



Tikki Brown, assistant commissioner
Children and Family Services
Minnesota Department of Human Services
Elmer L. Andersen Building
P.O. Box 64998
St. Paul, MN 55164-0998

July 1, 2022

Chair Jennifer Schultz
House Human Services Finance and Policy Committee
473 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
St Paul, MN 55155
rep.jennifer.schultz@house.mn

Minority Lead Tony Albright
House Human Services Finance and Policy Committee
259 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
St Paul, MN 55155
rep.tony.albright@house.mn

Chair Jamie Becker-Finn
House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law
559 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
St Paul, MN 55155
rep.jamie.becker-finn@house.mn

Minority Lead Peggy Scott
House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law
335 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
St Paul, MN 55155
rep.peggy.scott@house.mn

Chair Jim Abeler
Human Services Reform Finance and Policy Committee
3215 Minnesota Senate Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55155
sen.jim.abeler@senate.mn

Ranking Minority Member John Hoffman
Human Services Reform Finance and Policy Committee
2235 Minnesota Senate Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55155
jhoffman@senate.mn

Chair Warren Limmer
Senate Judiciary and Public Safety Finance Committee
3221 Minnesota Senate Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55155
sen.warren.limmer@senate.mn

Ranking Minority Member Ron Latz
Senate Judiciary and Public Safety Finance Committee
2215 Minnesota Senate Bldg.
St. Paul, MN 55155
sen.ron.latz@senate.mn

Sent via email only

Dear Health and Human Services committee chairs and minority Leads:

This document is in response to instructions provided by the Minnesota Legislature to the Minnesota Department of Human Services (Department) during the 2021 1st Special Session:

The commissioner of human services shall consult with counties and court administration regarding the availability of and process or collecting data related to court-appointed counsel under Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.163, subdivision 3, including but not limited to:

- 1) *data documenting the presence of court-appointed counsel for qualifying parents, guardians, or custodians at each emergency protective hearing;*

- 2) *total annual court-appointed parent representation expenditures for each county;*
- 3) *an appropriate formula to be used for distributing funding to counties to defray the costs of court-appointed counsel in child protection proceedings;*
- 4) *an appropriate allocation timeline for distributing funds to counties; and*
- 5) *additional demographic information that would assist counties in obtaining title IV-E reimbursement.*

By July 1, 2022, the commissioner must report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over human services and judiciary policy and finance with the findings from the consultation with counties and court administration and a plan for regular reporting of this data.¹

\$520,000 in fiscal year 2022 and \$520,000 in fiscal year 2023 are from the general fund for county costs, including administrative costs to obtain Title IV-E federal reimbursement, related to court-appointed counsel in child protection proceedings pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.163, subdivision 3. The commissioner shall distribute funds to counties based upon their proportional share of emergency protective care hearings averaged over the previous three years. Beginning in fiscal year 2024, the distribution formula shall be based upon the formula recommended by the commissioner in the required legislative report regarding initial implementation of court-appointed counsel in child protection proceedings.²

To comply with this legislation, department staff met with court administration to discuss available data. Department staff met with the Minnesota Association of Social Service Administrators' (MACSSA) children's committee, who provided context and feedback but deferred recommendations to the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) and the Minnesota Association of County Administrators (MACA) regarding the development of the formula.

Background

1. What is an emergency protective care hearing (EPC) and why is it critical for parents to have legal representation at an EPC?

An EPC is often the first hearing in a child protection case.³ The court must hold an EPC within 72 hours of when a child is taken into custody based on a court order, or by a peace officer if the child ran away from their parent(s), guardian(s) or custodian(s), or when a child is found in surroundings that the peace officer reasonably believes will endanger the their health or welfare.⁴

In Minnesota, parents who meet financial eligibility requirements for court-appointed legal counsel have a right to effective counsel in child protection proceedings.⁵ District court judges appoint legal counsel for qualifying parents.

The EPC is frequently the first opportunity a parent has to hear allegations of why their child was removed from their home. Parents are likely confused, frightened and unfamiliar with the child protection system and court

¹ See [Minn. Laws 2021 1st Special Session, Ch. 7, art. 9, § 6](#)

² See [Minn. Laws 2021 1st Special Session, Ch. 7, art. 16, § 2, subd. 22\(b\)](#)

³ See [Minn. Stat. § 230C.178](#)

⁴ See [Minn. Stat. § 260C.175, subd. 1](#)

⁵ See [Minn. Stat. § 611.17](#) and [Minn. Stat. § 260C.163, subd. 3](#)

proceedings. It is crucial that parents have legal counsel to help them understand their rights and the purpose of the EPC. According to data from the State Court Administrator's Office (Court Administration), legal counsel represents parents at approximately 46.4% of EPC hearings.⁶ Recognizing these factors, the 2021 Legislature made it a requirement that the court appoint legal counsel to represent eligible parents prior to the EPC.⁷

2. Who pays for parent legal counsel in child protection cases?

Under state law, individuals who meet financial eligibility requirements are entitled to be represented by a public defender in criminal cases, appeals of convictions and revocations of stays of imposition or execution of a sentence.⁸ Public defenders are also statutorily required to provide legal counsel to minors age 10 or older in child protection and juvenile delinquency proceedings. Although not required under law, public defenders provided legal counsel to parents who qualified for court-appointed counsel in child protection matters prior to 2008. However, inadequate funding led the Minnesota Board of Public Defense to stop representing parents in child protection cases in November 2008.⁹ At that time, the state shifted the cost for parent legal counsel to county property taxpayers. The legislature did not appropriate funding to counties to help pay these costs until the \$520,000 statewide appropriation enacted in 2021.

Payments for legal counsel are generally not a function of human services staff, either at state or county levels. They are an administrative function in each county. The Department plays no role in paying for legal counsel or tracking those costs for counties.¹⁰ It is arguable that it is a conflict of interest for counties to be responsible for contracting with and paying for legal counsel that is likely to oppose them in court.

Review of available data and plans for regular reporting

1. What data is available to document the presence of court-appointed counsel for qualifying parents, guardians or custodians at each EPC?

Currently, neither counties nor courts track the presence of *court-appointed* counsel for qualifying parents, guardians or custodians at each EPC.

Court Administration maintains county-specific data on how many EPCs are held each year. Court Administration also tracks data to show how many attorneys attend EPCs by county, but does not track whether those attorneys are court-appointed or retained privately by parents/guardians. Court Administration also maintains county-level data on the presence of an attorney representing parent(s) at all hearings, regardless of type, in child protection cases.

According to Court Administration, data regarding how many EPCs are held annually is more reliable than the data regarding the presence of attorneys at EPCs, and other hearings.¹¹

⁶ See court data, attached and [footnote 12](#)

⁷ See [Minn. Laws 2021 1st Special Session, Ch. 7, Art. 9, § 5](#)

⁸ See [Minn. Stat. § 611.14](#)

⁹ See [TwinCities.Com, Pioneer Press, July 4, 2008, updated November 13, 2015](#)

¹⁰ In 2019, the federal government began to allow federal Title IV-E reimbursement for a portion of costs for parent legal representation. Since 2019, Department staff have been working with counties to establish eligibility to receive these payments. The process to begin receiving these reimbursements is long. Currently, only Hennepin County is receiving Title IV-E reimbursement for parent legal fees. It is likely to take time before all counties that wish to seek reimbursements will be eligible to do so.

¹¹ There may be cases in which data on the presence of legal counsel is incomplete due to data entry errors. This gap could potentially be remedied in MNCIS, but determining a remedy is a discussion legislators should have with Court Administration.

County boards maintain data on costs associated with providing parent representation in child protection proceedings. AMC informed the Department that standardized data on when appointed legal counsel is present at an EPC is not readily available statewide due to the variations of contracting with, and making payments to, attorneys in these cases.

Plan for gathering this data: Responsibility for annual tracking of attendance of a court-appointed attorney at child protection hearings most appropriately lies with Court Administration. If the legislature would like to receive data beyond that which is currently available, committees responsible for funding state courts may consider working with Court Administration to determine if adequate resources and time would enable the courts to provide more specific or accurate data through the Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS).

2. What are total annual court-appointed parent representation expenditures for each county?

The Department does not have access to the total annual cost for court-appointed legal counsel for parents in child protection matters. This information is not related to the administration of social services programs, and as such, is not reported in the Social Services Information System (SSIS). AMC informed the Department that this data is not readily available, and they were unable to gather reliable data through surveys of member counties. As discussed above, there is not a consistent method among counties for tracking these costs, making a process for gathering and verifying this data would be a labor-intensive and entirely manual endeavor. The Department does not have capacity to gather this data and verify it would be reliable and consistent across counties. More accurate data would allow for better evaluation of the costs counties incur to provide parent legal representation in child protection cases.

Plan for gathering this data: The Department provides oversight for county administered social services, not for county administration fiscal management.¹² It does not have the expertise or resources to audit and report on costs incurred by 87 counties to provide legal counsel for parents in child protection matters. Legislative committees with jurisdiction over [Minnesota Statutes Chapter 375](#), and statutes governing county financial reporting, might consider establishing separate reporting requirements related to parent legal counsel costs. The legislature might also consider appropriating funds to an entity experienced in local government financial auditing to gather accounting of these costs from all counties, verify data is accurate and consistent and develop a standardized method for counties to gather and report this information to the Department annually. Upon receipt of standardized data, Department staff could use it to allocate the \$520,000 appropriation among counties in a manner that more accurately reflects each county's costs for parent legal representation.

3. What is an appropriate formula to be used for distributing funding to counties to defray costs of court-appointed counsel in child protection proceedings?

Based on available data, Department staff has determined there are three potential formulas for distributing the \$520,000 among counties to defray costs of legal counsel based on existing data, as follows:

- a. Continue to use a three-year average of data from Court Administration that provides the number of EPCs for each county. This is the formula provided in Laws of Minnesota, 2021 1st Special Session, Ch. 7, art. 9, § 6.
- b. Use a three-year average of the data from Court Administration that provides the number of hearings in which an attorney representing parent(s) was present for EPCs by county.
- c. Use a three-year average of the data from Court Administration that provides county-level data on the presence of an attorney representing parent(s) at all hearings in child protection cases.

¹² See [Minn. Stat. § 256.01](#)

What is the appropriate allocation timeline for distributing funds to counties?

Plan for payment timeline: Payments to counties for parent legal representation were made in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2022. The Department will allocate the \$520,000 among counties in the third quarter of each state fiscal year starting in fiscal year 2023.

4. What additional demographic information would assist counties in obtaining Title IV-E reimbursement?

Title IV-E reimbursement for eligible county costs for court-appointed parent legal counsel is separate and distinct from the issue of establishing a permanent formula for allocating state funds for these same costs.

Title IV-E reimbursement for eligible costs associated with independent legal representation for parent(s) in child protection proceedings is available to interested counties that work with the Department to implement the Parent Legal Representation program. In 2019, the department requested federal approval for a plan so that all counties in Minnesota could take the steps needed to receive Title IV-E reimbursement for eligible costs. DHS finally received federal approval in June, 2022. Prior to receiving statewide approval, the Department established a pilot with Hennepin County that resulted in Title IV-E reimbursement payments in 2020. DHS is currently in conversations with several other counties to establish their ability to do the same.

The Department and counties have access to all demographic data needed for counties to receive Title IV-E reimbursement for eligible cases. This data is available in SSIS, Court Administration records, and contracts county administration enters into with private attorneys.

Department recommendations

1. Recommendation for a permanent formula

The Department does not have a recommendation as to which of the three options are the most appropriate or if the most appropriate time period is averaging three years of data. Because the department can implement a formula using any of the existing data sources, it is recommended counties, through AMC and MACA, or the legislature make a final determination as to which formula to codify in statute.

AMC and MACA submitted the following recommendations for ongoing allocation of the \$520,000 appropriation for parent legal representation:

The AMC and MACA recommendation is to base allocation formula on the number of EPC hearings at which an attorney was present to represent the parent(s) (see Option b, above). However, we recommend the following flexibility in the formula between fiscal years 2023 and 2025:

*For state fiscal year 2023, DHS will base payments on an average of the most recent 3 years of data regarding the number of EPC hearings at which an attorney was present to represent parent(s). **This option is only possible if session law can be amended prior to the third quarter of state fiscal year 2023** when DHS plans to make payments to counties (3rd quarter begins in January, 2023). If session law is not amended by that time, DHS should use the current allocation formula.*

For state fiscal year 2024, DHS should base payments on the 2023 data regarding the number of EPC hearings at which an attorney was present to represent parent(s).

For state fiscal years 2025 and ongoing, DHS should determine the allocation based upon an average of the most recent 3 years of data regarding the number of EPC hearings at which an attorney was present to represent parent(s).

AMC and MACA make this recommendation because it would better account for the variation in number of EPC hearings experienced in smaller jurisdictions, which may have as few as 0 EPC hearings in one calendar year and 5 in the following year, a 500% increase. With a 3-year rolling average formula, if cases increase dramatically, the formula may more slowly bring the funding up to that threshold – however it would allow for more balanced budgeting at the county level. Given the statutory requirement for parental representation at the EPC hearing, the 2023 data should provide an accurate reflection of the number of hearings by county to be used for the 2024 allocation.

2. Recommendation for consideration of a statewide office of legal representation

High quality legal representation of parents in the child protection system is “an essential safeguard to ensure that pertinent information is conveyed to the court, all parties’ legal rights are well protected and the wishes and needs of all parties are effectively voiced. In turn, this helps judges make the best, most informed decisions possible in every case.”¹³ Using property taxes to pay for this representation, rather than a state appropriation to cover all such costs, might result in parents having unequal access to high quality legal counsel in child protection cases based on geography. As noted above, it is likely a conflict of interest for a county to represent the county’s position in a child protection case while at the same time contracting and paying for opposing counsel.

The Department recommends the legislature consider establishing a statewide office of legal representation for parents in the child protection system, including appellate representation. Such an office or agency would not fall under the jurisdiction of the Department because that is not its expertise, and would be a conflict of interest. An office funded with state revenue rather than local property taxes might better ensure parents’ rights are preserved in child protection cases and that parents have equal access to representation regardless of the county where they reside. A statewide office for parent legal representation might also result in the state capturing more Title IV-E reimbursements by centralizing administration of those costs in one entity rather than 87 individual counties.

County feedback

In addition to their recommendations provided above, AMC and MACA provided the department with the following additional feedback for inclusion in this letter (the department made two modifications for clarity, which are noted in [brackets]):

Upon reviewing the data [see attached], MACSSA has concerns about the validity of the data presented, based on past practices with some counties related to parental representation at an EPC hearing. We would support a recommendation for Court Administration to develop an improved method of recording presence of court appointed counsel at each EPC hearing beyond notation in MNCIS in the hearing attendance field and/or comment fields as is currently the practice. Clear data on attendance at EPC hearings by court appointed legal counsel would be ideal for use in this ongoing funding formula.

¹³ See <https://www.casey.org/quality-parent-representation/>, Casey Family Programs, August 1, 2019.

Additionally, being able to more accurately attributed the total annual court-appointed parent representation expenditures for each county is in the best interest of good public policy. The legislature expanded the unfunded mandate of county paid for parental representation and it is only appropriate to identify the actual costs of providing this service at the local level. DHS has attested that they do not have the capacity to gather that data from counties, and is not sure that they would be able to ensure that the data is reliable and consistent across counties given that each county tracks these costs in their own manner. County statewide associations recognize this challenge and hope that collaboration between the courts, DHS, and counties can determine joint solutions to be able to accurately determine these costs. Accurate data would support a conversation about a state office of parental representation, with clarity regarding the prospective workload and costs. A state office would be the more appropriate structure for administering and managing parental representation.

The original legislation included a request for DHS to gather “additional demographic information that would assist counties in obtaining title IV-E reimbursement”. This relates more to the issue of federal Title IV-E reimbursements for legal counsel than the funding formula. However, while this is not directly a formula issue, identifying and supporting the collection of the information needed to be gathered to draw down Title IV-E dollars in cases of county funded parental representation needs to remain a priority.

Beginning in 201[9] the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Children’s Bureau, has interpreted administrative costs for foster care to include costs for children’s and parents’ attorneys. (Child Welfare Policy Manual, Section 8.1B, Question 30). This created the opportunity, for the first time, for jurisdictions to seek federal reimbursement for the cost of legal representation for eligible children and their parents. Currently, Hennepin County is the only county in Minnesota that is able to draw down these federal fund.

This new funding source is particularly relevant because advocates and authors of the bill creating a new parental representation funding mandate for counties represented that the Title IV-E funds would being able to offset the costs of the new mandate. States can now claim federal matching funds through Title IV-E of the Social Security Act to help pay the costs of attorneys representing certain children and their parents in child welfare legal proceedings. The federal government can pay 50 percent of the share of administrative costs claimed for each Title IV-E eligible child, which included half of the cost of attorneys for the parents of children who are eligible for Title IV-E foster care benefits.

However, in Minnesota these federal matching funds are currently not available to 86 of 87 counties to offset the cost of parental representation. In our state-supervised, county-administered system for child welfare services, DHS is the state agency responsible for the administration of the state Title IV-E plan. There needs to be a concerted effort from the state to make these additional Title IV-E funds available to additional counties beyond the initial pilot county, Hennepin County. Advocates and authors of this bill recognized this, as demonstrated by early iterations of this legislation including funds for new DHS staff to facilitate the process of counties becoming eligible to access to these federal funds.

DHS has committed to working with counties interested in receiving IV-E reimbursements, recognizing this was a long and involved process for Hennepin County as the initial pilot county. Recognizing the administrative challenge of new counties drawing down these funds, AMC advocated that counties be free to use some or all of their share of the appropriation to pay the administrative costs for this work

and are pleased that this was included in the final legislation. However, additional state investment is needed to facilitate counties being able to access these funds – especially after these funds were used cited as the federal funding source to partially offset the expanded cost burden for counties of this new mandate. Short of a transition to a state office of parental representation, accessing these funds is in families, counties, and the state's best interest.

Thank you for your attention regarding these matters. Please contact Jennifer Sommerfeld at jennifer.sommerfeld@state.mn.us or 651.558.6123 if you have questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Tikki Brown
Assistant commissioner

cc: Senator Mark Johnson, Co-Chair, Child Protection Task Force
Representative Dave Pinto, Co-Chair, Child Protection Task Force
Senator Andrew Mathews, Chair, Senate Civil Law and Data Practices Policy Committee
Senator Karla Bigham, Ranking Minority Member, Senate Civil Law and Data Practices Policy Committee
Matt Freeman, Association of Minnesota Counties
Angie Thies, Minnesota Association of County Social Services Administrators
Janet Marshall, State Court Administration
Legislative Reference Library

Prepared by Court Services Division,
State Court Administrator's Office
Data as of 12/31/21

**Number of EPC hearings held, 2017 to
2021, by MNCIS case type**

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
Child in Voluntary Foster Care for Treatment	-	-	-	-	1	1
CHIPS	2,844	2,665	2,554	2,233	2,094	12,390
CHIPS - Permanency	264	241	299	252	257	1,313
CHIPS - Runaway	51	34	35	53	31	204
CHIPS - Truancy	34	30	19	12	6	101
CHIPS - Voluntary Placement (Other)	2	3	-	-	-	5
Grand Total	3,195	2,973	2,907	2,550	2,389	14,014

**Number of EPC hearings held, 2017 to
2021, by county**

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
1st Judicial District	300	348	262	199	194	1303
Carver County	33	52	44	51	47	227
Dakota County	123	132	111	43	49	458
Goodhue County	23	33	26	22	21	125
LeSueur County	16	15	13	6	14	64
McLeod County	50	57	34	43	32	216
Scott County	41	38	26	24	23	152
Sibley County	14	21	8	10	8	61
2nd Judicial District	321	307	205	109	160	1102
Ramsey County	321	307	205	109	160	1102
3rd Judicial District	219	204	211	213	152	999
Dodge County	11	10	14	8	5	48
Fillmore County	1	6	3	4	4	18
Freeborn County	23	27	31	25	18	124
Houston County	15	10	13	8	7	53
Mower County	23	25	21	21	21	111
Olmsted County	8	9	10	19	15	61
Rice County	69	53	60	66	37	285
Steele County	22	15	13	24	17	91
Wabasha County	17	11	7	13	6	54
Waseca County	10	14	9	3	7	43

Winona County	20	24	30	22	15	111
4th Judicial District	684	526	564	443	337	2554
Hennepin County	684	526	564	443	337	2554
5th Judicial District	196	197	210	179	198	980
Blue Earth County	32	35	55	38	37	197
Brown County	16	16	14	26	15	87
Cottonwood County	8	10	11	3	5	37
Faribault County	23	7	9	15	13	67
Jackson County	8	8	7	8	0	31
Lincoln County	3	2	0	3	2	10
Lyon County	12	14	20	10	14	70
Martin County	20	26	17	21	16	100
Murray County	4	3	0	3	3	13
Nicollet County	25	29	35	24	58	171
Nobles County	6	15	13	8	3	45
Pipestone County	6	6	9	4	7	32
Redwood County	20	6	10	5	10	51
Rock County	8	7	5	4	2	26
Watonwan County	5	13	5	7	13	43
6th Judicial District	230	205	233	258	252	1178
Carlton County	30	33	41	15	27	146
Cook County	5	5	0	1	5	16
Lake County	3	4	5	2	2	16
St. Louis County	192	163	187	240	218	1000
7th Judicial District	431	454	413	353	377	2028
Becker County	48	35	39	25	36	183
Benton County	31	31	36	18	19	135
Clay County	20	32	41	27	37	157
Douglas County	33	35	20	24	24	136
Mille Lacs County	24	7	18	15	19	83
Morrison County	15	24	23	30	31	123
Otter Tail County	53	60	54	59	44	270
Stearns County	159	168	136	116	117	696
Todd County	18	27	19	5	20	89
Wadena County	30	35	27	34	30	156
8th Judicial District	104	111	141	158	139	653
Big Stone County	0	3	0	3	1	7
Chippewa County	6	3	7	13	9	38
Grant County	4	8	7	5	10	34
Kandiyohi County	25	27	34	58	62	206
Lac qui Parle County	2	1	2	5	2	12
Meeker County	11	9	21	13	7	61
Pope County	9	9	7	6	6	37
Renville County	6	15	25	19	11	76
Stevens County	7	4	6	9	9	35
Swift County	14	14	14	11	13	66
Traverse County	7	2	4	3	3	19

Wilkin County	6	4	5	7	4	26
Yellow Medicine County	7	12	9	6	2	36
9th Judicial District	355	318	371	382	341	1767
Aitkin County	22	10	24	16	7	79
Beltrami County	95	75	74	100	80	424
Cass County	18	24	27	46	29	144
Clearwater County	8	5	12	10	5	40
Crow Wing County	68	67	59	55	60	309
Hubbard County	13	11	22	22	18	86
Itasca County	40	49	31	36	39	195
Kittson County	2	7	3	0	0	12
Koochiching County	10	12	22	21	22	87
Lake of the Woods County	2	0	2	1	4	9
Mahnomen County	3	3	10	2	6	24
Marshall County	3	1	4	1	3	12
Norman County	5	3	3	1	8	20
Pennington County	22	15	10	7	8	62
Polk County	38	31	49	53	33	204
Red Lake County	1	1	0	0	1	3
Roseau County	5	4	19	11	18	57
10th Judicial District	355	303	297	256	239	1450
Anoka County	97	100	95	77	68	437
Chisago County	34	30	27	33	25	149
Isanti County	29	15	19	14	10	87
Kanabec County	15	7	7	4	10	43
Pine County	18	24	7	9	9	67
Sherburne County	18	18	25	14	11	86
Washington County	92	72	82	68	66	380
Wright County	52	37	35	37	40	201
Grand Total	3195	2973	2907	2550	2389	14014

**Number of EPC hearings held where
parent attorney was recorded as
present in MNCIS, 2017 to 2021, by
county**

Note: in this timeframe, 16% of EPC hearings statewide have no parent recorded as present in MNCIS. This data reflects parent attorney presence regardless of parent presence.

Note: this data reflects data entered in a hearing attendance field in MNCIS and not in any comment fields in MNCIS.

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
1st Judicial District	89	114	97	114	116	530
Carver County	8	16	27	21	16	88
Dakota County	13	20	24	36	47	140
Goodhue County	5	11	7	8	9	40
LeSueur County	8	2	5	2	13	30
McLeod County	23	28	14	23	14	102
Scott County	25	25	15	17	12	94
Sibley County	7	12	5	7	5	36
2nd Judicial District	173	161	104	59	89	586
Ramsey County	173	161	104	59	89	586
3rd Judicial District	46	54	58	55	47	260
Dodge County	0	3	7	2	0	12
Fillmore County	0	3	0	0	0	3
Freeborn County	3	3	5	10	2	23
Houston County	2	0	3	0	0	5
Mower County	2	5	4	4	3	18
Olmsted County	8	7	5	13	12	45
Rice County	3	8	13	13	12	49
Steele County	21	15	10	6	2	54
Wabasha County	2	3	0	2	1	8
Waseca County	1	3	2	0	2	8
Winona County	4	4	9	5	13	35
4th Judicial District	440	375	417	368	282	1882
Hennepin County	440	375	417	368	282	1882
5th Judicial District	92	95	142	134	138	601
Blue Earth County	24	27	54	30	24	159
Brown County	1	2	3	17	12	35
Cottonwood County	5	9	10	1	4	29
Faribault County	21	5	9	12	11	58
Jackson County	8	8	4	8	0	28
Lincoln County	0	0	0	3	2	5
Lyon County	5	5	7	9	14	40
Martin County	6	4	3	20	13	46
Murray County	0	1	0	3	3	7
Nicollet County	6	6	17	7	30	66
Nobles County	2	10	9	8	3	32
Pipestone County	4	5	6	4	5	24
Redwood County	6	2	10	3	8	29
Rock County	3	6	5	4	1	19
Watonwan County	1	5	5	5	8	24
6th Judicial District	60	62	62	211	194	589
Carlton County	8	20	20	9	22	79
Cook County	1	2	0	0	2	5
Lake County	0	0	0	2	1	3
St. Louis County	51	40	42	200	169	502
7th Judicial District	156	177	149	128	106	716

Becker County	17	6	8	1	4	36
Benton County	2	4	1	1	2	10
Clay County	9	6	10	5	12	42
Douglas County	1	0	3	6	2	12
Mille Lacs County	5	1	11	4	13	34
Morrison County	6	12	9	13	10	50
Otter Tail County	19	18	11	23	28	99
Stearns County	95	119	86	72	17	389
Todd County	1	5	4	1	6	17
Wadena County	1	6	6	2	12	27
8th Judicial District	61	80	104	129	94	468
Big Stone County	0	1	0	1	1	3
Chippewa County	3	0	2	12	7	24
Grant County	1	2	0	2	7	12
Kandiyohi County	22	25	30	51	37	165
Lac qui Parle County	0	1	0	5	2	8
Meeker County	11	8	21	12	4	56
Pope County	6	4	5	3	6	24
Renville County	2	13	25	19	8	67
Stevens County	0	2	0	4	9	15
Swift County	13	13	13	10	7	56
Traverse County	2	1	0	2	2	7
Wilkin County	0	0	0	2	3	5
Yellow Medicine County	1	10	8	6	1	26
9th Judicial District	101	78	115	127	125	546
Aitkin County	7	4	7	2	2	22
Beltrami County	19	8	28	31	16	102
Cass County	1	1	5	9	16	32
Clearwater County	2	2	0	4	1	9
Crow Wing County	10	5	9	12	11	47
Hubbard County	3	2	4	5	3	17
Itasca County	36	37	26	29	34	162
Kittson County	0	0	1	0	0	1
Koochiching County	7	10	15	18	18	68
Lake of the Woods County	2	0	0	0	1	3
Mahnomen County	0	0	2	1	1	4
Marshall County	1	0	1	0	0	2
Norman County	3	0	0	0	5	8
Pennington County	1	2	4	6	4	17
Polk County	7	6	10	8	6	37
Roseau County	2	1	3	2	7	15
10th Judicial District	77	72	62	66	53	330
Anoka County	41	29	34	35	26	165
Chisago County	8	10	7	10	6	41
Isanti County	2	2	4	5	2	15
Kanabec County	0	4	0	0	1	5
Pine County	0	4	3	3	2	12

Sherburne County	1	1	2	1	0	5
Washington County	18	14	10	2	10	54
Wright County	7	8	2	10	6	33
Grand Total	1295	1268	1310	1391	1244	6508