker	30	12%	31	13%	39	16%	\$154	
Beltrami	84	11%	50	6%	89	11%	\$159	
Benton	17	12%	20	14%	41	28%	\$201	
Big Stone	2	8%	4	17%	9	38%	\$134	
Blue Earth	21	9%	6	3%	55	24%	\$238	
Brown	9	14%	5	8%	13	20%	\$201	
Carlton	36	20%	29	16%	41	23%	\$211	
Carver	20	26%	9	12%	17	22%	\$222	
Cass	20	7%	50	18%	50	18%	\$155	
Chippewa	3	9%	5	15%	6	18%	\$220	
Chisago	18	14%	7	6%	32	25%	\$237	
Clay	56	16%	24	7%	67	19%	\$237 \$173	
Clearwater	11	17%	7	11%	12	18%	\$173 \$196	
Cook	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	Ψ190	
Cottonwood	3	7%	10	23%	5	12%	\$288	
Crow Wing	40	17%	32	14%	48	20%	\$265 \$165	
Dakota	127	14%	119	13%	211	23%	\$103	
Dodge	4	10%	2	5%	10	24%	\$209 \$207	
Douglas	21	19%	23	21%	29	26%	\$146	
Faribault	15	32%	3	6%	29 15	32%	\$146 \$162	
Fillmore	6		3	8%				
		17%			15 50	42%	\$141	
Freeborn	27	16%	45	26%	50	29%	\$171 \$404	
Goodhue	15 1	12%	8 2	6%	28	22%	\$181	
Grant		7%		13%	1	7%	Φ477	
Hennepin	754	8%	757	8%	1,117	12%	\$177	
Houston	7	15%	4	9%	12	26%	\$189	
Hubbard	20	21%	13	14%	16	17%	\$151	
Isanti	23	17%	15	11%	37	28%	\$175	
Itasca 	45	21%	33	15%	49	23%	\$167	
Jackson	3	14%	4	19%	7	33%	\$244	
Kanabec	9	13%	5	7%	16	23%	\$179	
Kandiyohi	47	18%	43	17%	43	17%	\$201	
Kittson	1	14%	2	29%	3	43%	00.15	
Koochiching	14	18%	1	1%	15	19%	\$213	
Lac Qui Parle	4	29%	2	14%	2	14%		
Lake	5	20%	0	0%	8	32%	\$162	
Lake of the Woods	5	31%	1	6%	5	31%	\$70	
Le Sueur	10	15%	4	6%	16	24%	\$164	
Lincoln	4	24%	3	18%	1	6%		
Lyon	16	21%	7	9%	16	21%	\$175	
McLeod	10	13%	22	28%	18	23%	\$213	
Mahnomen	13	13%	17	18%	12	12%	\$138	
Marshall	10	36%	5	18%	5	18%	\$169	
Martin	17	21%	9	11%	25	30%	\$123	
Meeker	18	27%	7	11%	22	33%	\$175	
Mille Lacs	29	23%	12	10%	39	31%	\$214	

Table 10 (Part 6)

	Even		10 (Par	tions	O.L.	:1.1 0	4
0 1 10		ptions	Sand			ild Supp	
County/Region/		on-		Percent	Curre	ent Payn	ients
State		yment	l	of All	_		
	Count	Percent	Count	Cases	Count	Percent	Median
Morrison	14	13%	18	17%	33	30%	\$191
Mower	34	19%	32	18%	40	23%	\$217
Murray	6	33%	3	17%	3	17%	
Nicollet	8	7%	5	4%	35	31%	\$228
Nobles	18	18%	13	13%	22	22%	\$167
Norman	4	17%	5	21%	6	25%	\$232
Olmsted	56	12%	23	5%	105	22%	\$189
Otter Tail	29	16%	17	9%	45	24%	\$167
Pennington	9	18%	9	18%	13	25%	\$198
Pine	33	20%	17	10%	48	29%	\$179
Pipestone	8	28%	2	7%	8	28%	\$94
Polk	41	18%	31	14%	69	30%	\$175
Pope	3	18%	4	24%	3	18%	
Ramsey	596	11%	359	6%	744	13%	\$175
Red Lake	4	29%	6	43%	1	7%	
Redwood	8	15%	10	19%	10	19%	\$195
Renville	11	21%	3	6%	9	17%	\$116
Rice	34	20%	10	6%	38	22%	\$223
Rock	1	5%	1	5%	5	23%	\$228
Roseau	5	23%	5	23%	5	23%	\$283
St. Louis	241	16%	124	8%	292	19%	\$161
Scott	33	21%	13	8%	37	23%	\$222
Sherburne	33	20%	19	11%	44	26%	\$202
Sibley	3	7%	1	2%	11	27%	\$184
Stearns	90	21%	42	10%	86	20%	\$217
Steele	28	17%	9	6%	26	16%	\$170
Stevens	6	29%	1	5%	8	38%	\$204
Swift	11	32%	2	6%	9	26%	\$184
Todd	21	24%	9	10%	22	25%	\$245
Traverse	3	17%	1	6%	5	28%	\$231
Wabasha	10	25%	6	15%	10	25%	\$213
Wadena	12	15%	11	14%	23	29%	\$190
Waseca	18	21%	1	1%	16	18%	\$134
Washington	68	13%	43	9%	95	19%	\$227
Watonwan	8	17%	3	6%	8	17%	\$238
Wilkin	9	29%	3	10%	10	32%	\$195
Winona	26	18%	9	6%	31	22%	\$257
Wright	33	14%	32	14%	60	26%	\$241
Yellow Medicine	2	8%	4	17%	2	8%	
Northwest	74	20%	63	17%	102	27%	\$176
West Central	398	14%	313	11%	517	18%	\$169
Northeast	356	17%	195	9%	428	20%	\$174
Central	371	18%	244	12%	495	24%	\$203
Southwest	89	17%	70	14%	105	21%	\$176
South Central	109	14%	37	5%	194	25%	\$192
Southeast	247	15%	151	9%	365	23%	\$196
Metro Suburban	424	15%	318	11%	595	21%	\$217
Core Metro	1,350	9%	1,116	8%	1,861	13%	\$176
Minnesota	3,418	12%	2,507	9%	4,662	17%	\$183

Table 11. Economic characteristics of December 2000 MFIP paid cases with two eligible adults by county and region

				duits b		Welfa					
County/Region/	Number	Ac	tive Mon		T.A	NF Mont	hs	Ne	ew Cases	in 2000	
State	of		Over 60	Months		Over 36	Months	То	tal	Out-of-	-State
	Cases	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Prcnt
Aitkin	27	29	4	15%	16	1	4%	9	33%	1	4%
Anoka	191	33	38	20%	14	9	5%	64	34%	38	20%
Becker	62	38	17	27%	17	7	11%	13	21%	2	3%
Beltrami	185	42	55	30%	12	5	3%	35	19%	5	3%
Benton	26	31	6	23%	15	2	8%	8	31%	0	0%
Big Stone	10	30	1	10%	15	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%
Blue Earth	53	25	5	9%	15	2	4%	19	36%	14	26%
Brown	20	29	3	15%	16	0	0%	2	10%	1	5%
Carlton	29	42	10	34%	19	3	10%	4	14%	1	3%
Carver	14	41	5	36%	21	3	21%	3	21%	2	14%
Cass	69	43	19	28%	18	8	12%	11	16%	2	3%
Chippewa	8	40	4	50%	16	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%
Chisago	28	35	6	21%	13	2	7%	6	21%	3	11%
Clay	96	33	21	22%	16	4	4%	26	27%	13	14%
Clearwater	32	51	14	44%	21	5	16%	7	22%	0	0%
Cook	3	59	2	67%	26	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%
Cottonwood	9	13	0	0%	9	0	0%	4	44%	2	22%
Crow Wing	54	39	14	26%	18	7	13%	15	28%	5	9%
Dakota	90	27	13	14%	16	7	8%	32	36%	13	14%
Dodge	5	30	1	20%	23	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%
Douglas	22	32	4	18%	16	2	9%	9	41%	1	5%
Faribault	12	36	4	33%	16	2	17%	3	25%	0	0%
Fillmore	12	26	1	8%	18	0	0%	5	42%	1	8%
Freeborn	40	30	9	23%	15	2	5%	11	28%	4	10%
Goodhue	15	37	4	27%	16	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%
Grant	4	24	0	0%	14	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%
Hennepin	1,148	40	308	27%	21	208	18%	290	25%	196	17%
Houston	8	15	0	0%	11	0	0%	5	63%	4	50%
Hubbard	29	34	5	17%	15	2	7%	5	17%	1	3%
Isanti	30	23	2	7%	11	1	3%	10	33%	3	10%
Itasca	46	41	13	28%	17	5	11%	10	22%	3	7%
Jackson	11	33	2	18%	15	1	9%	2	18%	1	9%
Kanabec	16	21	1	6%	11	0	0%	4	25%	0	0%
Kandiyohi	68	28	7	10%	13	4	6%	15	22%	8	12%
Kittson	4	30	1	25%	16	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%
Koochiching	24	32	4	17%	16	2	8%	5	21%	0	0%
Lac Qui Parle	3	21	0	0%	12	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Lake	3	40	0	0%	29	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Lake of the Woods	2	3	0	0%	3	0	0%	2	100%	1	50%
Le Sueur	11	23	2	18%	8	0	0%	4	36%	0	0%
Lincoln	2	14	0	0%	8	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Lyon	24	14	1	4%	12	2	8%	16	67%	9	38%
McLeod	22	19	1 -	5%	13	1	5%	11	50%	3	14%
Mahnomen	16	40	5	31%	12	0	0%	7	44%	0	0%
Marshall	8	32	1	13%	18	1	13%	2	25%	1	13%
Martin	19	34	4	21%	17	2	11%	5	26%	1	5%
Meeker	11	13	0	0%	7	0	0%	7	64%	1	9%
Mille Lacs	23	36	5	22%	13	2	9%	5	22%	1	4%

Table 11 (Part 2)

				Table 1	1 (1 411	. <u>∠,</u> Welfa	re				
County/Region/	Number	Ac	tive Mont	ths	T/	NF Mont	hs	Ne	ew Cases	in 2000)
State	of		Over 60	Months			Months	То		Out-of	
	Cases	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Prcnt
Morrison	24	29	3	13%	14	1	4%	10	42%	2	8%
Mower	34	26	4	12%	17	4	12%	7	21%	2	6%
Murray	5	24	0	0%	11	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%
Nicollet	28	19	1	4%	13	3	11%	15	54%	7	25%
Nobles	25	31	5	20%	12	1	4%	10	40%	7	28%
Norman	13	40	4	31%	20	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%
Olmsted	96	26	10	10%	13	4	4%	32	33%	21	22%
Otter Tail	62	28	7	11%	14	5	8%	20	32%	7	11%
Pennington	11	25	1	9%	12	0	0%	5	45%	1	9%
Pine	44	35	9	20%	14	1	2%	10	23%	0	0%
Pipestone	13	13	0	0%	8	0	0%	7	54%	4	31%
Polk	78	26	8	10%	15	3	4%	24	31%	9	12%
Pope	5	40	2	40%	12	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Ramsey	744	46	250	34%	23	161	22%	143	19%	79	11%
Red Lake	1	57	0	0%	28	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Redwood	10	30	2	20%	15	0	0%	3	30%	1	10%
Renville	21	20	2	10%	11	1	5%	9	43%	7	33%
Rice	25	24	4	16%	12	0	0%	12	48%	6	24%
Rock	5	5	0	0%	4	0	0%	4	80%	2	40%
Roseau	3	38	1	33%	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
St. Louis	309	37	74	24%	17	34	11%	77	25%	14	5%
Scott	24	24	3	13%	14	2	8%	8	33%	7	29%
Sherburne	18	37	4	22%	15	1	6%	5	28%	1	6%
Sibley	13	27	1	8%	10	1	8%	3	23%	1	8%
Stearns	78	32	15	19%	15	3	4%	21	27%	6	8%
Steele	40	27	6	15%	15 -	2	5%	12	30%	4	10%
Stevens	4	11	0	0%	7	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
Swift	6	37	2	33%	11	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%
Todd	25	33	5	20%	12	0	0%	4	16%	2	8%
Traverse	2	13	0	0%	9	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Wabasha	9	30	2	22%	15	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%
Wadena Waseca	25	35	6 2	24%	15	2	8%	6	24%	1	4%
	20 65	26 40		10%	18 19	2	10%	7 14	35%	5	25% 6%
Washington Watonwan	17	40 17	16 0	25% 0%	19	11 0	17% 0%	1 4 6	22% 35%	4 0	0%
Watonwan Wilkin	6	17 27	0	0%	23		0% 17%	0	0%	0	0%
Winona	32	27 27	4	13%	23 15	1 4	17%	11	34%	5	16%
Wright	33	30	7	21%	12	1	3%	10	30%	0	0%
Yellow Medicine	7	21	0	0%	15	0	0%	3	43%	0	0%
Northwest	118	28	16	14%	16	5	4%	35	30%	14	12%
West Central	724	37	177	24%	15	49	7%	175	24%	44	6%
Northeast	441	37	107	24%	17	49	11%	106	24%	19	4%
Central	418	29	65	16%	13	19	5%	121	29%	33	8%
Southwest	138	29	17	12%	12	6	4%	59	43%	29	21%
South Central	193	25	22	11%	14	12	6%	64	33%	29	15%
Southeast	316	27	45	14%	15	18	6%	99	31%	49	16%
Metro Suburban	384	33	75	20%	16	32	8%	121	32%	64	17%
Core Metro	1,892	42	558	29%	22	369	20%	433	23%	275	15%
Minnesota	4,624	36	1,082	23%	18	557	12%	1,213	26%	556	12%

Table 11 (Part 3)

	Welfare				ri (Pari	Work and	d Income	Δ		
County/Region/		d-Only	Buda	eted Ear			tal Inco		Work	Hours
State		IFIP	Daag	otou Lui	ımıgo	'	, tui 11100		I III	a.
	Count	Prcnt	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Mean
Aitkin	5	19%	14	52%	\$509	18	67%	\$947	18	126
Anoka	16	8%	84	44%	\$480	111	58%	\$1,111	110	122
Becker	10	16%	37	60%	\$466	33	53%	\$955	33	142
Beltrami	23	12%	91	49%	\$486	112	61%	\$1,015	112	131
Benton	2	8%	15	58%	\$403	11	42%	\$826	11	86
Big Stone	3	30%	6	60%	\$717	6	60%	\$1,035	6	133
Blue Earth	4	8%	33	62%	\$359	36	68%	\$971	36	121
Brown	2	10%	12	60%	\$453	17	85%	\$1,009	17	116
Carlton	5	17%	19	66%	\$523	19	66%	\$1,083	19	134
Carver	3	21%	10	71%	\$507	12	86%	\$1,614	12	183
Cass	7	10%	40	58%	\$495	40	58%	\$895	40	122
Chippewa	0	0%	6	75%	\$167	3	38%		3	
Chisago	4	14%	14	50%	\$479	17	61%	\$922	17	113
Clay	18	19%	56	58%	\$541	64	67%	\$1,039	64	132
Clearwater	1	3%	20	63%	\$352	21	66%	\$713	21	102
Cook	0	0%	3	100%		3	100%		3	
Cottonwood	2	22%	9	100%	\$456	7	78%	\$1,163	7	153
Crow Wing	5	9%	36	67%	\$447	37	69%	\$1,097	36	127
Dakota	13	14%	47	52%	\$507	54	60%	\$976	54	114
Dodge	0	0%	2	40%		1	20%		1	
Douglas	4	18%	18	82%	\$455	16	73%	\$964	16	121
Faribault	4	33%	9	75%	\$597	9	75%	\$761	9	113
Fillmore	0	0%	11	92%	\$278	8	67%	\$960	8	145
Freeborn	4	10%	27	68%	\$460	28	70%	\$1,153	28	138
Goodhue	2	13%	7	47%	\$415	6	40%	\$937	6	120
Grant	0	0%	1	25%		2	50%		2	
Hennepin	196	17%	578	50%	\$618	658	57%	\$1,295	651	140
Houston	0	0%	4	50%		3	38%		3	
Hubbard	6	21%	20	69%	\$483	19	66%	\$1,087	19	126
Isanti	2	7%	15	50%	\$467	20	67%	\$879	19	107
Itasca	8	17%	22	48%	\$470	28	61%	\$921	28	133
Jackson	2	18%	5	45%	\$559	6	55%	\$1,221	6	158
Kanabec	2	13%	7	44%	\$352	10	63%	\$838	10	128
Kandiyohi	11	16%	49	72%	\$482	47	69%	\$1,198	46	149
Kittson	1	25%	2	50%		2	50%		2	
Koochiching	1	4%	10	42%	\$430	9	38%	\$719	9	112
Lac Qui Parle	0	0%	3	100%		3	100%		3	
Lake	1	33%	3	100%		3	100%		3	
Lake of the Woods	0	0%		0%			0%			
Le Sueur	1	9%	6	55%	\$446	6	55%	\$930	6	117
Lincoln	1	50%	1	50%		2	100%		2	
Lyon	7	29%	13	54%	\$755	17	71%	\$1,246	17	156
McLeod	1	5%	11	50%	\$354	12	55%	\$1,216	12	161
Mahnomen	3	19%	5	31%	\$654	5	31%	\$765	5	111
Marshall	0	0%	3	38%		2	25%		2	
Martin	1	5%	14	74%	\$375	14	74%	\$797	14	117
Meeker	2	18%	3	27%		5	45%	\$431	5	69
Mille Lacs	2	9%	14	61%	\$375	13	57%	\$813	13	108

Table 11 (Part 4)

	Welfare Work and Income										
County/Region/		d-Only	Buda	eted Ear					Work	Hours	
State		IFIP	Duag	eteu Lai	iiiigs	l '	rotal income			TIOTK HOUIS	
Otate	Count	Pront	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Count	Mean	
Morrison	1	4%	15	63%	\$282	17	71%	\$620	15	69	
Mower	6	18%	24	71%	\$439	24	71%	\$1,047	23	136	
Murray	1	20%	2	40%		3	60%	,	3		
Nicollet	4	14%	16	57%	\$455	20	71%	\$1,178	20	131	
Nobles	11	44%	21	84%	\$603	22	88%	\$1,369	22	171	
Norman	2	15%	11	85%	\$499	10	77%	\$821	9	106	
Olmsted	27	28%	63	66%	\$691	72	75%	\$1,495	72	159	
Otter Tail	12	19%	41	66%	\$543	43	69%	\$1,238	42	153	
Pennington	3	27%	7	64%	\$492	6	55%	\$875	6	111	
Pine	1	2%	17	39%	\$401	24	55%	\$893	24	101	
Pipestone	0	0%	9	69%	\$458	10	77%	\$951	10	123	
Polk	16	21%	49	63%	\$475	47	60%	\$1,026	47	137	
Pope	1	20%	2	40%		2	40%		2		
Ramsey	135	18%	396	53%	\$676	435	58%	\$1,410	435	146	
Red Lake	1	100%	1	100%		1	100%		1		
Redwood	2	20%	8	80%	\$630	7	70%	\$1,261	7	146	
Renville	6	29%	10	48%	\$543	11	52%	\$1,384	10	168	
Rice	5	20%	15	60%	\$572	19	76%	\$1,237	19	136	
Rock	1	20%	3	60%		4	80%		4		
Roseau	0	0%		0%		1	33%		1		
St. Louis	48	16%	198	64%	\$449	218	71%	\$915	216	125	
Scott	1	4%	10	42%	\$489	11	46%	\$884	11	103	
Sherburne	1	6%	9	50%	\$450	13	72%	\$1,329	13	131	
Sibley	7	54%	8	62%	\$452	8	62%	\$1,118	8	139	
Stearns	9	12%	42	54%	\$444	47	60%	\$1,143	46 22	129	
Steele	7	18%	27	68%	\$587	23	58%	\$1,319	23	160	
Stevens Swift	1	25%	3	75%		3 5	75%	¢4 220	3 5	100	
Todd	0	0% 12%	4	67% 72%	\$421	21	83% 84%	\$1,328 \$841	21	166 124	
Traverse	0	0%	18 2	100%	⊅4∠1	2	100%	Φ0 4 I	2	124	
Wabasha	1	11%	5	56%	\$497	8	89%	\$1,715	8	138	
Wadena		4%	14	56%	\$497	19	76%	\$7,713	18	102	
Waseca	3	15%	10	50%	\$510	13	65%	\$1,058	13	134	
Washington	8	12%	34	52%	\$474	40	62%	\$1,050	40	118	
Watonwan	2	12%	11	65%	\$567	11	65%	\$1,219	11	154	
Wilkin	0	0%	5	83%	\$665	5	83%	\$1,026	5	155	
Winona	4	13%	16	50%	\$616	18	56%	\$1,132	18	145	
Wright	6	18%	23	70%	\$467	24	73%	\$1,077	24	129	
Yellow Medicine	3	43%	5	71%	\$857	6	86%	\$1,459	6	188	
Northwest	23	19%	73	62%	\$479	69	58%	\$964	68	129	
West Central	96	13%	424	59%	\$476	461	64%	\$976	456	127	
Northeast	68	15%	269	61%	\$462	298	68%	\$927	296	127	
Central	49	12%	229	55%	\$445	254	61%	\$1,054	250	126	
Southwest	33	24%	95	69%	\$568	101	73%	\$1,167	101	146	
South Central	28	15%	119	62%	\$444	134	69%	\$1,010	134	126	
Southeast	56	18%	201	64%	\$554	210	66%	\$1,292	209	148	
Metro Suburban	41	11%	185	48%	\$487	228	59%	\$1,084	227	122	
Core Metro	331	17%	974	51%	\$642	1,093	58%	\$1,341	1,086	142	
Minnesota	725	16%	2,569	56%	\$543	2,848	62%	\$1,158	2,827	135	

Table 11 (Part 5)

Exemptions Sanctions Child Support								
Country/Dominant	Exemptions				Child Support			
State	Non-Employment Person		Percent of All		Current Payments			
State	Count	Percent	Count	Cases	Count	Percent	Median	
Aitkin	10	19%	2	7%	0	0%		
Anoka	46	12%	33	17%	13	7%	\$183	
Becker	17	14%	18	29%	6	10%	\$128	
Beltrami	36	10%	11	6%	4	2%	Ψ120	
Benton	7	13%	5	19%	1	4%		
Big Stone	4	20%	0	0%	1	10%		
Blue Earth	9	8%	1	2%	3	6%		
Brown	6	15%	5	25%	4	20%		
Carlton	11	19%	4	14%	4	14%		
Carver	2	7%	4	29%	1	7%		
Cass	11	8%	15	22%	4	6%		
Chippewa	1	6%	3	38%	1	13%		
Chisago	6	11%	4	14%	3	11%		
Clay	28	15%	13	14%	2	2%		
Clearwater	12	19%	3	9%	1	3%		
Cook	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		
Cottonwood	5	28%	1	11%	0	0%		
Crow Wing	15	14%	5	9%	5	9%	\$161	
Dakota	29	16%	10	11%	5	6%	\$150	
Dodge	29 1	10%	0	0%	1	20%	\$ 150	
Douglas	11	25%	2	9%	4	18%		
Faribault	6	25% 25%	0	9% 0%	1	8%		
	5			0% 8%		8%		
Fillmore		21%	1		1			
Freeborn	12	15%	10	25%	3	8%		
Goodhue	8	27%	0	0%	1	7%		
Grant	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%	6457	
Hennepin	188	8%	112	10%	33	3%	\$157	
Houston	4	25%	0	0%	0	0%		
Hubbard	8	14%	4	14%	4	14%		
Isanti	8	13%	3	10%	2	7%		
Itasca	16	17%	9	20%	4 1	9%		
Jackson	2	9%	1	9%	•	9%		
Kanabec	8	25%	0	0%	1	6%		
Kandiyohi	29	21%	14	21%	3	4%		
Koochiching	1 8	13%	3	25%	3	0%		
Koochiching		17%		13%		13%		
Lac Qui Parle	1	17%	0	0%	1	33%		
Lake Lake of the Woods	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%		
	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		
Le Sueur	3	14%	0	0%	1	9%		
Lincoln	0	0% 21%	0	0%	0	0%		
Lyon McLeod	10 10		0	0%	0	0% 5%		
	10	23%	2	9%	1	5%		
Mannomen	1	3%	3	19%	1	6%		
Marshall	3	19%	4	50%	0	0%		
Martin	5	13%	1	5%	1	5%		
Meeker	5	23%	0	0%	0	0%		
Mille Lacs	10	22%	4	17%	2	9%		

Table 11 (Part 6)

	Exem	ptions		tions	Child Support			
County/Region/	Non-Employment		Percent		Current Payments			
State	Person		of All		Current Payments			
State	Count	Percent	Count	Cases	Count	Percent	Median	
Morrison	10	21%	6	25%	2	8%	Wieulali	
Mower	11							
	4	16%	10 1	29%	0	12%		
Murray		40%		20%		0%		
Nicollet	3	5%	4	14%	2	7%		
Nobles	5	10%	3	12%	2	8%		
Norman	2	8%	4	31%	1	8%	0400	
Olmsted	16	8%	4	4%	5	5%	\$128	
Otter Tail	19	15%	11	18%	6	10%	\$135	
Pennington	6	27%	2	18%	0	0%	0.400	
Pine	16	18%	5	11%	9	20%	\$132	
Pipestone	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%		
Polk	31	20%	11	14%	1	1%		
Pope	4	40%	2	40%	0	0%	04.5	
Ramsey	131	9%	69	9%	22	3%	\$142	
Red Lake	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%		
Redwood	1	5%	1	10%	2	20%		
Renville	7	17%	3	14%	3	14%		
Rice	10	20%	3	12%	3	12%		
Rock	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%		
Roseau	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%		
St. Louis	64	10%	41	13%	23	7%	\$139	
Scott	13	27%	2	8%	3	13%		
Sherburne	6	17%	2	11%	1	6%		
Sibley	7	27%	4	31%	2	15%		
Stearns	28	18%	10	13%	10	13%	\$155	
Steele	19	24%	4	10%	0	0%		
Stevens	1	13%	1	25%	0	0%		
Swift	1	8%	1	17%	0	0%		
Todd	4	8%	4	16%	2	8%		
Traverse	1	25%	2	100%	0	0%		
Wabasha	3	17%	1	11%	0	0%		
Wadena	6	12%	6	24%	3	12%		
Waseca	7	18%	1	5%	2	10%		
Washington	17	13%	8	12%	10	15%	\$159	
Watonwan	6	18%	2	12%	0	0%		
Wilkin	1	8%	2	33%	0	0%		
Winona	7	11%	2	6%	2	6%		
Wright	8	12%	5	15%	1	3%		
Yellow Medicine	2	14%	0	0%	2	29%		
Northwest	45	19%	23	19%	2	2%		
West Central	186	13%	109	15%	44	6%	\$139	
Northeast	109	12%	60	14%	35	8%	\$139	
Central	148	18%	57	14%	37	9%	\$142	
Southwest	42	15%	11	8%	10	7%	\$115	
South Central	52	13%	18	9%	16	8%	\$186	
Southeast	96	15%	35	11%	20	6%	\$148	
Metro Suburban	107	14%	57	15%	32	8%	\$170	
Core Metro	319	8%	181	10%	55	3%	\$150	
Minnesota	1,104	12%	551	12%	251	5%	\$144	