



Minnesota Department of **Human Services** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Characteristics of December 2006 Minnesota Family Assistance Programs: Cases and Eligible Adults**

August 2007  
Revised October 2008

Program Assessment and Integrity Division  
Minnesota Department of Human Services

*This report was revised in October 2008. On page 21, the second column headed "Percent of State Cases" was corrected.*

*Prepared by:  
Dana DeMaster, MPP  
Senior Research Analysis Specialist  
(651) 431-3963  
[dana.demaster@state.mn.us](mailto:dana.demaster@state.mn.us)*

*Reports are posted on DHS Website at:*

*[http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/id\\_004113#MFIP](http://www.dhs.state.mn.us/id_004113#MFIP)*

## Table of Contents

<b>Characteristics of December 2006 Minnesota Family Assistance Programs: Cases and Eligible Adults .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Statewide Data .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Caseload Data.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Table 1. December 2006 Counts and Percentages of MFIP, DWP, and Tribal TANF Paid Cases and Eligible Persons.....	<b>4</b>
Figure 1. December MFIP and DWP Caseloads, December 2000 to December 2006 ...	<b>4</b>
<b>Demographic Characteristics.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Table 3. Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges of December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Economic Characteristics.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Table 4. Economic Characteristics of December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases ....	<b>14</b>
<b>County and Regional Data .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Table 5. December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases by County and Region .....	<b>21</b>
Table 6. December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases Compared with Census Data of Poverty, by County .....	<b>28</b>
Table 7. Demographics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 Paid MFIP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Age, Gender, Education, and Marital Status, by County and Region .....	<b>31</b>
Table 8. Demographics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 Paid DWP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Age, Gender, Education, and Marital Status, by Large County and Region.....	<b>38</b>
Table 9. Demographics of Eligible Adults in December 2006 MFIP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Race/Ethnicity and Citizenship, by Large County and Region .....	<b>40</b>
Table 10. Demographics of Eligible Adults in December 2006 DWP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Race/Ethnicity and Citizenship, by Large County and Region .....	<b>41</b>
Table 11. Family Types in December One-eligible-adult MFIP and DWP Cases, by County and Region.....	<b>42</b>
Table 12. All Children in December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases, by County and Region .....	<b>46</b>
Table 13. All Children in December 2006 One-eligible-adult DWP Cases, by County and Region .....	<b>50</b>
Table 14. Family Violence, Chemical Dependency, and Severe Mental Health Diagnosis for December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases, by Large County and Region.....	<b>54</b>

Table 15. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Exception, Exemptions, or Extension to the Life Time Limit, MFIP Counted Months, and New MFIP Cases in 2006, by County and Region .....	<b>55</b>
Table 16. December 2006 One-eligible-adult DWP Cases with MFIP Counted Months and New DWP Cases in 2006, by Large County and Region .....	<b>59</b>
Table 17. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases Receiving Food-only Assistance, Budgeted Earnings, Working Adults, Earned Income, and Month Work Hours, by County and Region .....	<b>60</b>
Table 18. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Sanctions and Child Support Payments, by County and Region.....	<b>64</b>
Table 19. December 2006 Two-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Exception, Exemptions, or Extensions to the Life Time Limit, MFIP Counted Months, and New MFIP Cases in 2006, by County and Region .....	<b>66</b>
Table 20. December 2006 Two-eligible-adult MFIP Cases Receiving Food-only Assistance, Budgeted Earnings, Working Adults, Earned Income, and Monthly Work Hours, by County and Region .....	<b>70</b>
Table 21. December 2006 MFIP Two-eligible-adult Cases with Sanctions and Child Support Payments, by Large County and Region .....	<b>72</b>

## Characteristics of December 2006 Minnesota Family Assistance Programs: Cases and Eligible Adults

This is the tenth annual report in this series that provides a snapshot of the universe of cases and participants in Minnesota's public assistance programs for families. A supplement to this report, *Minnesota's Family Cash Assistance Caseload: a Ten-Year Retrospective*, shows select results from all ten reports in this series to highlight trends in the family cash assistance caseload since 1997. This report describes characteristics of eligible adults and active cases receiving family cash assistance through either the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) or the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) in December 2006. Information on the demographics of the eligible adult caregivers; family composition, residence, and challenges; and economic status of paid cases is provided by state, county, and region. The Data Definitions and Policy Information sections that follow each table are essential for interpreting the data.<sup>1</sup>

Federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) provides funds for all MFIP cases except cases with two eligible natural, adoptive, or step-parents. TANF, originally enacted in 1996, was reauthorized as part of the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005.<sup>2</sup> The original TANF legislation set program requirements such as the five-year lifetime limit on welfare receipt, a work-first emphasis, work participation requirements, and other rules. DRA retained these program requirements and, among other changes, narrowed the definition of work activities and broadened the definition of which participants are "work-eligible." Some MFIP-ineligible caregivers that had previously not been considered work-eligible are now required to participate in work activities. These new requirements went into effect October 1, 2006.

MFIP, Minnesota's TANF program, was implemented statewide in 1998, replacing Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The goals of MFIP were to increase employment and income, decrease welfare dependence, and decrease poverty. The first caseload characteristics report described eligible recipients and paid cases in December 1997, the month before the change to MFIP started. Subsequent reports described MFIP participants and cases in December of each year.

The 2004 report added data on DWP which enrolled its first cases in July 2004. Many families who apply for cash assistance are directed to DWP with its intensive work supports and short-term benefits (up to four months). The goals of DWP are to facilitate unsubsidized employment, increase economic stability, and reduce the risk of needing assistance through MFIP in the future. Thus, the number of MFIP cases in a given month is decreased by at least the number of cases eligible for DWP. To interpret comparisons between outcomes for MFIP and DWP cases, take into account that DWP cases are

---

<sup>1</sup> Public assistance data were extracted from MAXIS and medical data were extracted from MMIS, both in the DHS Data warehouse. Child support data were provided by the DHS Child Support Enforcement Division (CSED).

<sup>2</sup> For more information on DRA, see the Minnesota House of Representatives "Information Brief: TANF Background" that is available at [www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/pubs/tanfbkgd.pdf](http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/pubs/tanfbkgd.pdf).

considered more likely to attain or regain self-sufficiency quickly and that MFIP includes many long-term cases.

Findings that parallel this report for five major racial/ethnic groups (American Indian, Asian, black, Hispanic, and white) and the immigrant subgroups in Minnesota among blacks (African Americans, Somali immigrants, and non-Somali African immigrants) and Asians (Asian Americans, Hmong immigrants, and other Asian immigrants) will follow as a report the Department of Human Services series on *Welfare Reform Outcomes of Racial/Ethnic and Immigrant Groups in Minnesota*.

Input from readers is invited, both reactions to this report and suggestions for data to include in future reports. The next annual report in this series will describe the family assistance caseload in December 2007.

## Statewide Data

For reporting purposes, the MFIP population was divided into three segments: child-only cases in which the grant includes children but not their adult caregivers, cases with one eligible adult, and cases with two eligible adults. The DWP population, which cannot have child-only cases, is divided into cases with one or two eligible adult caregivers. The Mille Lacs American Indian Tribal Council administers MFIP-eligible cases in its jurisdiction. Their Tribal TANF program is a separate program from MFIP; Tribal TANF cases are only included in Table 1 of this report.

Table 1 (page 4) provides the distribution of MFIP, DWP, and Tribal TANF cases, eligible adults, and eligible children. Figure 1 (page 4) shows the history of MFIP and DWP caseloads since 2000. Table 2 (pages 6 - 7) gives the demographic characteristics of eligible adults: age, gender, education, marital status, ethnicity, and citizenship status. Table 3 (pages 9 - 10) reports case level statistics on family composition, residence, and challenges. Table 4 (pages 14 - 17) quantifies economic characteristics of cases.

### Caseload Data


#### Data Highlights: Table 1 and Figure 1

- MFIP and DWP total caseloads have continued to decline over the past five years. During the 2000s, 2002 saw the largest family cash assistance caseload with 44,883 MFIP households, including child-only cases. Since that time the total caseload, including DWP, has decreased by 24 percent to 36,329 households. The total caseload has decreased by 8 percent in the last year.
- The only family cash assistance case type to increase was child-only MFIP cases, which has increased by 23 percent since the start of this decade, from 8,298 cases to 10,244 cases. MFIP child-only cases increased by less than 1 percent in the past year and, as a share of the total MFIP caseload, increased by 2 percentage points. Thirty percent of eligible children were in child-only cases.
- Tribal TANF continued to increase (11 percent increase in cases between December 2005 and December 2006), although not nearly as dramatically as it did between 2004 and 2005 when the program expanded to Minnesota Chippewa Tribe enrolled members in Hennepin, Anoka, and Ramsey Counties. Between 2004 and 2005 Tribal TANF cases increased by 71 percent.

**Table 1. December 2006 Counts and Percentages of MFIP, DWP, and Tribal TANF Paid Cases and Eligible Persons**

Counts of Cases	MFIP and Tribal TANF Paid Cases						DWP Paid Cases		
	Tribal TANF Cases	All MFIP Paid Cases	Child Only Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults			DWP Cases with Eligible Adults		
				One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All Cases
Paid Cases	261 100.0%	32,620 100%	10,244 31.4%	19,195 58.8%	3,181 9.8%	22,376 68.6%	2,925 78.9%	784 21.1%	3,709 100%
Eligible Adults	317 100.0%	25,557 100%	0 0.0%	19,195 75.1%	6,362 24.9%	25,557 100.0%	2,925 65.1%	1,568 34.9%	4,493 100.0%
Eligible Children	468 100.0%	64,662 100%	19,358 29.9%	36,450 56.4%	8,855 13.7%	45,305 70.1%	4,915 73.0%	1,816 27.0%	6,731 100.0%

**Figure 1. December MFIP and DWP Caseloads, December 2000 to December 2006**



**Data Definitions and Policy Information: Table 1 and Figure 1**

An “eligible adult” is an adult caregiver or minor parent who meets MFIP or DWP eligibility requirements and receives a MFIP or DWP grant. Cases with two caregivers in which one caregiver was ineligible for MFIP or DWP are included in the one-eligible-adult cases column. Since October 2001, cases with two eligible adults have been state funded. Cases receiving MFIP or DWP grants are known as “paid cases”; this excludes active cases suspended for the month because they have income great enough to cancel out the cash grant. This typically occurs in months with five weekly or three biweekly pay periods.

Percentages summed across subgroups sometimes do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.



## Demographic Characteristics

### Data Highlights: Table 2

- The demographic characteristics of recipients have remained similar during the last few years. MFIP-eligible adults were young (57 percent were less than 30 years old), female (81 percent), have little education (44 percent did not have a high school diploma), unmarried (63 percent had never married), and persons of color (63 percent listed a race other than white).
- Eligible adults on DWP were more likely than eligible adults on MFIP to be male (25 percent of DWP-eligible adults compared to 19 percent of MFIP-eligible adults), have at least a high school diploma (69 percent of DWP-eligible adults compared to 56 percent of MFIP-eligible adults), to have been married (49 percent compared to 37 percent of MFIP-eligible adults), and to be white (53 percent of DWP-eligible adults compared to 38 percent of MFIP-eligible adults). These disparities may be attributed to differences between the programs – DWP is a short-term program lasting up to four months and MFIP is a longer term program. Long-term MFIP recipients are more likely to face significant barriers to employment whereas recipients that are diverted to DWP are considered more likely to quickly gain employment.
- Black, American Indian, and Asian people were under-represented in DWP cases as compared to MFIP cases. While 38 percent of MFIP-eligible adults were black, 29 percent of DWP-eligible adults were black. Likewise, 10 percent of MFIP-eligible adults were American Indian compared to 5 percent of DWP-eligible adults and 9 percent of MFIP-eligible adults were Asian compared to 5 percent of DWP-eligible adults. There were great racial disparities between MFIP and DWP-eligible adults and the general Minnesota population as well. According to the 2005 American Community Survey, 86 percent of all Minnesota adults were white; in December 2006, 38 percent of MFIP and 53 percent of DWP-eligible adults were white.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> For more detailed information on racial/ethnic disparities in Minnesota's family cash assistance programs, see the *Characteristics of Racial/Ethnic and Immigrant Groups in Minnesota Family Assistance Programs* report series.

**Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases**

Adult Characteristics		MFIP Cases			DWP Cases		
		One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All MFIP Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
Eligible Adults	Count	19,195	6,362	25,557	2,925	1,568	4,493
	Percent of All Eligible Adults	75.1%	24.9%	100.0%	65.1%	34.9%	100.0%
Age of Adults	Mean	29.9	30.5	30.1	30.7	31.8	31.1
	Median	27	28	28	29	29	29
	Minimum	13	15	13	17	16	16
	Maximum	78	72	78	59	71	71
Frequency	< 18	530	54	584	2	6	8
		2.8%	0.8%	2.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
	18 - 19	1,529	375	1,904	116	42	158
		8.0%	5.9%	7.5%	4.0%	2.7%	3.5%
	20 - 29	8,991	3,052	12,043	1,425	740	2,165
		46.8%	48.0%	47.1%	48.7%	47.2%	48.2%
	30 - 39	4,777	1,754	6,531	871	466	1,337
		24.9%	27.6%	25.6%	29.8%	29.7%	29.8%
	40 - 49	2,515	849	3,364	423	220	643
		13.1%	13.3%	13.2%	14.5%	14.0%	14.3%
50 - 59		704	237	941	88	76	164
		3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.0%	4.8%	3.7%
	60 and over	149	41	190	0	18	18
		0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%
Gender	Female	17,600	3,181	20,781	2,608	784	3,394
		91.7%	50.0%	81.3%	89.2%	50.0%	75.5%
	Male	1,595	3,181	4,776	317	784	1,099
		8.3%	50.0%	18.7%	10.8%	50.0%	24.5%
Education	None or Pre-1st Grade or Unknown	1,188	1,210	2,398	169	177	346
		6.2%	19.0%	9.4%	5.8%	11.3%	7.7%
	Grade School	460	203	663	42	53	95
		2.4%	3.2%	2.6%	1.4%	3.4%	2.1%
	Some High School	6,384	1,881	8,265	593	347	940
		33.3%	29.6%	32.3%	20.3%	22.1%	20.9%
	High School Graduate	9,465	2,707	12,172	1,760	817	2,577
		49.3%	42.5%	47.6%	60.2%	52.1%	57.4%
	Some Post-Secondary	1,435	294	1,729	287	130	417
		7.5%	4.6%	6.8%	9.8%	8.3%	9.3%
College Graduate	164	33	197	35	13	48	
	0.9%	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%	0.8%	1.1%	
Graduate Degree	99	34	133	39	31	70	
	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	1.3%	2.0%	1.6%	
	High School Graduate or Higher	11,163	3,068	14,231	2,121	991	3,112
		58.2%	48.2%	55.7%	72.5%	63.2%	69.3%
Marital Status	Divorced	1,556	130	1,686	344	22	366
		8.1%	2.0%	6.6%	11.8%	1.4%	8.1%
	Legally Separated	47	4	51	22	2	24
		0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%
	Married, Living with Spouse	888	3,393	4,281	93	1,021	1,114
		4.6%	53.3%	16.8%	3.2%	65.1%	24.8%
	Never Married	13,459	2,700	16,159	1,796	494	2,290
		70.1%	42.4%	63.2%	61.4%	31.5%	51.0%
	Married, Living Apart	3,022	130	3,152	644	29	673
		15.7%	2.0%	12.3%	22.0%	1.8%	15.0%
Widowed	223	5	228	26	0	26	
	1.2%	0.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%	

**Table 2 – Page 2**

Adult Characteristics		MFIP Cases			DWP Cases			
		One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All MFIP Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases	
Race/Ethnicity	Asian	907 4.7%	1,388 21.8%	2,295 9.0%	78 2.7%	132 8.4%	210 4.7%	
	Black	7,815 40.7%	1,690 26.6%	9,505 37.2%	885 30.3%	395 25.2%	1,280 28.5%	
	Hispanic	1,019 5.3%	264 4.1%	1,283 5.0%	180 6.2%	102 6.5%	282 6.3%	
	American Indian	1,708 8.9%	708 11.1%	2,416 9.5%	159 5.4%	70 4.5%	229 5.1%	
	White	7,380 38.4%	2,218 34.9%	9,598 37.6%	1,562 53.4%	837 53.4%	2,399 53.4%	
	Multiple	292 1.5%	58 0.9%	350 1.4%	30 1.0%	13 0.8%	43 1.0%	
	Citizenship	Non-U.S.	2,401 12.5%	1,965 30.9%	4,366 17.1%	331 11.3%	359 22.9%	690 15.4%
	U.S.	16,794 87.5%	4,397 69.1%	21,191 82.9%	2,594 88.7%	1,209 77.1%	3,803 84.6%	
Noncitizens	Asian	539 59.4%	1,263 91.0%	1,802 78.5%	45 57.7%	98 74.2%	143 68.1%	
	Black	1,639 21.0%	559 33.1%	2,198 23.1%	235 26.6%	200 50.6%	435 34.0%	
	Hispanic	133 13.1%	24 9.1%	157 12.2%	31 17.2%	23 22.5%	54 19.1%	
	American Indian	3 0.2%	0 0.0%	3 0.1%	1 0.6%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%	
	White	80 1.1%	116 5.2%	196 2.0%	15 1.0%	38 4.5%	53 2.2%	
		Percent of All Whites						

**Data Definitions and Policy Information: Table 2**

Characteristics with no bearing on program eligibility may not be routinely updated after the initial application, including education, marital status, and citizenship. Thus, high school graduation and achievement of U.S. citizenship may be underreported.

The coding method for race/ethnicity follows the 2000 U.S. Census methodology, with participants asked their racial choice (yes or no) for each of five racial categories (American Indian, Asian, black, Pacific Islander, and white) and ethnicity (Hispanic or non-Hispanic). Hispanics of all races were listed as Hispanic and Pacific Islander and Asian groups were combined due to small numbers of Pacific Islanders.

Race data were missing for 110 MFIP-eligible adults and 50 DWP-eligible adults.

## Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges

### Data Highlights: Table 3

- As in previous years, nearly all eligible-adult MFIP (97 percent) and DWP (89 percent) cases were caregivers with their own biological, adopted, or step children. DWP cases continued to have a higher proportion of caregivers that were pregnant with no other children than MFIP (10 percent compared to 2 percent) which is due to program length and timing.
- Ineligible caregivers in MFIP child-only cases were most likely to be ineligible because they were relative caregivers (47 percent) or due to receipt of SSI (40 percent). Receipt of SSI was the most common reason for caregiver ineligibility in MFIP one-eligible-adult cases (73 percent), followed by caregivers who reached their 60<sup>th</sup> MFIP counted month and opted out of the case so that it could remain open (13 percent). These latter cases are ones with two caregivers; one caregiver reaches 60 counted months, but the other has less than 60 months and remains eligible.
- Six percent of MFIP child-only, 4 percent of MFIP-eligible adult, and 7 percent of DWP cases had at least one ineligible child. More than 90 percent of ineligible children in eligible-adult cases were ineligible due to receipt for SSI. In MFIP child-only cases, 70 percent were ineligible due to receipt of SSI and 27 percent were ineligible due to a lack of documentation of the U.S. citizenship status.
- More than one-third of MFIP cases had a caregiver (eligible or ineligible) that received a severe mental health diagnosis during 2004 to 2006. About a quarter of MFIP cases had a caregiver who received such a diagnosis in the last year.
- About one-quarter of MFIP eligible- adult cases had a caregiver – whether or not personally eligible for MFIP - who had received a chemical dependency diagnosis during 2004 to 2006; 13 percent of child-only cases had caregivers with such a diagnosis. Thirteen percent of MFIP eligible-adult cases had a caregiver who received the diagnosis in the previous year as did 8 percent of child-only cases.

**Table 3. Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges of December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases**

Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges		MFIP Paid Cases			DWP Paid Cases			
		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers		DWP Cases			
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
Cases	Count	10,244	19,195	3,181	22,376	2,925	784	3,709
	Percent of All Cases	31.4%	58.8%	9.8%	68.6%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
Family Type	Natural/Adopted/Step Children	5,815	18,511	3,171	21,682	2,545	766	3,311
Count of Cases		56.8%	96.4%	99.7%	96.9%	87.0%	97.7%	89.3%
	Pregnant Only	-	473	3	473	352	17	369
		0.0%	2.5%	0.1%	2.1%	12.0%	2.2%	9.9%
	Relative Care	4,429	211	7	218	28	1	29
		43.2%	1.1%	0.2%	1.0%	1.0%	0.1%	0.8%
Two-caregiver Families	Count of Cases	2,388	1,095	3,181	4,276	146	784	930
	Percent of Cases in Column	23.3%	5.7%	100.0%	19.1%	5.0%	100.0%	25.1%
Two Caregivers	Count of Cases	2,029	849	1,710	2,559	76	506	582
Married	Percent of Cases in Column	19.8%	4.4%	53.8%	11.4%	2.6%	64.5%	15.7%
Ineligible Caregivers:	Relative Caregivers	5,974	4			-		
Count of Persons & Percent of Ineligible Caregivers		47.3%	0.4%			0.0%		
	SSI Parents	5,005	797			34		
		39.6%	72.8%			52.3%		
	Undocumented Noncitizen Parents	1,423	122			25		
		11.3%	11.1%			38.5%		
	MFIP Disqualified Parents	209	31			2		
		1.7%	2.8%			3.1%		
	Reached 60th Month And Opted Out	1	139			-		
		0.0%	12.7%			0.0%		
	Other Ineligible Parents	18	2			4		
		0.1%	0.2%			6.2%		
	Count of Ineligible Caregivers	12,630	1,095			65		
Number of Eligible Children in Family & Household	Mean	1.8	1.9	2.8	2.0	1.7	2.3	1.8
	Count of Cases	10,244	19,195	3,181	22,376	2,925	784	3,709
	Median	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Maximum	13	12	12	12	9	11	11
	Frequency of Cases	0	821	31	852	356	17	373
		0.0%	4.3%	1.0%	3.8%	12.2%	2.2%	10.1%
	1	5,197	8,624	871	9,495	1,164	255	1,419
		50.7%	44.9%	27.4%	42.4%	39.8%	32.5%	38.3%
	2	2,754	5,171	840	6,011	819	231	1,050
		26.9%	26.9%	26.4%	26.9%	28.0%	29.5%	28.3%
	3	1,330	2,484	558	3,042	355	143	498
		13.0%	12.9%	17.5%	13.6%	12.1%	18.2%	13.4%
	4 - 6	859	1,896	721	2,617	220	128	348
		8.4%	9.9%	22.7%	11.7%	7.5%	16.3%	9.4%
	7 - 9	97	185	148	333	11	8	19
		0.9%	1.0%	4.7%	1.5%	0.4%	1.0%	0.5%
	10 or more	7	14	12	26	0	2	2
		0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
	Count of Eligible Children	19,357	36,450	8,855	45,305	4,915	1,816	6,731
Ineligible Children:	SSI Children	819	1,581	213	1,794	100	22	122
Count of Children & Percent of Ineligible Children		69.1%	94.1%	92.6%	93.9%	85.5%	100.0%	87.8%
	Undocumented Noncitizen	315	21	0	21	3	0	3
		26.6%	1.3%	0.0%	1.1%	2.6%	0.0%	2.2%
	Other Ineligible Children	51	78	17	95	14	0	14
		4.3%	4.6%	7.4%	5.0%	12.0%	0.0%	10.1%
	Count of Ineligible Children	1,185	1,680	230	1,910	117	22	139
	Percent of All Children in Column	5.8%	4.4%	2.5%	4.0%	2.3%	1.2%	2.0%

**Table 3 – Page 2**

Family Composition, Residence, and Challenges		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers			DWP Cases			
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases	
Number of All Minor Children in Family & Household	Mean	2.0	2.0	2.9	2.1	1.7	2.3	1.9	
	Count of Cases	10,244	19,195	3,181	22,376	2,925	784	3,709	
	Median	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	
	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Maximum	13	12	12	12	9	11	11	
	Frequency of Cases	0	0	553	3	556	331	17	348
			0.0%	2.9%	0.1%	2.5%	11.3%	2.2%	9.4%
	1	4,804	8,395	842	9,237	1,161	246	1,407	
			46.9%	43.7%	26.5%	41.3%	39.7%	31.4%	37.9%
	2	2,760	5,254	851	6,105	815	234	1,049	
			26.9%	27.4%	26.8%	27.3%	27.9%	29.8%	28.3%
	3	1,487	2,656	571	3,227	372	145	517	
			14.5%	13.8%	18.0%	14.4%	12.7%	18.5%	13.9%
	4 - 6	1,071	2,100	744	2,844	233	132	365	
		10.5%	10.9%	23.4%	12.7%	8.0%	16.8%	9.8%	
7 - 9	112	216	156	372	13	8	21		
		1.1%	1.1%	4.9%	1.7%	0.4%	1.0%	0.6%	
10 or more	10	21	14	35	0	2	2		
		0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	
Count of All Children		20,503	38,116	9,062	47,215	5,032	1,838	6,870	
Age of Youngest Child (All Children)	Mean	8.1	4.5	2.6	4.2	5.6	3.3	5.1	
	Count of Cases	10,112	18,698	3,178	21,876	2,624	768	3,392	
	Median	8	3	1	2	4	2	3	
	Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Maximum	19	19	18	19	19	18	19	
	Frequency of Cases	< 1 year old	687	4,171	1,106	5,277	305	242	547
			6.7%	21.7%	34.8%	23.6%	10.4%	30.9%	14.7%
		1-5 years old	3,258	8,660	1,581	10,241	1,250	365	1,615
			31.8%	45.1%	49.7%	45.8%	42.7%	46.6%	43.5%
		6-10 years old	2,423	3,003	291	3,294	560	82	642
			23.7%	15.6%	9.1%	14.7%	19.1%	10.5%	17.3%
		11-12 years old	975	828	55	883	157	27	184
			9.5%	4.3%	1.7%	3.9%	5.4%	3.4%	5.0%
		13-15 years old	1,581	1,218	92	1,310	234	32	266
		15.4%	6.3%	2.9%	5.9%	8.0%	4.1%	7.2%	
	>15 years old	1,189	818	53	871	118	20	138	
		11.6%	4.3%	1.7%	3.9%	4.0%	2.6%	3.7%	
Region	Hennepin County	3,208	5,863	716	6,579	768	151	919	
			31.3%	30.5%	22.5%	29.4%	26.3%	19.3%	24.8%
	Ramsey County	2,119	4,748	963	5,711	381	112	493	
			20.7%	24.7%	30.3%	25.5%	13.0%	14.3%	13.3%
	Metro Suburban	1,368	2,521	345	2,866	630	149	779	
			13.4%	13.1%	10.8%	12.8%	21.5%	19.0%	21.0%
Greater Minnesota	3,549	6,063	1,157	7,220	1,146	372	1,518		
		34.6%	31.6%	36.4%	32.3%	39.2%	47.4%	40.9%	
Family Violence	MFIP Exemption or Extension During 2000 - 2006		1,220	60	1,280	28	1	29	
			6.4%	1.9%	5.7%	1.0%	0.1%	0.8%	
Adult Mental Health Diagnosis (All Caregivers)	During 2004 - 2006	3,509	6,942	1,154	8,096	574	143	717	
			34.3%	36.2%	36.3%	36.2%	19.6%	18.2%	19.3%
	During 2006	2,475	5,021	864	5,885	380	93	473	
			24.2%	26.2%	27.2%	26.3%	13.0%	11.9%	12.8%
Adult Chemical Dependency Diagnosis (All Caregivers)	During 2004 - 2006	1,357	4,150	817	4,967	372	113	485	
			13.2%	21.6%	25.7%	22.2%	12.7%	14.4%	13.1%
	During 2006	785	2,469	506	2,975	215	66	281	
		7.7%	12.9%	15.9%	13.3%	7.4%	8.4%	7.6%	

### Data Definitions and Policy Information: Table 3

Table 3 provides case level statistics, except for person counts in the sections on ineligible caregivers and counts of children.

**Family Composition.** The Family Type section defines households by the relationship of the caregivers to the children. The three types of families were parents caring for their biological, adopted, or step children; caregivers caring for a relative's children; and pregnant women (and sometimes a spouse) with no other children.

**Ineligible Caregivers.** Caregivers may be ineligible due to receipt of SSI, relative caregiver status, lack of documentation of their non-U.S. citizenship status, disqualification from MFIP due to fraud, or have reached their 60<sup>th</sup> month of MFIP eligibility and opted out of the case. A caregiver may not opt out once they reach 60 months for the purpose of continued eligibility for their children. These situations are when caregivers in a two caregiver household have different numbers of counted months. The caregiver with 60 months opts out and the other caregiver continues to receive a grant. Children in MFIP or DWP cases may also be ineligible to receive MFIP or DWP. Children may be ineligible due to receipt of SSI, lack of documentation of their non-U.S. citizenship status, lack of documentation of their Social Security number, or coming in or out of foster care.

**Region.** The counties where households lived were grouped into the following regions: Hennepin County, Ramsey County, Twin Cities metropolitan suburbs (Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Isanti, Scott, Sherburne, Washington, and Wright Counties), and Greater Minnesota (the remaining 76 counties).

**Family Challenges.** Family violence was indicated by whether a case had a time limit exemption or extension for a family violence safety plan at any time between 2000 and 2006. These numbers greatly underestimate the occurrence of family violence because they only include cases that not only reported the abuse, but also acted on a plan. Data on child protection assessments and determinations of maltreatment have been reported in previous years; updates will be incorporated into this report when available.

A severe mental health diagnosis identifies caregivers who were known to have been diagnosed with psychosis, depression, personality disorder, post-traumatic stress syndrome, or anxiety state during 2006 or during the three-year period 2004 to 2006. Chemical dependency diagnosis identifies caregivers who received that diagnosis during 2006 or during the three-year period 2004 to 2006. Both of these measures may underestimate the actual number of adults with these diagnoses because these only include cases that receive publicly paid health care that is recorded in administrative records. On the other hand, these diagnoses may be a secondary diagnosis and do not indicate whether treatment services were received. Starting in the 2004 report, the mental health and chemical health histories of all caregivers were considered rather than only eligible caregivers.

## Economic Characteristics

### Data Highlights: Table 4

- Eligible-adult MFIP cases averaged 26 months counted toward the lifetime limit of 60 months. Just more than half of eligible-adult MFIP cases had 24 or fewer counted months and 22 percent were within 12 months of their lifetime limit. Nearly half (48 percent) of DWP cases had at least one MFIP counted month from previous time on MFIP, which is similar to December 2005.
- Twelve percent of eligible-adult MFIP cases were either exempt or excepted from the time limit because they were a minor parent complying with education requirements, an 18 or 19-year old caregiver complying with high school education requirements, age 60 or older, experiencing family violence, living on an American Indian reservation with a not employed rate of at least 50 percent, or disabled and met certain special medical criteria.
- The percentage of MFIP-eligible-adult cases with extensions was the same as in December 2005 (10 percent of cases), which was the first time since December 2002 (the first year extensions were reported in this report series) that the percentage of cases with extensions did not increase. Extended cases had an average of 24 extension months, with one-third having 12 extension months or less and one-quarter having more than 36 extension months. The most common extension reason was being ill or incapacitated for more than 30 days (31 percent), followed by meeting Special Medical Criteria for a disability or illness (18 percent) and having an IQ between 70 and 80 (17 percent).
- The percentage of MFIP cases that were new cases in the previous year remained similar to December 2005, but the percentage of new DWP cases decreased from 54 percent in December 2005 to 46 percent in December 2006. The proportion of cases that moved into Minnesota during the most recent year remained similar to last year (19 percent of MFIP-eligible-adult cases and 40 percent of DWP cases). The most frequent states from which new residents in both programs had moved into the state from were Illinois (437 cases), Wisconsin (247 cases), and Texas (208 cases). The largest number of new residents came from foreign countries (509 cases).
- A slightly smaller percentage of MFIP cases reported earned income in December 2006 than in December 2005. Thirty-eight percent of eligible-adult cases and 8 percent of child-only cases had reported work hours in December 2006 compared to 41 percent of eligible-adult cases and 13 percent of child-only cases in December 2005. The percentage of DWP cases with reported earned income did not change between December 2005 and December 2006 when it was 44 percent. MFIP eligible-adult cases that reported earned income worked an average of 108 hours and had an average income of \$961 in December 2006. This is a decrease in both average income and hours worked since December 2005.
- The percentage of both MFIP-eligible-adult and DWP cases that had second quarter 2006 (two quarters prior to the report month) wages reported to the Minnesota



Unemployment Insurance (UI) system increased since December 2005. The percentage of MFIP-eligible-adult cases with reported wages increased by 8 percentage points and the percentage of DWP cases with reported wages increased by 7 percentage points. The average amount of these wages also increased – for MFIP-eligible-adult cases from \$3,060 two quarters before December 2005 to \$3,509 two quarters before December 2006 and for DWP cases from \$4,823 to \$5,165 for the two reports.

- The percentage of households affected by the family cap increased each year since 2004, when the policy was first applied. Since December 2004, the percentage of MFIP-eligible-adult households impacted by the family cap increased from 4 percent to 14 percent. Two-eligible-adult households were more likely to have had a child that was impacted by the family cap than child-only or one-eligible-adult cases. In December 2006, 22 percent of two-eligible-adult cases were affected by the family cap compared to 5 percent of child-only and 12 percent of one-eligible-adult cases.

**Table 4. Economic Characteristics of December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases**

Economic Characteristics of Cases		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers			DWP Cases		
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
<b>Cases</b>	Count	10,244	19,195	3,181	22,376	2,925	784	3,709
	Percent of All Cases	31.4%	58.8%	9.8%	68.6%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%
<b>Counted MFIP Months</b> Sept. 1996 to Dec. 2006	Mean	13.7	26.8	22.6	26.2	10.2	8.0	9.7
	Median	0	23	18	22	0	0	0
<b>Maximum for Eligible Adult in Case</b> Frequency of Cases	No Counted Months	5,855	1,673	143	1,816	1,476	446	1,922
		57.2%	8.7%	4.5%	8.1%	50.5%	56.9%	51.8%
	1 - 12 Months	1,117	5,140	1,031	6,171	561	145	706
		10.9%	26.8%	32.4%	27.6%	19.2%	18.5%	19.0%
	13 - 24 Months	764	3,275	889	4,164	381	93	474
		7.5%	17.1%	27.9%	18.6%	13.0%	11.9%	12.8%
	25 - 36 Months	642	2,559	380	2,939	234	37	271
		6.3%	13.3%	11.9%	13.1%	8.0%	4.7%	7.3%
	37 - 42 Months	273	1,100	168	1,268	83	18	101
		2.7%	5.7%	5.3%	5.7%	2.8%	2.3%	2.7%
	43 - 48 Months	274	988	141	1,129	68	13	81
		2.7%	5.1%	4.4%	5.0%	2.3%	1.7%	2.2%
49 - 54 Months	257	926	132	1,058	61	15	76	
	2.5%	4.8%	4.1%	4.7%	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	
55 - 60 Months	1,062	3,534	297	3,831	43	9	52	
	10.4%	18.4%	9.3%	17.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%	
<b>MFIP Excepted or Exempted</b>	Count of Cases	17	2,236	345	2,581			
	Percent of All Cases	0.2%	11.6%	10.8%	11.5%			
<b>MFIP Extensions</b>	Count		2,085	154	2,239			
	Percent of MFIP Cases		10.9%	4.8%	10.0%			
<b>Total Extension Months</b>	Mean		23.8	20.2	23.5			
	Median		22	17	21			
	1 - 12 Months		665	62	723			
	Percent of Extended Cases		31.9%	40.3%	32.3%			
	13 - 24 Months		495	37	532			
			23.7%	24.0%	23.8%			
	25 - 36 Months		404	30	434			
		19.4%	19.5%	19.4%				
More than 36 Months		521	25	546				
		25.0%	16.2%	24.4%				

Table 4 – Page 2

Economic Characteristics of Cases		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers			DWP Cases		
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
Extension Reason	Ill or incapacitated		649	40	689			
	Percent of Extended Cases		31.1%	26.0%	30.8%			
	Special Medical Criteria		373	21	394			
			17.9%	13.6%	17.6%			
	IQ Between 70 and 80		338	39	377			
			16.2%	25.3%	16.8%			
	Mentally Ill		244	20	264			
			11.7%	13.0%	11.8%			
	Care of Ill or Incapacitated		188	10	198			
			9.0%	6.5%	8.8%			
	Employment Required Hours		98	14	112			
			4.7%	9.1%	5.0%			
	Unemployable		56	2	58			
			2.7%	1.3%	2.6%			
	Family Violence Waiver		69	2	71			
	3.3%	1.3%	3.2%					
Learning Disabled	52	6	58					
	2.5%	3.9%	2.6%					
IQ Below 70	16	0	16					
	0.8%	0.0%	0.7%					
Appeal	2	0	2					
	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%					
Months since Start of DWP Eligibility	1st Month					730	221	951
						25.0%	28.2%	25.6%
	2nd Month					751	169	920
						25.7%	21.6%	24.8%
	3rd Month					782	215	997
	26.7%	27.4%	26.9%					
4th Month	662	179	841					
	22.6%	22.8%	22.7%					

Table 4 – Page 3

Economic Characteristics of Cases		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers			DWP Cases		
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
New Cases in 2006	Minnesota Resident before 2006	1,134	3,756	640	4,396	776	233	1,009
	Percent of New Cases	84.1%	81.8%	79.8%	81.5%	60.8%	56.6%	59.7%
	Moved into State in 2006	214	837	162	999	501	179	680
	Percent of New Cases	15.9%	18.2%	20.2%	18.5%	39.2%	43.4%	40.3%
<b>Total of New Cases</b>		1,348	4,593	802	5,395	1,277	412	1,689
<b>Percent of All Cases</b>		13.2%	23.9%	25.2%	24.1%	43.7%	52.6%	45.5%
MFIP or DWP Cash Grants	Mean of All Cases in Column	\$256	\$303	\$351	\$310	\$340	\$477	\$369
MFIP Food Portion	Mean of All Cases in Column	\$216	\$279	\$395	\$296			
Food Support- "Uncle Harry" Cases	Mean of Cases Receiving	\$113	\$104	\$106	\$105	\$215	\$507	\$288
	Percent of Cases in Column Receiving	46.7%	12.2%	7.5%	11.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Food Support - Other Cases	Mean of Cases Receiving	\$220	\$328	\$425	\$341	\$298	\$427	\$326
	Percent of Cases in Column Receiving	1.2%	3.8%	3.7%	3.8%	90.8%	91.6%	91.0%
MFIP Food-Only Assistance	Mean	\$121	\$183	\$262	\$197			
	Count of Cases	1,028	3,450	737	4,187			
	Percent of All Cases	10.0%	18.0%	23.2%	18.7%			
Income / Working	Count of Cases	791	6,800	1,802	8,602	1,192	454	1,646
	Percent of All Cases	7.7%	35.4%	56.6%	38.4%	40.8%	57.9%	44.4%
December Total Earned Income	Mean of Working Cases	\$976	\$892	\$1,220	\$961	\$892	\$1,292	\$1,003
	Median	\$720	\$773	\$1,145	\$838	\$775	\$1,033	\$832
December Budgeted Earnings	Mean of Working Cases		\$417	\$580	\$454	\$463	\$601	\$505
	Median		\$382	\$555	\$410	\$387	\$490	\$411
December Monthly Work Hours	Mean of Working Cases	100.6	100.2	136.2	107.7	95.4	127.7	104.3
	Median	96	96	135	100	90	115	96
Percent of All Cases	1 - 79 Hours	304	2,541	427	2,968	485	149	634
		3.0%	13.2%	13.4%	13.3%	16.6%	19.0%	17.1%
	80 - 119 Hours	142	1,575	304	1,879	272	80	352
		1.4%	8.2%	9.6%	8.4%	9.3%	10.2%	9.5%
	120 - 159 Hours	107	1,297	349	1,646	195	63	258
		1.0%	6.8%	11.0%	7.4%	6.7%	8.0%	7.0%
	160 Hours or More	211	1,291	705	1,996	227	158	385
		2.1%	6.7%	22.2%	8.9%	7.8%	20.2%	10.4%
Wages Reported for 2nd Quarter 2006 for Jobs Covered by Unemployment Insurance	Mean of Cases with UI Wages	\$6,594	\$3,507	\$3,524	\$3,509	\$4,927	\$5,959	\$5,165
	Median	\$5,150	\$2,342	\$2,744	\$2,422	\$4,115	\$5,315	\$4,389
	Count of Cases	4,628	10,280	2,030	12,310	1,706	509	2,215
	Percent of All Cases	45.2%	53.6%	63.8%	55.0%	58.3%	64.9%	59.7%

Table 4 – Page 4

Economic Characteristics of Cases		Child-only MFIP Cases	MFIP Cases with Eligible Caregivers			DWP Cases		
			One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	All DWP Cases
Employment Services Sanctions	10 % ES Sanction		389	64	453			
	30 % ES Sanction		71	183	1,210			
	All Cases with ES Sanctions		1,345	247	1,663			
	Percent of All Cases		7.0%	7.8%	7.4%			
	Six Counted Sanction Months		6	171	34			
	Percent of All Cases	0.1%	0.9%	1.1%	0.9%			
Housing Subsidy	Mean Subsidy Amount > \$0	\$598	\$618	\$567	\$613			
	Count of Cases	2,991	6,347	745	7,092			
	Percent of All Cases	29.2%	33.1%	23.4%	31.7%			
Cases with Adult and/or Child Receiving SSI	Count of Cases	4,805	2,150	204	2,354	132	21	153
	Percent of Cases	46.9%	11.2%	6.4%	10.5%	4.5%	2.7%	4.1%
Deductions to MFIP Grant	SSI (Maximum \$125 per person)	4,455	2,047	189	2,236			
	Percent of All Cases	43.5%	10.7%	5.9%	10.0%			
	Housing (Maximum \$50 per case)	70	3,977	529	4,506			
	Percent of All Cases	0.7%	20.7%	16.6%	20.1%			
	Either SSI or Housing Deductions > \$0	4,517	5,789	692	6,481			
	Percent of All Cases	44.1%	30.2%	21.8%	29.0%			
	Mean Deduction > \$0	\$117	\$77	\$71	\$76			
Family Cap	Count of Cases with One Child	456	2,150	611	2,761			
	Two Children	33	223	85	308			
	Three Children	3	7	2	9			
	Percentage of Cases	4.8%	12.4%	21.9%	13.8%			
Child Support Disbursements: Average of Payments > \$0	Current Mean	\$197	\$221	\$222	\$221	\$320	\$256	\$315
	Median	\$174	\$197	\$194	\$197	\$278	\$211	\$273
	Count	1,166	2,569	120	2,689	467	36	503
	Percent of Cases	11.4%	13.4%	3.8%	12.0%	16.0%	4.6%	13.6%
	Sum	\$230,073	\$568,545	\$26,675	\$595,220	\$149,464	\$9,218	\$158,682
	Arrears Mean	\$129	\$137	\$159	\$138	\$271	\$157	\$262
	Median	\$61	\$64	\$75	\$65	\$100	\$61	\$98
	Count	998	1,892	85	1,977	312	25	337
	Percent of Cases	9.7%	9.9%	2.7%	8.8%	10.7%	3.2%	9.1%
	Sum	\$129,077	\$258,388	\$13,491	\$271,879	\$84,420	\$3,914	\$88,334
	Total Mean	\$238	\$269	\$279	\$269	\$453	\$298	\$283
	Median	\$179	\$213	\$211	\$213	\$329	\$244	\$320
	Count	1,508	3,078	144	3,222	516	44	560
	Percent of Cases	14.7%	16.0%	4.5%	14.4%	17.6%	5.6%	15.1%
	Sum	\$359,040	\$826,668	\$40,166	\$866,834	\$233,884	\$13,132	\$247,016

## Data Definitions and Policy Information: Table 4

**Months of Welfare Use.** Counted MFIP months were defined as the maximum number of months of counted eligibility for TANF and/ or MFIP between September 1996 and December 2006 of any eligible adult on the case. This includes Minnesota paid and federally paid months in Minnesota and federally paid months in other states, but excludes months exempt or excepted from the time limit.

Previous reports included total family assistance months that included months on AFDC, Family General Assistance (FGA), and other MFIP non-counted months. These data were dropped from this report because these measures lost their original purpose of providing a picture of total time of family cash assistance pre- and post-AFDC as the nine-year window for reporting family cash assistance months no longer included time on AFDC or FGA. The difference between total family cash assistance months and MFIP counted months should now only be cases that are exempt or excepted from the time limit, child-only cases, and cases in extension. This report adds a distribution of total extension months and a case count of except/excepted cases.

Cases can receive an exemption for special medical criteria. Counted months before the time limit of 60 months was reached in which special medical criteria were present can be “banked” (used to extend eligibility beyond 60 months after the time limit has been reached). The following cases are excepted from the time limit (neither counted nor banked): living on a reservation with a not-employed rate of at least 50 percent, family violence cases cooperating with an alternative employment plan, caregivers aged 60 or older, a minor parent complying with an education plan, or an 18 or 19-year old parent complying with high school education requirements in their employment plan.

DWP is a four-month program and its months do not count toward the MFIP lifetime limit. A case is eligible for DWP if the applicant has not received MFIP in the previous twelve months and if the applicant is deemed likely to benefit from intensive employment services. An applicant is ineligible for DWP if he or she has 60 or more MFIP-counted months.

A MFIP case can be extended beyond the 60 month lifetime limit for a documented hardship that is a permitted extension reason. Extensions may be granted for cases that have an ill or incapacitated caregiver, a family with special medical criteria, a caregiver with an IQ score between 70 and 80, a single parent working at least 30 hours or two parents working a total of 55 hours, or other reasons. A case sanctioned for not being in compliance with Employment Services (ES) or child support in month 60 can never be extended.

New welfare cases in 2006 were December 2006 cases active in a family cash assistance program in Minnesota for one or more months in 2006 but active zero months in 1992 through 2005 (the period covered by the administrative database). Cases new to the state had a 2006 state entry date. Minnesota residents were either lifelong residents or had moved to the state before 2006. This definition is consistent with definitions in the December 1999 through December 2005 reports.

**Cash and Food Grant Amounts.** MFIP includes a cash grant and a food portion that can only be spent on food. As families work their way toward leaving assistance, their cash grant is decreased first so that some families only receive a food portion. Families can opt out of the cash portion, receiving only the food portion, and those months do not count toward their lifetime limit. If a household member is not eligible for MFIP, that person may be eligible to receive Food Support, Minnesota’s Food Stamps program. These cases are referred to as “Uncle Harry” cases in Minnesota. DWP provides a cash grant only, but families are categorically eligible to receive Food Support as well. MFIP cases that received Food Support that were not an Uncle Harry case were most often “expedited” cases, which meant that the household met the criteria for immediate Food Support assistance but whose MFIP cases were not opened until later in the month, usually due to not having necessary documents at the time of application.

The means for MFIP and DWP cash grants and MFIP food portions were calculated using the grant amounts for all cases, including zero cash or food portion for some MFIP cases. The means for all other Food Support amounts include only cases with benefit amounts greater than zero.

**Income, Earnings, and Work Hours.** Total income was either actual or projected December 2006 income of eligible adults and other adults whose earnings were deemed for the cases. The amount used was either verified earnings for December 2006 or zero for cases still active in February 2007 with no income reported for

December 2006 (required to be reported by February 2007) or prospective December 2006 income for new cases with retrospective data missing and for all migrant cases. Total income was gross income except for the self-employed where it was gross less expenses, with a minimum of zero. Mean total income excluded cases with no verified or expected income from eligible or deeming adults in December 2006.

The work hours reported for eligible and other deeming adults with earned income are defined in the same manner as earned income. The hours are totals for the case. The percentages of all cases with hours reported are slightly smaller than the percentages reported working because of hours that were not entered into the administrative database. Mean hours only included cases with any hours reported.

Budgeted earnings are total earnings with certain kinds and percentages of earnings subtracted to yield an amount that is then deducted from the MFIP grant level for work status and family size to determine the size of the MFIP grant paid. The budgeted earnings used to calculate the December 2006 grants were based on verified income earned in October 2006 or, for new cases and migrants, prospective earnings for December 2006. Mean budgeted earnings in the table were computed for cases which had budgeted earnings greater than zero.

Employers covered by the Unemployment Insurance (UI) system (which excludes federal government, religious, and seasonal workers) must report wages to the states. The table provides second quarter 2006 wages reported for participants' jobs covered by UI in Minnesota as a measure of recent work history and earnings. The second quarter predates DWP application (the earliest any of these DWP cases started was September), so for many or most DWP cases the second quarter was before the occurrence of whatever caused them to apply, often the loss of a job. They had either never been on MFIP or had been off for at least one year before starting DWP. Some MFIP participants were on DWP in the second quarter; many were on MFIP. Therefore, it is not surprising that there were differences between average incomes of participants when making program comparisons.

**Sanctions, Deductions, and Child Support.** MFIP cases not complying with Employment Services (ES) requirements can be sanctioned with a reduction of the grant amount. For one eligible adult not complying in 2006, the first sanction was 10 percent, while the first sanction for two eligible adults both not complying was 30 percent. If not resolved, the 10 percent sanction was increased the next month to a maximum of 30 percent. In July 2003, the Minnesota Legislature instituted a policy that after the sixth occurrence of non-compliance a case may face closure, or 100 percent sanction.

Beginning in July 2003, the Minnesota Legislature mandated deductions from MFIP grants for cases including a family member who receives SSI (\$125 maximum deduction per person) and cases with housing subsidies (\$50 maximum deduction per case). The SSI deduction will end as of February 1, 2008.

Also in July 2003, the Minnesota Legislature instituted the family cap, which does not allow a cash grant increase for cases with children conceived when the family was receiving MFIP. Any births after 10 months of eligibility did not result in a grant increase as it would have previously.

Child support disbursements were paid to families receiving MFIP or DWP in December 2006 from support payments on behalf of children on the cases. This included both current payments and payments made for arrears on past months. All current support was passed through to custodial families and counted dollar-for-dollar against the grants.

## County and Regional Data

The following section presents data by county and geographic region. Each table, except for poverty rate data in Table 6, is drawn from the statewide tables. Please refer to the Data Definitions and Policy Information section for each statewide table for notes crucial to understanding the data. Note that all percentages and means will be less stable and extreme values more common for counties with small caseloads. Unless stated, data are for all counties and geographic regions. Due to the small number of DWP cases, some DWP data are presented by large counties and regions only.

Statewide Table	County and Regional Table	Description
Table 1	Table 5	Total number of MFIP and DWP paid cases
	Table 6	Count of all MFIP and DWP cases and percentage of state cases with county family poverty rates
Table 2	Table 7	Age, gender, education, and marital status of one-eligible-adult MFIP cases
	Table 8	Age, gender, education, and marital status by large counties and regions of one-eligible-adult DWP cases
	Table 9	Race/ethnicity distributions and citizenship status of one-eligible-adult MFIP cases
	Table 10	Race/ethnicity distributions and citizenship status by large counties and regions of one-eligible-adult DWP cases
Table 3	Table 11	Distribution of family type for MFIP and DWP cases with one eligible adult
	Table 12	Number of children and age of youngest child for MFIP cases with one eligible adult
	Table 13	Number of children and age of youngest child for DWP cases with one eligible adult
	Table 14	Family violence, adult chemical dependency, and adult mental health diagnoses for MFIP and DWP cases with one eligible adult by large counties and region
Table 4	Table 15	Exempted, excepted, and extended cases, MFIP/TANF counted months, and new cases and residents for MFIP one-eligible-adult cases
	Table 16	MFIP/TANF counted months and new cases and residents for DWP one-eligible-adult cases by large county and region
	Table 17	Food-only MFIP cases, budgeted earnings, income, and hours of work for MFIP one-eligible-adult cases
	Table 18	Sanctions and child support for one-eligible-adult MFIP cases
	Table 19	Exempted, excepted, and extended cases, MFIP/TANF counted months, and new cases and residents for MFIP two-eligible-adult cases
	Table 20	Food-only MFIP cases, budgeted earnings, income, and hours of work for MFIP two-eligible-adult cases
	Table 21	Sanctions and child support for two-eligible-adult MFIP cases by large county and region



**Table 5. December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
<b>Aitkin</b>	28		41	8	49		13	2	15	
		0.3%	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%	0.2%	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Anoka</b>	466		932	137	1,069		218	47	265	
		4.5%	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%	4.8%	82.3%	17.7%	100.0%	7.1%
<b>Becker</b>	105		133	31	164		20	5	25	
		1.0%	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%	0.7%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.7%
<b>Beltrami</b>	405		695	196	891		52	17	69	
		4.0%	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%	4.0%	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%	1.9%
<b>Benton</b>	47		105	16	121		15	5	20	
		0.5%	86.8%	13.2%	100.0%	0.5%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.5%
<b>Big Stone</b>	3		6	1	7		3	0	3	
		0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Blue Earth</b>	57		142	39	181		31	13	44	
		0.6%	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%	0.8%	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%	1.2%
<b>Brown</b>	12		48	8	56		10	3	13	
		0.1%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.3%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Carlton</b>	54		94	14	108		12	2	14	
		0.5%	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%	0.5%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Carver</b>	38		58	2	60		18	5	23	
		0.4%	96.7%	3.3%	100.0%	0.3%	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%	0.6%
<b>Cass</b>	132		199	52	251		35	5	40	
		1.3%	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	1.1%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	1.1%
<b>Chippewa</b>	24		25	1	26		2	0	2	
		0.2%	96.2%	3.8%	100.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Chisago</b>	35		84	16	100		29	8	37	
		0.3%	84.0%	16.0%	100.0%	0.4%	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%	1.0%
<b>Clay</b>	84		181	43	224		33	13	46	
		0.8%	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%	1.0%	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%	1.2%
<b>Clearwater</b>	28		38	13	51		8	5	13	
		0.3%	74.5%	25.5%	100.0%	0.2%	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Cook</b>	4		4	0	4		2	0	2	
		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%

Table 5 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
Cottonwood	21		17	4	21		8	1	9	
		0.2%	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%	0.1%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%	0.2%
Crow Wing	98		172	20	192		45	16	61	
		1.0%	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%	0.9%	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%	1.6%
Dakota	403		731	78	809		195	45	240	
		3.9%	90.4%	9.6%	100.0%	3.6%	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%	6.5%
Dodge	25		31	1	32		9	1	10	
		0.2%	96.9%	3.1%	100.0%	0.1%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.3%
Douglas	43		50	10	60		11	1	12	
		0.4%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.3%	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%	0.3%
Faribault	22		21	5	26		5	2	7	
		0.2%	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%	0.1%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.2%
Fillmore	10		38	12	50		10	4	14	
		0.1%	76.0%	24.0%	100.0%	0.2%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.4%
Freeborn	52		89	20	109		15	4	19	
		0.5%	81.7%	18.3%	100.0%	0.5%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.5%
Goodhue	25		83	13	96		18	6	24	
		0.2%	86.5%	13.5%	100.0%	0.4%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.6%
Grant	4		9	4	13		2	0	2	
		0.0%	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
Hennepin	3,208		5,863	716	6,579		768	151	919	
		31.3%	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%	29.4%	83.6%	16.4%	100.0%	24.8%
Houston	16		62	17	79		17	6	23	
		0.2%	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%	0.4%	73.9%	26.1%	100.0%	0.6%
Hubbard	41		44	11	55		8	4	12	
		0.4%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.2%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	0.3%
Isanti	43		65	19	84		23	6	29	
		0.4%	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%	0.4%	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	0.8%
Itasca	104		121	38	159		22	14	36	
		1.0%	76.1%	23.9%	100.0%	0.7%	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%	1.0%
Jackson	12		11	3	14		5	2	7	
		0.1%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%	0.1%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.2%

Table 5 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
Kanabec	36	0.4%	49	7	56	0.3%	15	5	20	0.5%
Kandiyohi	74	0.7%	156	19	175	0.8%	26	9	35	0.9%
Kittson	5	0.0%	6	1	7	0.0%	1	1	2	0.1%
Koochiching	21	0.2%	50	18	68	0.3%	9	3	12	0.3%
Lac Qui Parle	7	0.1%	6	0	6	0.0%	1	3	4	0.1%
Lake	8	0.1%	12	2	14	0.1%	3	0	3	0.1%
Lake of Woods	1	0.0%	5	1	6	0.0%	2	0	2	0.1%
Le Sueur	18	0.2%	45	12	57	0.3%	8	6	14	0.4%
Lincoln	16	0.2%	7	0	7	0.0%	1	0	1	0.0%
Lyon	26	0.3%	57	4	61	0.3%	18	4	22	0.6%
McLeod	38	0.4%	48	4	52	0.2%	14	5	19	0.5%
Mahnomen	59	0.6%	80	19	99	0.4%	7	1	8	0.2%
Marshall	7	0.1%	7	0	7	0.0%	7	5	12	0.3%
Martin	35	0.3%	53	6	59	0.3%	12	7	19	0.5%
Meeker	24	0.2%	44	4	48	0.2%	11	2	13	0.4%
Mille Lacs	61	0.6%	55	11	66	0.3%	15	3	18	0.5%

Table 5 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
<b>Morrison</b>	32		46	6	52		11	4	15	
		0.3%	88.5%	11.5%	100.0%	0.2%	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%	0.4%
<b>Mower</b>	85		117	20	137		19	12	31	
		0.8%	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%	0.6%	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%	0.8%
<b>Murray</b>	8		4	1	5		0	0	0	
		0.1%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%				0.0%
<b>Nicollet</b>	36		111	17	128		26	6	32	
		0.4%	86.7%	13.3%	100.0%	0.6%	81.3%	18.8%	100.0%	0.9%
<b>Nobles</b>	41		62	4	66		15	8	23	
		0.4%	93.9%	6.1%	100.0%	0.3%	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%	0.6%
<b>Norman</b>	9		18	2	20		5	2	7	
		0.1%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.1%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Olmsted</b>	197		330	45	375		87	16	103	
		1.9%	88.0%	12.0%	100.0%	1.7%	84.5%	15.5%	100.0%	2.8%
<b>Otter Tail</b>	56		108	19	127		27	8	35	
		0.5%	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%	0.6%	77.1%	22.9%	100.0%	0.9%
<b>Pennington</b>	22		34	1	35		5	2	7	
		0.2%	97.1%	2.9%	100.0%	0.2%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Pine</b>	55		75	26	101		22	6	28	
		0.5%	74.3%	25.7%	100.0%	0.5%	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%	0.8%
<b>Pipestone</b>	11		13	4	17		4	1	5	
		0.1%	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%	0.1%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Polk</b>	47		100	23	123		18	6	24	
		0.5%	81.3%	18.7%	100.0%	0.5%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.6%
<b>Pope</b>	14		21	1	22		5	0	5	
		0.1%	95.5%	4.5%	100.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Ramsey</b>	2,119		4,748	963	5,711		381	112	493	
		20.7%	83.1%	16.9%	100.0%	25.5%	77.3%	22.7%	100.0%	13.3%
<b>Red Lake</b>	3		10	2	12		3	4	7	
		0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.1%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Redwood</b>	28		23	2	25		12	3	15	
		0.3%	92.0%	8.0%	100.0%	0.1%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.4%

Table 5 – Page 5

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
<b>Renville</b>	29		31	8	39		7	2	9	
		0.3%	79.5%	20.5%	100.0%	0.2%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Rice</b>	78		139	21	160		36	10	46	
		0.8%	86.9%	13.1%	100.0%	0.7%	78.3%	21.7%	100.0%	1.2%
<b>Rock</b>	10		14	5	19		4	1	5	
		0.1%	73.7%	26.3%	100.0%	0.1%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Roseau</b>	13		10	1	11		5	0	5	
		0.1%	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>St. Louis</b>	448		863	125	988		108	31	139	
		4.4%	87.3%	12.7%	100.0%	4.4%	77.7%	22.3%	100.0%	3.7%
<b>Scott</b>	102		119	13	132		28	9	37	
		1.0%	90.2%	9.8%	100.0%	0.6%	75.7%	24.3%	100.0%	1.0%
<b>Sherburne</b>	75		87	21	108		29	8	37	
		0.7%	80.6%	19.4%	100.0%	0.5%	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%	1.0%
<b>Sibley</b>	15		30	8	38		6	2	8	
		0.1%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	0.2%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Stearns</b>	156		362	51	413		64	25	89	
		1.5%	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%	1.8%	71.9%	28.1%	100.0%	2.4%
<b>Steele</b>	53		70	19	89		23	10	33	
		0.5%	78.7%	21.3%	100.0%	0.4%	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%	0.9%
<b>Stevens</b>	2		5	1	6		0	1	1	
		0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Swift</b>	9		14	4	18		0	0	0	
		0.1%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.1%				0.0%
<b>Todd</b>	33		30	10	40		11	1	12	
		0.3%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	0.2%	91.7%	8.3%	100.0%	0.3%
<b>Traverse</b>	4		3	0	3		0	2	2	
		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Wabasha</b>	20		18	4	22		10	2	12	
		0.2%	81.8%	18.2%	100.0%	0.1%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.3%
<b>Wadena</b>	26		64	14	78		11	11	22	
		0.3%	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%	0.3%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.6%

**Table 5 – Page 6**

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
<b>Waseca</b>	26		59	7	66		11	7	18	
		0.3%	89.4%	10.6%	100.0%	0.3%	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%	0.5%
<b>Washington</b>	146		329	42	371		51	13	64	
		1.4%	88.7%	11.3%	100.0%	1.7%	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%	1.7%
<b>Watonwan</b>	10		23	3	26		7	1	8	
		0.1%	88.5%	11.5%	100.0%	0.1%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	0.2%
<b>Wilkin</b>	5		10	2	12		4	0	4	
		0.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.1%
<b>Winona</b>	71		95	11	106		18	2	20	
		0.7%	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%	0.5%	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%	0.5%
<b>Wright</b>	60		116	17	133		39	8	47	
		0.6%	87.2%	12.8%	100.0%	0.6%	83.0%	17.0%	100.0%	1.3%
<b>Yellow Medicine</b>	15		12	2	14		1	1	2	
		0.1%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	0.1%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.1%

Table 5 – Page 7

County/Region/ State	Child-only MFIP		MFIP Cases with Eligible Adults				DWP Cases with Eligible Adults			
	Count of Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases	One Eligible Adult	Two Eligible Adults	Total Cases	Percent of State Cases
Northwest	106		185	30	215		44	20	64	
		1.0%	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%	1.0%	68.8%	31.3%	100.0%	1.7%
West Central	1,172		1,893	453	2,346		292	94	386	
		11.4%	80.7%	19.3%	100.0%	10.5%	75.6%	24.4%	100.0%	10.4%
Northeast	667		1,185	205	1,390		169	52	221	
		6.5%	85.3%	14.7%	100.0%	6.2%	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%	6.0%
Central	698		1,193	203	1,396		280	84	364	
		6.8%	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%	6.2%	76.9%	23.1%	100.0%	9.8%
Southwest	221		271	35	306		74	24	98	
		2.2%	88.6%	11.4%	100.0%	1.4%	75.5%	24.5%	100.0%	2.6%
South Central	231		532	105	637		116	47	163	
		2.3%	83.5%	16.5%	100.0%	2.8%	71.2%	28.8%	100.0%	4.4%
Southeast	632		1,072	183	1,255		262	73	335	
		6.2%	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%	5.6%	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%	9.0%
Metro Suburban	1,190		2,253	288	2,541		539	127	666	
		11.6%	88.7%	11.3%	100.0%	11.4%	80.9%	19.1%	100.0%	18.0%
Core Metro	5,327		10,611	1,679	12,290		1,149	263	1,412	
		52.0%	86.3%	13.7%	100.0%	54.9%	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%	38.1%
Minnesota	10,244		19,195	3,181	22,376		2,925	784	3,709	
		100.0%	85.8%	14.2%	100.0%	100.0%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 6. December 2006 MFIP and DWP Paid Cases Compared with Census Data of Poverty, by County**

County	Count of MFIP Cases (Child-only and Cases with Eligible Adults)	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP Cases	Count of DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State DWP Cases	Count of Total MFIP and DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP and DWP Cases	2003 Percent of State Family Households with Children <18 below Poverty Level	2003 Poverty Rate of Family Households with Children <18
Aitkin	77	0.2%	15	0.4%	92	0.3%	0.4%	17.3%
Anoka	1,535	4.7%	265	7.1%	1,800	5.0%	4.3%	6.3%
Becker	269	0.8%	25	0.7%	294	0.8%	1.0%	16.4%
Beltrami	1,296	4.0%	69	1.9%	1,365	3.8%	1.8%	21.5%
Benton	168	0.5%	20	0.5%	188	0.5%	0.7%	8.7%
Big Stone	10	0.0%	3	0.1%	13	0.0%	0.1%	12.7%
Blue Earth	238	0.7%	44	1.2%	282	0.8%	1.0%	10.9%
Brown	68	0.2%	13	0.4%	81	0.2%	0.4%	8.5%
Carlton	162	0.5%	14	0.4%	176	0.5%	0.6%	10.1%
Carver	98	0.3%	23	0.6%	121	0.3%	0.8%	4.3%
Cass	383	1.2%	40	1.1%	423	1.2%	0.9%	18.7%
Chippewa	50	0.2%	2	0.1%	52	0.1%	0.3%	11.8%
Chisago	135	0.4%	37	1.0%	172	0.5%	0.7%	7.0%
Clay	308	0.9%	46	1.2%	354	1.0%	1.1%	11.9%
Clearwater	79	0.2%	13	0.4%	92	0.3%	0.3%	18.5%
Cook	8	0.0%	2	0.1%	10	0.0%	0.1%	9.2%
Cottonwood	42	0.1%	9	0.2%	51	0.1%	0.3%	13.6%
Crow Wing	290	0.9%	61	1.6%	351	1.0%	1.3%	12.3%
Dakota	1,212	3.7%	240	6.5%	1,452	4.0%	5.0%	6.0%
Dodge	57	0.2%	10	0.3%	67	0.2%	0.3%	6.4%
Douglas	103	0.3%	12	0.3%	115	0.3%	0.6%	10.1%
Faribault	48	0.1%	7	0.2%	55	0.2%	0.3%	12.1%
Fillmore	60	0.2%	14	0.4%	74	0.2%	0.4%	11.2%
Freeborn	161	0.5%	19	0.5%	180	0.5%	0.6%	11.8%
Goodhue	121	0.4%	24	0.6%	145	0.4%	0.7%	7.9%
Grant	17	0.1%	2	0.1%	19	0.1%	0.1%	11.9%
Hennepin	9,787	30.0%	919	24.8%	10,706	29.5%	25.3%	12.1%
Houston	95	0.3%	23	0.6%	118	0.3%	0.3%	8.5%
Hubbard	96	0.3%	12	0.3%	108	0.3%	0.5%	15.7%
Isanti	127	0.4%	29	0.8%	156	0.4%	0.5%	7.8%



Table 6 – Page 2

County	Count of MFIP Cases (Child-only and Cases with Eligible Adults)	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP Cases	Count of DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State DWP Cases	Count of Total MFIP and DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP and DWP Cases	2003 Percent of State Family Households with Children <18 below Poverty Level	2003 Poverty Rate of Family Households with Children <18
Itasca	263	0.8%	36	1.0%	299	0.8%	1.1%	14.5%
Jackson	26	0.1%	7	0.2%	33	0.1%	0.2%	10.7%
Kanabec	92	0.3%	20	0.5%	112	0.3%	0.4%	12.7%
Kandiyohi	249	0.8%	35	0.9%	284	0.8%	1.0%	13.0%
Kittson	12	0.0%	2	0.1%	14	0.0%	0.1%	10.0%
Koochiching	89	0.3%	12	0.3%	101	0.3%	0.3%	14.9%
Lac Qui Parle	13	0.0%	4	0.1%	17	0.0%	0.1%	10.0%
Lake	22	0.1%	3	0.1%	25	0.1%	0.2%	11.1%
Lake of the Woods	7	0.0%	2	0.1%	9	0.0%	0.1%	10.5%
Le Sueur	75	0.2%	14	0.4%	89	0.2%	0.4%	8.1%
Lincoln	13	0.0%	1	0.0%	14	0.0%	0.1%	10.1%
Lyon	87	0.3%	22	0.6%	109	0.3%	0.5%	10.5%
McLeod	90	0.3%	19	0.5%	109	0.3%	0.6%	8.1%
Mahnomen	158	0.5%	8	0.2%	166	0.5%	0.3%	23.3%
Marshall	14	0.0%	12	0.3%	26	0.1%	0.2%	11.7%
Martin	94	0.3%	19	0.5%	113	0.3%	0.5%	14.0%
Meeker	72	0.2%	13	0.4%	85	0.2%	0.4%	10.1%
Mille Lacs	127	0.4%	18	0.5%	145	0.4%	0.6%	11.9%
Morrison	84	0.3%	15	0.4%	99	0.3%	0.8%	12.1%
Mower	222	0.7%	31	0.8%	253	0.7%	0.9%	12.3%
Murray	13	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	0.0%	0.1%	9.3%
Nicollet	164	0.5%	32	0.9%	196	0.5%	0.4%	8.2%
Nobles	107	0.3%	23	0.6%	130	0.4%	0.5%	13.0%
Norman	29	0.1%	7	0.2%	36	0.1%	0.2%	13.6%
Olmsted	572	1.8%	103	2.8%	675	1.9%	2.3%	8.4%
Otter Tail	183	0.6%	35	0.9%	218	0.6%	1.3%	12.9%
Pennington	57	0.2%	7	0.2%	64	0.2%	0.3%	12.2%
Pine	156	0.5%	28	0.8%	184	0.5%	0.8%	15.5%
Pipestone	28	0.1%	5	0.1%	33	0.1%	0.2%	11.3%
Polk	170	0.5%	24	0.6%	194	0.5%	0.8%	14.5%

Table 6 – Page 3

County	Count of MFIP Cases (Child-only and Cases with Eligible Adults)	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP Cases	Count of DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State DWP Cases	Count of Total MFIP and DWP Cases	December 2006 Percent of State MFIP and DWP Cases	2003 Percent of State Family Households with Children <18 below Poverty Level	2003 Poverty Rate of Family Households with Children <18
Pope	36	0.1%	5	0.1%	41	0.1%	0.2%	10.8%
Ramsey	7,830	24.0%	493	13.3%	8,323	22.9%	14.3%	14.5%
Red Lake	15	0.0%	7	0.2%	22	0.1%	0.1%	12.1%
Redwood	53	0.2%	15	0.4%	68	0.2%	0.4%	11.4%
Renville	68	0.2%	9	0.2%	77	0.2%	0.4%	12.5%
Rice	238	0.7%	46	1.2%	284	0.8%	0.9%	8.0%
Rock	29	0.1%	5	0.1%	34	0.1%	0.2%	9.6%
Roseau	24	0.1%	5	0.1%	29	0.1%	0.3%	7.4%
St. Louis	1,436	4.4%	139	3.7%	1,575	4.3%	4.2%	13.4%
Scott	234	0.7%	37	1.0%	271	0.7%	1.1%	4.3%
Sherburne	183	0.6%	37	1.0%	220	0.6%	0.9%	5.4%
Sibley	53	0.2%	8	0.2%	61	0.2%	0.3%	10.7%
Stearns	569	1.7%	89	2.4%	658	1.8%	2.3%	8.8%
Steele	142	0.4%	33	0.9%	175	0.5%	0.6%	8.5%
Stevens	8	0.0%	1	0.0%	9	0.0%	0.1%	8.2%
Swift	27	0.1%	0	0.0%	27	0.1%	0.2%	11.2%
Todd	73	0.2%	12	0.3%	85	0.2%	0.7%	15.6%
Traverse	7	0.0%	2	0.1%	9	0.0%	0.1%	14.0%
Wabasha	42	0.1%	12	0.3%	54	0.1%	0.3%	7.7%
Wadena	104	0.3%	22	0.6%	126	0.3%	0.4%	16.5%
Waseca	92	0.3%	18	0.5%	110	0.3%	0.4%	10.4%
Washington	517	1.6%	64	1.7%	581	1.6%	2.5%	5.4%
Watsonwan	36	0.1%	8	0.2%	44	0.1%	0.3%	11.7%
Wilkin	17	0.1%	4	0.1%	21	0.1%	0.1%	10.4%
Winona	177	0.5%	20	0.5%	197	0.5%	0.9%	11.3%
Wright	193	0.6%	47	1.3%	240	0.7%	1.4%	6.0%
Yellow Medicine	29	0.1%	2	0.1%	31	0.1%	0.2%	10.4%
Minnesota	32,620	100.0%	3,709	100.0%	36,329	100.0%	100.0%	10.2%

**Table 7. Demographics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 Paid MFIP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Age, Gender, Education, and Marital Status, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Aitkin</b>	10	13	18	41	19	20	*	0	22	19
	24.4%	31.7%	43.9%	100.0%	46.3%	48.8%		0.0%	53.7%	46.3%
<b>Anoka</b>	102	401	412	820	370	437	108	43	609	263
	11.1%	43.8%	45.0%	89.6%	40.4%	47.8%	11.8%	4.7%	66.6%	28.7%
<b>Becker</b>	14	74	40	116	48	74	6	*	90	34
	10.9%	57.8%	31.3%	90.6%	37.5%	57.8%	4.7%		70.3%	26.6%
<b>Beltrami</b>	92	316	282	591	338	320	32	15	563	112
	13.3%	45.8%	40.9%	85.7%	49.0%	46.4%	4.6%	2.2%	81.6%	16.2%
<b>Benton</b>	16	57	23	93	35	48	13	*	73	21
	16.7%	59.4%	24.0%	96.9%	36.5%	50.0%	13.5%		76.0%	21.9%
<b>Big Stone</b>	*	*	*	5	0	6	0	0	6	0
				83.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Blue Earth</b>	14	62	64	132	56	68	16	9	90	41
	10.0%	44.3%	45.7%	94.3%	40.0%	48.6%	11.4%	6.4%	64.3%	29.3%
<b>Brown</b>	*	27	16	44	12	32	*	*	27	16
		57.4%	34.0%	93.6%	25.5%	68.1%			57.4%	34.0%
<b>Carlton</b>	10	48	37	89	29	60	6	*	57	35
	10.5%	50.5%	38.9%	93.7%	30.5%	63.2%	6.3%		60.0%	36.8%
<b>Carver</b>	*	31	27	54	20	33	7	*	38	19
		51.7%	45.0%	90.0%	33.3%	55.0%	11.7%		63.3%	31.7%
<b>Cass</b>	25	90	89	172	89	99	16	10	143	51
	12.3%	44.1%	43.6%	84.3%	43.6%	48.5%	7.8%	4.9%	70.1%	25.0%
<b>Chippewa</b>	5	10	12	23	11	13	*	*	12	11
	18.5%	37.0%	44.4%	85.2%	40.7%	48.1%			44.4%	40.7%
<b>Chisago</b>	6	38	34	70	26	45	7	*	54	22
	7.7%	48.7%	43.6%	89.7%	33.3%	57.7%	9.0%		69.2%	28.2%
<b>Clay</b>	23	86	72	168	63	103	15	18	111	52
	12.7%	47.5%	39.8%	92.8%	34.8%	56.9%	8.3%	9.9%	61.3%	28.7%
<b>Clearwater</b>	7	12	17	29	13	22	*	*	26	7
	19.4%	33.3%	47.2%	80.6%	36.1%	61.1%			72.2%	19.4%

Table 7 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Cook</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	0	*	*
							0.0%	0.0%		
<b>Cottonwood</b>	*	7	7	17	9	8	*	*	10	7
		38.9%	38.9%	94.4%	50.0%	44.4%			55.6%	38.9%
<b>Crow Wing</b>	14	90	65	162	41	104	24	*	103	62
	8.3%	53.3%	38.5%	95.9%	24.3%	61.5%	14.2%		60.9%	36.7%
<b>Dakota</b>	77	383	279	700	257	387	95	19	537	183
	10.4%	51.8%	37.8%	94.7%	34.8%	52.4%	12.9%	2.6%	72.7%	24.8%
<b>Dodge</b>	*	13	16	27	13	18	*	*	21	10
		40.6%	50.0%	84.4%	40.6%	56.3%			65.6%	31.3%
<b>Douglas</b>	6	24	21	49	11	32	8	*	27	23
	11.8%	47.1%	41.2%	96.1%	21.6%	62.7%	15.7%		52.9%	45.1%
<b>Faribault</b>	*	13	7	21	7	13	*	*	11	11
		56.5%	30.4%	91.3%	30.4%	56.5%			47.8%	47.8%
<b>Fillmore</b>	*	20	14	35	6	27	5	*	24	13
		52.6%	36.8%	92.1%	15.8%	71.1%	13.2%		63.2%	34.2%
<b>Freeborn</b>	13	41	37	85	31	49	11	6	58	27
	14.3%	45.1%	40.7%	93.4%	34.1%	53.8%	12.1%	6.6%	63.7%	29.7%
<b>Goodhue</b>	*	43	40	79	22	56	8	*	58	27
		50.0%	46.5%	91.9%	25.6%	65.1%	9.3%		67.4%	31.4%
<b>Grant</b>	*	0	6	8	*	*	*	0	5	*
		0.0%	66.7%	88.9%				0.0%	55.6%	
<b>Hennepin</b>	655	2705	2521	5,440	2,677	2,747	457	250	4,327	1,304
	11.1%	46.0%	42.9%	92.5%	45.5%	46.7%	7.8%	4.3%	73.6%	22.2%
<b>Houston</b>	*	34	24	60	12	44	6	*	40	21
		54.8%	38.7%	96.8%	19.4%	71.0%	9.7%		64.5%	33.9%
<b>Hubbard</b>	6	22	17	42	18	24	*	*	27	17
	13.3%	48.9%	37.8%	93.3%	40.0%	53.3%			60.0%	37.8%
<b>Isanti</b>	9	41	22	67	25	39	8	*	49	22
	12.5%	56.9%	30.6%	93.1%	34.7%	54.2%	11.1%		68.1%	30.6%

Table 7 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
Itasca	12	60	46	103	27	77	14	*	76	39
	10.2%	50.8%	39.0%	87.3%	22.9%	65.3%	11.9%		64.4%	33.1%
Jackson	*	7	*	11	*	6	*	*	5	5
		58.3%		91.7%		50.0%			41.7%	41.7%
Kanabec	6	21	17	40	12	30	*	0	29	15
	13.6%	47.7%	38.6%	90.9%	27.3%	68.2%		0.0%	65.9%	34.1%
Kandiyohi	34	75	50	147	93	54	12	6	91	62
	21.4%	47.2%	31.4%	92.5%	58.5%	34.0%	7.5%	3.8%	57.2%	39.0%
Kittson	0	*	*	*	*	*	0	*	*	*
	0.0%						0.0%			
Koochiching	5	25	20	48	18	30	*	*	35	13
	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	96.0%	36.0%	60.0%			70.0%	26.0%
Lac Qui Parle	0	*	*	7	*	*	*	0	5	*
	0.0%			100.0%				0.0%	71.4%	
Lake	*	7	*	10	*	7	*	*	5	5
		63.6%		90.9%		63.6%			45.5%	45.5%
Lake of Woods	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
	0.0%									
Le Sueur	*	24	19	46	12	29	6	0	31	16
		51.1%	40.4%	97.9%	25.5%	61.7%	12.8%	0.0%	66.0%	34.0%
Lincoln	0	*	*	5	*	5	*	*	*	*
	0.0%			71.4%		71.4%				
Lyon	6	34	21	57	31	22	8	*	37	20
	9.8%	55.7%	34.4%	93.4%	50.8%	36.1%	13.1%		60.7%	32.8%
McLeod	10	28	13	47	17	31	*	*	33	15
	19.6%	54.9%	25.5%	92.2%	33.3%	60.8%			64.7%	29.4%
Mahnomon	12	37	38	71	38	44	*	*	66	18
	13.8%	42.5%	43.7%	81.6%	43.7%	50.6%			75.9%	20.7%
Marshall	0	*	*	8	*	5	0	0	5	*
	0.0%			100.0%		62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	

Table 7 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Martin</b>	8	24	18	43	16	28	6	5	31	14
	16.0%	48.0%	36.0%	86.0%	32.0%	56.0%	12.0%	10.0%	62.0%	28.0%
<b>Meeker</b>	6	21	14	39	12	24	5	*	30	9
	14.6%	51.2%	34.1%	95.1%	29.3%	58.5%	12.2%		73.2%	22.0%
<b>Mille Lacs</b>	*	23	33	55	19	35	6	*	33	25
		38.3%	55.0%	91.7%	31.7%	58.3%	10.0%		55.0%	41.7%
<b>Morrison</b>	8	24	11	40	14	27	*	*	31	11
	18.6%	55.8%	25.6%	93.0%	32.6%	62.8%			72.1%	25.6%
<b>Mower</b>	16	63	39	112	43	64	11	7	74	37
	13.6%	53.4%	33.1%	94.9%	36.4%	54.2%	9.3%	5.9%	62.7%	31.4%
<b>Murray</b>	0	*	*	*	0	*	*	0	*	*
	0.0%				0.0%			0.0%		
<b>Nicollet</b>	13	64	36	104	38	56	19	7	78	28
	11.5%	56.6%	31.9%	92.0%	33.6%	49.6%	16.8%	6.2%	69.0%	24.8%
<b>Nobles</b>	9	32	24	62	36	24	5	7	31	27
	13.8%	49.2%	36.9%	95.4%	55.4%	36.9%	7.7%	10.8%	47.7%	41.5%
<b>Norman</b>	0	9	9	14	*	12	*	*	12	*
	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	77.8%		66.7%			66.7%	
<b>Olmsted</b>	39	148	142	308	140	161	28	19	194	116
	11.9%	45.0%	43.2%	93.6%	42.6%	48.9%	8.5%	5.8%	59.0%	35.3%
<b>Otter Tail</b>	14	55	42	101	46	53	12	8	64	39
	12.6%	49.5%	37.8%	91.0%	41.4%	47.7%	10.8%	7.2%	57.7%	35.1%
<b>Pennington</b>	*	19	11	31	9	22	*	*	22	10
		57.6%	33.3%	93.9%	27.3%	66.7%			66.7%	30.3%
<b>Pine</b>	7	41	31	71	33	40	6	*	48	29
	8.9%	51.9%	39.2%	89.9%	41.8%	50.6%	7.6%		60.8%	36.7%
<b>Pipestone</b>	*	7	*	12	*	7	*	0	5	7
		58.3%		100.0%		58.3%		0.0%	41.7%	58.3%
<b>Polk</b>	11	50	41	89	32	62	8	9	53	40
	10.8%	49.0%	40.2%	87.3%	31.4%	60.8%	7.8%	8.8%	52.0%	39.2%

Table 7 – Page 5

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
Pope	*	10	10	21	5	14	*	0	10	11
		47.6%	47.6%	100.0%	23.8%	66.7%		0.0%	47.6%	52.4%
Ramsey	416	2,077	2,202	4,285	2,159	2,134	402	274	3,446	975
	8.9%	44.2%	46.9%	91.3%	46.0%	45.5%	8.6%	5.8%	73.4%	20.8%
Red Lake	*	*	8	11	*	7	*	0	8	*
			66.7%	91.7%		58.3%		0.0%	66.7%	
Redwood	*	11	9	19	14	6	*	*	11	7
		50.0%	40.9%	86.4%	63.6%	27.3%			50.0%	31.8%
Renville	*	19	10	29	14	16	*	0	19	12
		61.3%	32.3%	93.5%	45.2%	51.6%		0.0%	61.3%	38.7%
Rice	12	59	60	122	59	64	8	8	79	44
	9.2%	45.0%	45.8%	93.1%	45.0%	48.9%	6.1%	6.1%	60.3%	33.6%
Rock	*	5	7	12	5	6	*	*	6	6
		38.5%	53.8%	92.3%	38.5%	46.2%			46.2%	46.2%
Roseau	*	6	*	10	5	5	*	0	7	*
		54.5%		90.9%	45.5%	45.5%		0.0%	63.6%	
St. Louis	87	461	327	799	264	520	91	34	597	244
	9.9%	52.7%	37.4%	91.3%	30.2%	59.4%	10.4%	3.9%	68.2%	27.9%
Scott	11	56	50	108	42	63	12	5	83	29
	9.4%	47.9%	42.7%	92.3%	35.9%	53.8%	10.3%	4.3%	70.9%	24.8%
Sherburne	9	42	35	74	24	49	13	*	54	30
	10.5%	48.8%	40.7%	86.0%	27.9%	57.0%	15.1%		62.8%	34.9%
Sibley	8	14	8	27	16	12	*	*	19	8
	26.7%	46.7%	26.7%	90.0%	53.3%	40.0%			63.3%	26.7%
Stearns	35	186	155	348	157	191	28	13	212	151
	9.3%	49.5%	41.2%	92.6%	41.8%	50.8%	7.4%	3.5%	56.4%	40.2%
Steele	6	36	30	68	36	33	*	*	41	29
	8.3%	50.0%	41.7%	94.4%	50.0%	45.8%			56.9%	40.3%
Stevens	*	*	0	*	*	*	*	0	*	*
			0.0%					0.0%		

Table 7 – Page 6

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Swift</b>	0	5	6	9	*	6	*	0	5	6
	0.0%	45.5%	54.5%	81.8%		54.5%		0.0%	45.5%	54.5%
<b>Todd</b>	*	14	13	27	8	21	*	*	12	14
		46.7%	43.3%	90.0%	26.7%	70.0%			40.0%	46.7%
<b>Traverse</b>	*	*	0	*	*	*	0	0	*	*
			0.0%				0.0%	0.0%		
<b>Wabasha</b>	*	10	8	18	7	12	*	*	15	5
		47.6%	38.1%	85.7%	33.3%	57.1%			71.4%	23.8%
<b>Wadena</b>	9	24	28	56	14	42	5	5	33	23
	14.8%	39.3%	45.9%	91.8%	23.0%	68.9%	8.2%	8.2%	54.1%	37.7%
<b>Waseca</b>	11	33	14	56	24	26	8	*	38	18
	19.0%	56.9%	24.1%	96.6%	41.4%	44.8%	13.8%		65.5%	31.0%
<b>Washington</b>	29	176	141	318	95	203	48	10	240	96
	8.4%	50.9%	40.8%	91.9%	27.5%	58.7%	13.9%	2.9%	69.4%	27.7%
<b>Watonwan</b>	*	9	10	20	9	11	*	*	11	9
		42.9%	47.6%	95.2%	42.9%	52.4%			52.4%	42.9%
<b>Wilkin</b>	*	5	*	10	*	8	0	0	6	*
		50.0%		100.0%		80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	
<b>Winona</b>	16	45	36	90	44	47	6	8	58	31
	16.5%	46.4%	37.1%	92.8%	45.4%	48.5%	6.2%	8.2%	59.8%	32.0%
<b>Wright</b>	22	58	37	113	46	59	12	*	86	28
	18.8%	49.6%	31.6%	96.6%	39.3%	50.4%	10.3%		73.5%	23.9%
<b>Yellow Medicine</b>	0	5	*	9	*	6	*	*	*	*
	0.0%	55.6%		100.0%		66.7%				



Table 7 – Page 7

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Northwest</b>	17	92	80	167	57	117	15	13	108	68
	9.0%	48.7%	42.3%	88.4%	30.2%	61.9%	7.9%	6.9%	57.1%	36.0%
<b>West Central</b>	241	889	758	1,673	758	994	136	78	1,324	486
	12.8%	47.1%	40.1%	88.6%	40.1%	52.6%	7.2%	4.1%	70.1%	25.7%
<b>Northeast</b>	126	616	452	1,093	361	717	116	43	795	356
	10.6%	51.6%	37.9%	91.5%	30.2%	60.1%	9.7%	3.6%	66.6%	29.8%
<b>Central</b>	160	612	440	1,123	487	616	109	36	757	419
	13.2%	50.5%	36.3%	92.7%	40.2%	50.8%	9.0%	3.0%	62.5%	34.6%
<b>Southwest</b>	31	133	111	252	120	122	33	25	143	107
	11.3%	48.4%	40.4%	91.6%	43.6%	44.4%	12.0%	9.1%	52.0%	38.9%
<b>South Central</b>	67	270	192	493	190	275	64	32	336	161
	12.7%	51.0%	36.3%	93.2%	35.9%	52.0%	12.1%	6.0%	63.5%	30.4%
<b>Southeast</b>	119	512	446	1,004	413	575	89	55	662	360
	11.0%	47.5%	41.4%	93.2%	38.3%	53.4%	8.3%	5.1%	61.5%	33.4%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	227	1,085	943	2,070	810	1,168	277	82	1,561	612
	10.1%	48.1%	41.8%	91.8%	35.9%	51.8%	12.3%	3.6%	69.2%	27.1%
<b>Core Metro</b>	1,071	4,782	4,723	9,725	4,836	4,881	859	524	7,773	2,279
	10.1%	45.2%	44.7%	92.0%	45.7%	46.2%	8.1%	5.0%	73.5%	21.5%
<b>Minnesota</b>	2,059	8,991	8,145	17,600	8,032	9,465	1,698	888	13,459	4,848
	10.7%	46.8%	42.4%	91.7%	41.8%	49.3%	8.8%	4.6%	70.1%	25.3%

\* Cells with fewer than 5 cases were removed to protect individual identities.

**Table 8. Demographics of Eligible Adults on December 2006 Paid DWP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Age, Gender, Education, and Marital Status, by Large County and Region**

<b>County/Region/ State</b>	<b>Teens</b>	<b>20's</b>	<b>30 or Older</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>&lt; HS</b>	<b>HS or GED</b>	<b>&gt; HS</b>	<b>Married</b>	<b>Never Married</b>	<b>Others</b>
<b>Anoka</b>	6	106	106	190	47	135	36	5	128	85
	2.8%	48.6%	48.6%	87.2%	21.6%	61.9%	16.5%	2.3%	58.7%	39.0%
<b>Beltrami</b>	*	20	30	39	12	35	5	*	32	18
		38.5%	57.7%	75.0%	23.1%	67.3%	9.6%		61.5%	34.6%
<b>Dakota</b>	8	89	98	180	41	112	42	10	114	71
	4.1%	45.6%	50.3%	92.3%	21.0%	57.4%	21.5%	5.1%	58.5%	36.4%
<b>Hennepin</b>	31	373	364	697	277	419	72	17	535	216
	4.0%	48.6%	47.4%	90.8%	36.1%	54.6%	9.4%	2.2%	69.7%	28.1%
<b>Olmsted</b>	*	37	46	76	28	55	*	*	46	37
		42.5%	52.9%	87.4%	32.2%	63.2%			52.9%	42.5%
<b>Ramsey</b>	15	184	182	337	110	216	55	8	281	92
	3.9%	48.3%	47.8%	88.5%	28.9%	56.7%	14.4%	2.1%	73.8%	24.1%
<b>St. Louis</b>	7	57	44	91	15	77	16	*	72	33
	6.5%	52.8%	40.7%	84.3%	13.9%	71.3%	14.8%		66.7%	30.6%
<b>Washington</b>	*	18	32	43	10	29	12	0	33	18
		35.3%	62.7%	84.3%	19.6%	56.9%	23.5%	0.0%	64.7%	35.3%
<b>All Other Counties</b>	44	541	480	955	264	682	119	44	555	466
	4.1%	50.8%	45.1%	89.7%	24.8%	64.0%	11.2%	4.1%	52.1%	43.8%
<b>Minnesota</b>	118	1,425	1,382	2,608	804	1,760	361	93	1,796	1,036
	4.0%	48.7%	47.2%	89.2%	27.5%	60.2%	12.3%	3.2%	61.4%	35.4%

Table 8 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Teens	20's	30 or Older	Female	< HS	HS or GED	> HS	Married	Never Married	Others
<b>Northwest</b>	*	26	16	42	11	25	8	0	24	20
		59.1%	36.4%	95.5%	25.0%	56.8%	18.2%	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%
<b>West Central</b>	11	141	140	247	71	196	25	6	152	134
	3.8%	48.3%	47.9%	84.6%	24.3%	67.1%	8.6%	2.1%	52.1%	45.9%
<b>Northeast</b>	8	91	70	142	28	119	22	6	104	59
	4.7%	53.8%	41.4%	84.0%	16.6%	70.4%	13.0%	3.6%	61.5%	34.9%
<b>Central</b>	10	124	146	251	64	181	35	11	142	127
	3.6%	44.3%	52.1%	89.6%	22.9%	64.6%	12.5%	3.9%	50.7%	45.4%
<b>Southwest</b>	5	44	25	70	22	39	13	5	39	30
	6.8%	59.5%	33.8%	94.6%	29.7%	52.7%	17.6%	6.8%	52.7%	40.5%
<b>South Central</b>	6	73	37	104	30	70	16	5	67	44
	5.2%	62.9%	31.9%	89.7%	25.9%	60.3%	13.8%	4.3%	57.8%	37.9%
<b>Southeast</b>	12	116	134	236	77	166	19	13	137	112
	4.6%	44.3%	51.1%	90.1%	29.4%	63.4%	7.3%	5.0%	52.3%	42.7%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	18	253	268	482	114	329	96	22	315	202
	3.3%	46.9%	49.7%	89.4%	21.2%	61.0%	17.8%	4.1%	58.4%	37.5%
<b>Core Metro</b>	46	557	546	1,034	387	635	127	25	816	308
	4.0%	48.5%	47.5%	90.0%	33.7%	55.3%	11.1%	2.2%	71.0%	26.8%
<b>Minnesota</b>	118	1,425	1,382	2,608	804	1,760	361	93	1,796	1,036
	4.0%	48.7%	47.2%	89.2%	27.5%	60.2%	12.3%	3.2%	61.4%	35.4%

\* For cells with fewer than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect individual identities.

**Table 9. Demographics of Eligible Adults in December 2006 MFIP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Race/Ethnicity and Citizenship, by Large County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Race/Ethnicity						Non-US Citizens
	Asian/ Pacific	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Multiple	
<b>Anoka</b>	26	294	17	22	552	*	92
	2.8%	32.1%	1.9%	2.4%	60.3%		10.1%
<b>Beltrami</b>	0	5	5	572	107	*	0
	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	82.9%	15.5%		0.0%
<b>Dakota</b>	16	255	76	22	367	*	71
	2.2%	34.5%	10.3%	3.0%	49.7%		9.6%
<b>Hennepin</b>	225	4,107	143	357	1,004	45	1,090
	3.8%	69.8%	2.4%	6.1%	17.1%	0.8%	18.5%
<b>Olmsted</b>	13	139	21	7	148	*	79
	4.0%	42.2%	6.4%	2.1%	45.0%		24.0%
<b>Ramsey</b>	571	2,495	304	166	1,158	*	730
	12.2%	53.1%	6.5%	3.5%	24.7%		15.5%
<b>St. Louis</b>	*	93	13	136	629	*	6
		10.6%	1.5%	15.5%	71.9%		0.7%
<b>Washington</b>	19	77	18	*	226	*	21
	5.5%	22.3%	5.2%		65.3%		6.1%
<b>All Other Counties</b>	66	510	423	511	3,191	24	312
	1.4%	10.8%	9.0%	10.8%	67.5%	0.5%	6.6%
<b>Northwest</b>	0	*	37	18	129	*	*
	0.0%		19.6%	9.5%	68.3%		
<b>West Central</b>	10	44	62	934	834	*	37
	0.5%	2.3%	3.3%	49.5%	44.2%		2.0%
<b>Northeast</b>	*	95	16	196	882	*	8
		8.0%	1.3%	16.4%	73.9%		0.7%
<b>Central</b>	16	201	122	19	848	6	125
	1.3%	16.6%	10.1%	1.6%	70.0%	0.5%	10.3%
<b>Southwest</b>	15	26	43	19	169	*	31
	5.5%	9.5%	15.6%	6.9%	61.5%		11.3%
<b>South Central</b>	6	78	69	5	370	*	47
	1.1%	14.7%	13.0%	0.9%	69.9%		8.9%
<b>Southeast</b>	22	257	103	20	668	7	133
	2.0%	23.9%	9.6%	1.9%	62.0%	0.6%	12.3%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	71	669	121	62	1,320	12	199
	3.1%	29.7%	5.4%	2.7%	58.5%	0.5%	8.8%
<b>Core Metro</b>	796	6,602	447	523	2,162	46	1,820
	7.5%	62.4%	4.2%	4.9%	20.4%	0.4%	17.2%
<b>Minnesota</b>	939	7,975	1,020	1,796	7,382	83	2,401
	4.9%	41.5%	5.3%	9.4%	38.5%	0.4%	12.5%

\* For cells with fewer than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect individual identities.

**Table 10. Demographics of Eligible Adults in December 2006 DWP Cases with One Eligible Adult: Race/Ethnicity and Citizenship, by Large County and Region**

County/Region/ State	American						Non-US Citizens
	Asian/ Pacific	Black	Hispanic	Indian	White	Multiple	
<b>Hennepin</b>	24	494	22	29	171	11	160
	3.1%	64.3%	2.9%	3.8%	22.3%	1.4%	20.8%
<b>Ramsey</b>	28	185	28	12	122	*	58
	7.3%	48.6%	7.3%	3.1%	32.0%		15.2%
<b>All Other Counties</b>	26	206	130	118	1,269	17	113
	1.5%	11.6%	7.3%	6.6%	71.5%	1.0%	6.4%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	15	117	24	16	445	10	40
	2.4%	18.6%	3.8%	2.5%	70.6%	1.6%	6.3%
<b>Core Metro</b>	52	679	50	41	293	13	218
	4.5%	59.1%	4.4%	3.6%	25.5%	1.1%	19.0%
<b>All Other Regions</b>	11	89	106	102	824	7	73
	1.0%	7.8%	9.2%	8.9%	71.9%	0.6%	6.4%
<b>Minnesota</b>	78	885	180	159	1,562	30	331
	2.7%	30.3%	6.2%	5.4%	53.4%	1.0%	11.3%

**Table 11. Family Types in December One-eligible-adult MFIP and DWP Cases, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	MFIP				DWP			
	Family Type			Two Care- givers	Family Type			Two Care- givers
	Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care		Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care	
Aitkin	35	6	0	3	11	2	0	1
	85.4%	14.6%	0.0%	7.3%	84.6%	15.4%	0.0%	7.7%
Anoka	906	18	8	69	195	22	1	5
	97.2%	1.9%	0.9%	7.4%	89.4%	10.1%	0.5%	2.3%
Becker	120	12	1	8	17	3	0	2
	90.2%	9.0%	0.8%	6.0%	85.0%	15.0%	0.0%	10.0%
Beltrami	653	19	23	38	41	10	1	2
	94.0%	2.7%	3.3%	5.5%	78.8%	19.2%	1.9%	3.8%
Benton	104	1	0	3	13	2	0	1
	99.0%	1.0%	0.0%	2.9%	86.7%	13.3%	0.0%	6.7%
Big Stone	6	0	0	1	2	1	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Blue Earth	138	3	1	12	26	4	1	2
	97.2%	2.1%	0.7%	8.5%	83.9%	12.9%	3.2%	6.5%
Brown	48	0	0	6	9	1	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Carlton	93	1	0	7	11	1	0	1
	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%	7.4%	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%
Carver	58	0	0	6	16	2	0	3
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.3%	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%	16.7%
Cass	189	7	3	14	31	3	1	2
	95.0%	3.5%	1.5%	7.0%	88.6%	8.6%	2.9%	5.7%
Chippewa	25	0	0	6	2	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Chisago	80	3	1	6	25	4	0	1
	95.2%	3.6%	1.2%	7.1%	86.2%	13.8%	0.0%	3.4%
Clay	175	4	2	23	28	5	0	2
	96.7%	2.2%	1.1%	12.7%	84.8%	15.2%	0.0%	6.1%
Clearwater	36	2	0	5	5	3	0	0
	94.7%	5.3%	0.0%	13.2%	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Cook	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cottonwood	16	1	0	1	7	1	0	1
	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%
Crow Wing	166	5	1	10	41	4	0	4
	96.5%	2.9%	0.6%	5.8%	91.1%	8.9%	0.0%	8.9%
Dakota	713	15	3	30	176	19	0	13
	97.5%	2.1%	0.4%	4.1%	90.3%	9.7%	0.0%	6.7%
Dodge	30	1	0	1	9	0	0	1
	96.8%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Douglas	47	3	0	1	9	2	0	0
	94.0%	6.0%	0.0%	2.0%	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Faribault	21	0	0	3	1	4	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	20.0%
Fillmore	35	3	0	1	9	1	0	0
	92.1%	7.9%	0.0%	2.6%	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Freeborn	85	3	1	7	13	2	0	0
	95.5%	3.4%	1.1%	7.9%	86.7%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 11 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	MFIP				DWP			
	Family Type			Two Care- givers	Family Type			Two Care- givers
	Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care		Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care	
Goodhue	82	1	0	2	17	1	0	1
	98.8%	1.2%	0.0%	2.4%	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
Grant	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hennepin	5,645	141	77	369	659	98	11	26
	96.3%	2.4%	1.3%	6.3%	85.8%	12.8%	1.4%	3.4%
Houston	61	1	0	0	16	1	0	2
	98.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	11.8%
Hubbard	42	2	0	2	8	0	0	0
	95.5%	4.5%	0.0%	4.5%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Isanti	63	2	0	2	22	1	0	1
	96.9%	3.1%	0.0%	3.1%	95.7%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
Itasca	117	4	0	7	20	2	0	3
	96.7%	3.3%	0.0%	5.8%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	13.6%
Jackson	11	0	0	3	4	1	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kanabec	46	3	0	2	12	3	0	1
	93.9%	6.1%	0.0%	4.1%	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	6.7%
Kandiyohi	144	10	2	14	25	1	0	2
	92.3%	6.4%	1.3%	9.0%	96.2%	3.8%	0.0%	7.7%
Kittson	5	1	0	2	0	1	0	0
	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Koochiching	48	0	2	4	8	1	0	0
	96.0%	0.0%	4.0%	8.0%	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Lac Qui Parle	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lake	11	1	0	1	3	0	0	1
	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Lake of Woods	5	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Le Sueur	45	0	0	0	6	2	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Lincoln	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lyon	54	2	1	5	13	5	0	1
	94.7%	3.5%	1.8%	8.8%	72.2%	27.8%	0.0%	5.6%
McLeod	47	1	0	5	14	0	0	1
	97.9%	2.1%	0.0%	10.4%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Mahnomon	66	6	8	5	5	2	0	0
	82.5%	7.5%	10.0%	6.3%	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Marshall	7	0	0	1	7	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Martin	50	3	0	6	12	0	0	0
	94.3%	5.7%	0.0%	11.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Meeker	43	1	0	4	10	1	0	0
	97.7%	2.3%	0.0%	9.1%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Mille Lacs	53	2	0	4	15	0	0	0
	96.4%	3.6%	0.0%	7.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Morrison	45	1	0	4	10	1	0	2
	97.8%	2.2%	0.0%	8.7%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	18.2%

Table 11 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	MFIP				DWP			
	Family Type			Two Care- givers	Family Type			Two Care- givers
	Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care		Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care	
Mower	116	1	0	9	18	1	0	1
	99.1%	0.9%	0.0%	7.7%	94.7%	5.3%	0.0%	5.3%
Murray	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Nicollet	108	2	1	9	21	4	1	1
	97.3%	1.8%	0.9%	8.1%	80.8%	15.4%	3.8%	3.8%
Nobles	59	3	0	9	12	3	0	4
	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	14.5%	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	26.7%
Norman	18	0	0	2	4	1	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Olmsted	306	20	4	21	76	9	2	10
	92.7%	6.1%	1.2%	6.4%	87.4%	10.3%	2.3%	11.5%
Otter Tail	105	1	2	11	23	3	1	0
	97.2%	0.9%	1.9%	10.2%	85.2%	11.1%	3.7%	0.0%
Pennington	32	2	0	2	5	0	0	0
	94.1%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pine	73	1	1	6	20	2	0	0
	97.3%	1.3%	1.3%	8.0%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Pipestone	10	2	1	0	3	1	0	0
	76.9%	15.4%	7.7%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Polk	99	1	0	13	12	6	0	0
	99.0%	1.0%	0.0%	13.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Pope	21	0	0	1	3	1	1	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Ramsey	4,624	74	50	383	321	55	5	16
	97.4%	1.6%	1.1%	8.1%	84.3%	14.4%	1.3%	4.2%
Red Lake	9	1	0	2	3	0	0	0
	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Redwood	23	0	0	4	12	0	0	2
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.4%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Renville	29	2	0	1	6	1	0	0
	93.5%	6.5%	0.0%	3.2%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Rice	134	3	2	12	31	5	0	5
	96.4%	2.2%	1.4%	8.6%	86.1%	13.9%	0.0%	13.9%
Rock	14	0	0	1	4	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Roseau	9	1	0	0	5	0	0	0
	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
St. Louis	822	34	7	58	92	15	1	6
	95.2%	3.9%	0.8%	6.7%	85.2%	13.9%	0.9%	5.6%
Scott	116	1	2	9	27	1	0	2
	97.5%	0.8%	1.7%	7.6%	96.4%	3.6%	0.0%	7.1%
Sherburne	85	2	0	4	24	4	1	2
	97.7%	2.3%	0.0%	4.6%	82.8%	13.8%	3.4%	6.9%
Sibley	30	0	0	4	6	0	0	2
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Stearns	352	8	2	23	54	10	0	5
	97.2%	2.2%	0.6%	6.4%	84.4%	15.6%	0.0%	7.8%
Steele	65	4	1	5	22	1	0	0
	92.9%	5.7%	1.4%	7.1%	95.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%



Table 11 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	MFIP				DWP			
	Family Type			Two Care- givers	Family Type			Two Care- givers
	Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care		Own Children	Pregnant Only	Relative Care	
<b>Stevens</b>	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
<b>Swift</b>	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%				
<b>Todd</b>	29	1	0	6	10	0	1	0
	96.7%	3.3%	0.0%	20.0%	90.9%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%
<b>Traverse</b>	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
<b>Wabasha</b>	18	0	0	1	10	0	0	1
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
<b>Wadena</b>	58	4	2	5	9	2	0	0
	90.6%	6.3%	3.1%	7.8%	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Waseca</b>	58	1	0	3	10	1	0	0
	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%	5.1%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Washington</b>	323	4	2	15	45	6	0	1
	98.2%	1.2%	0.6%	4.6%	88.2%	11.8%	0.0%	2.0%
<b>Watonwan</b>	22	1	0	1	6	1	0	1
	95.7%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%
<b>Wilkin</b>	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Winona</b>	91	4	0	12	17	1	0	0
	95.8%	4.2%	0.0%	12.6%	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Wright</b>	112	4	0	3	39	0	0	2
	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%	2.6%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
<b>Yellow Medicine</b>	11	1	0	2	1	0	0	0
	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Northwest</b>	179	6	0	22	36	8	0	0
	96.8%	3.2%	0.0%	11.9%	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>West Central</b>	1,784	67	42	135	247	40	5	14
	94.2%	3.5%	2.2%	7.1%	84.6%	13.7%	1.7%	4.8%
<b>Northeast</b>	1,129	47	9	80	147	21	1	12
	95.3%	4.0%	0.8%	6.8%	87.0%	12.4%	0.6%	7.1%
<b>Central</b>	1,151	37	5	71	254	25	1	15
	96.5%	3.1%	0.4%	6.0%	90.7%	8.9%	0.4%	5.4%
<b>Southwest</b>	260	9	2	34	62	12	0	9
	95.9%	3.3%	0.7%	12.5%	83.8%	16.2%	0.0%	12.2%
<b>South Central</b>	520	10	2	44	97	17	2	8
	97.7%	1.9%	0.4%	8.3%	83.6%	14.7%	1.7%	6.9%
<b>Southeast</b>	1,023	41	8	71	238	22	2	21
	95.4%	3.8%	0.7%	6.6%	90.8%	8.4%	0.8%	8.0%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	2,196	41	16	135	484	54	1	25
	97.5%	1.8%	0.7%	6.0%	89.8%	10.0%	0.2%	4.6%
<b>Core Metro</b>	10,269	688	338	2096	980	153	16	42
	34.5%	2.3%	1.1%	7.0%	85.3%	13.3%	1.4%	3.7%
<b>Minnesota</b>	18,511	473	211	1,344	2,545	352	28	146
	96.4%	2.5%	1.1%	7.0%	87.0%	12.0%	1.0%	5.0%

**Table 12. All Children in December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
<b>Aitkin</b>	6	16	8	7	4	10	19	4	2
	14.6%	39.0%	19.5%	17.1%	9.8%	28.6%	54.3%	11.4%	5.7%
<b>Anoka</b>	21	373	269	152	117	190	402	196	123
	2.3%	40.0%	28.9%	16.3%	12.6%	20.9%	44.1%	21.5%	13.5%
<b>Becker</b>	12	63	32	15	11	34	57	18	12
	9.0%	47.4%	24.1%	11.3%	8.3%	28.1%	47.1%	14.9%	9.9%
<b>Beltrami</b>	21	266	207	135	66	147	316	146	64
	3.0%	38.3%	29.8%	19.4%	9.5%	21.8%	47.0%	21.7%	9.5%
<b>Benton</b>	2	47	25	23	8	32	56	12	3
	1.9%	44.8%	23.8%	21.9%	7.6%	31.1%	54.4%	11.7%	2.9%
<b>Big Stone</b>	0	4	0	1	1	0	4	1	1
	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%
<b>Blue Earth</b>	3	57	43	21	18	34	60	31	14
	2.1%	40.1%	30.3%	14.8%	12.7%	24.5%	43.2%	22.3%	10.1%
<b>Brown</b>	0	26	12	7	3	18	17	7	6
	0.0%	54.2%	25.0%	14.6%	6.3%	37.5%	35.4%	14.6%	12.5%
<b>Carlton</b>	1	41	34	15	3	8	41	19	10
	1.1%	43.6%	36.2%	16.0%	3.2%	8.6%	44.1%	20.4%	10.8%
<b>Carver</b>	0	23	18	7	10	12	27	11	8
	0.0%	39.7%	31.0%	12.1%	17.2%	20.7%	46.6%	19.0%	13.8%
<b>Cass</b>	7	70	70	25	27	39	93	44	16
	3.5%	35.2%	35.2%	12.6%	13.6%	20.3%	48.4%	22.9%	8.3%
<b>Chippewa</b>	0	13	9	0	3	3	12	5	5
	0.0%	52.0%	36.0%	0.0%	12.0%	12.0%	48.0%	20.0%	20.0%
<b>Chisago</b>	3	41	30	6	4	14	42	17	8
	3.6%	48.8%	35.7%	7.1%	4.8%	17.3%	51.9%	21.0%	9.9%
<b>Clay</b>	4	77	60	21	19	32	92	31	22
	2.2%	42.5%	33.1%	11.6%	10.5%	18.1%	52.0%	17.5%	12.4%
<b>Clearwater</b>	2	15	12	4	5	8	16	7	5
	5.3%	39.5%	31.6%	10.5%	13.2%	22.2%	44.4%	19.4%	13.9%
<b>Cook</b>	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	1
	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%
<b>Cottonwood</b>	1	7	7	2	0	4	7	3	2
	5.9%	41.2%	41.2%	11.8%	0.0%	25.0%	43.8%	18.8%	12.5%
<b>Crow Wing</b>	5	88	51	22	6	40	73	34	20
	2.9%	51.2%	29.7%	12.8%	3.5%	24.0%	43.7%	20.4%	12.0%
<b>Dakota</b>	15	293	239	102	82	168	354	129	65
	2.1%	40.1%	32.7%	14.0%	11.2%	23.5%	49.4%	18.0%	9.1%
<b>Dodge</b>	1	14	11	2	3	6	13	7	4
	3.2%	45.2%	35.5%	6.5%	9.7%	20.0%	43.3%	23.3%	13.3%
<b>Douglas</b>	3	22	15	8	2	10	23	7	7
	6.0%	44.0%	30.0%	16.0%	4.0%	21.3%	48.9%	14.9%	14.9%
<b>Faribault</b>	0	11	1	5	4	3	11	3	4
	0.0%	52.4%	4.8%	23.8%	19.0%	14.3%	52.4%	14.3%	19.0%
<b>Fillmore</b>	3	18	8	5	4	11	14	6	4
	7.9%	47.4%	21.1%	13.2%	10.5%	31.4%	40.0%	17.1%	11.4%
<b>Freeborn</b>	3	41	32	7	6	21	38	16	11
	3.4%	46.1%	36.0%	7.9%	6.7%	24.4%	44.2%	18.6%	12.8%

Table 12 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
Goodhue	1	33	19	19	11	21	37	16	8
	1.2%	39.8%	22.9%	22.9%	13.3%	25.6%	45.1%	19.5%	9.8%
Grant	0	4	3	1	1	2	2	1	4
	0.0%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	44.4%
Hennepin	141	2,373	1,587	914	848	1,231	2,699	1,165	625
	2.4%	40.5%	27.1%	15.6%	14.5%	21.5%	47.2%	20.4%	10.9%
Houston	1	22	31	5	3	14	32	9	6
	1.6%	35.5%	50.0%	8.1%	4.8%	23.0%	52.5%	14.8%	9.8%
Hubbard	2	18	11	7	6	9	23	6	4
	4.5%	40.9%	25.0%	15.9%	13.6%	21.4%	54.8%	14.3%	9.5%
Isanti	2	27	26	9	1	23	23	12	5
	3.1%	41.5%	40.0%	13.8%	1.5%	36.5%	36.5%	19.0%	7.9%
Itasca	4	44	40	21	12	25	57	26	9
	3.3%	36.4%	33.1%	17.4%	9.9%	21.4%	48.7%	22.2%	7.7%
Jackson	1	4	3	1	2	3	4	1	2
	9.1%	36.4%	27.3%	9.1%	18.2%	30.0%	40.0%	10.0%	20.0%
Kanabec	3	28	11	4	3	14	13	14	5
	6.1%	57.1%	22.4%	8.2%	6.1%	30.4%	28.3%	30.4%	10.9%
Kandiyohi	11	63	36	17	29	45	63	23	13
	7.1%	40.4%	23.1%	10.9%	18.6%	31.3%	43.8%	16.0%	9.0%
Kittson	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	2	1
	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%
Koochiching	0	21	15	11	3	13	24	7	6
	0.0%	42.0%	30.0%	22.0%	6.0%	26.0%	48.0%	14.0%	12.0%
Lac Qui Parle	0	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	0
	0.0%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Lake	1	6	4	0	1	5	2	4	0
	8.3%	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%	45.5%	18.2%	36.4%	0.0%
Lake of Woods	0	1	3	0	1	2	2	1	0
	0.0%	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Le Sueur	0	21	13	7	4	12	23	7	3
	0.0%	46.7%	28.9%	15.6%	8.9%	26.7%	51.1%	15.6%	6.7%
Lincoln	0	4	2	1	0	3	0	3	1
	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	42.9%	14.3%
Lyon	3	29	9	7	9	17	24	8	5
	5.3%	50.9%	15.8%	12.3%	15.8%	31.5%	44.4%	14.8%	9.3%
McLeod	1	17	18	4	8	18	20	6	3
	2.1%	35.4%	37.5%	8.3%	16.7%	38.3%	42.6%	12.8%	6.4%
Mahnomn	6	26	19	13	16	15	36	13	8
	7.5%	32.5%	23.8%	16.3%	20.0%	20.8%	50.0%	18.1%	11.1%
Marshall	0	2	2	3	0	1	3	2	1
	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	0.0%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%
Martin	3	26	14	6	4	18	23	5	4
	5.7%	49.1%	26.4%	11.3%	7.5%	36.0%	46.0%	10.0%	8.0%
Meeker	1	21	14	4	4	13	20	10	0
	2.3%	47.7%	31.8%	9.1%	9.1%	30.2%	46.5%	23.3%	0.0%
Mille Lacs	2	23	13	10	7	10	27	11	5
	3.6%	41.8%	23.6%	18.2%	12.7%	18.9%	50.9%	20.8%	9.4%
Morrison	1	24	12	7	2	20	19	5	1
	2.2%	52.2%	26.1%	15.2%	4.3%	44.4%	42.2%	11.1%	2.2%

Table 12 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
Mower	1	54	30	19	13	44	44	21	7
	0.9%	46.2%	25.6%	16.2%	11.1%	37.9%	37.9%	18.1%	6.0%
Murray	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Nicollet	3	53	37	14	4	31	48	22	7
	2.7%	47.7%	33.3%	12.6%	3.6%	28.7%	44.4%	20.4%	6.5%
Nobles	3	21	16	13	9	15	28	11	5
	4.8%	33.9%	25.8%	21.0%	14.5%	25.4%	47.5%	18.6%	8.5%
Norman	0	6	3	7	2	6	5	7	0
	0.0%	33.3%	16.7%	38.9%	11.1%	33.3%	27.8%	38.9%	0.0%
Olmsted	21	127	91	49	42	91	129	48	41
	6.4%	38.5%	27.6%	14.8%	12.7%	29.4%	41.7%	15.5%	13.3%
Otter Tail	1	48	38	12	9	33	41	16	16
	0.9%	44.4%	35.2%	11.1%	8.3%	31.1%	38.7%	15.1%	15.1%
Pennington	2	15	13	3	1	11	11	8	2
	5.9%	44.1%	38.2%	8.8%	2.9%	34.4%	34.4%	25.0%	6.3%
Pine	1	37	24	8	5	15	34	15	10
	1.3%	49.3%	32.0%	10.7%	6.7%	20.3%	45.9%	20.3%	13.5%
Pipestone	2	5	4	1	1	2	6	3	0
	15.4%	38.5%	30.8%	7.7%	7.7%	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%	0.0%
Polk	1	34	34	14	17	23	48	22	6
	1.0%	34.0%	34.0%	14.0%	17.0%	23.2%	48.5%	22.2%	6.1%
Pope	0	10	6	3	2	6	9	3	3
	0.0%	47.6%	28.6%	14.3%	9.5%	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%
Ramsey	75	1,713	1,295	770	895	878	2,167	1,091	537
	1.6%	36.1%	27.3%	16.2%	18.9%	18.8%	46.4%	23.3%	11.5%
Red Lake	1	3	4	0	2	2	2	4	1
	10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	22.2%	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%
Redwood	0	11	7	0	5	7	10	3	3
	0.0%	47.8%	30.4%	0.0%	21.7%	30.4%	43.5%	13.0%	13.0%
Renville	2	12	8	4	5	8	13	4	4
	6.5%	38.7%	25.8%	12.9%	16.1%	27.6%	44.8%	13.8%	13.8%
Rice	3	63	42	18	13	38	55	23	20
	2.2%	45.3%	30.2%	12.9%	9.4%	27.9%	40.4%	16.9%	14.7%
Rock	0	5	4	2	3	5	3	6	0
	0.0%	35.7%	28.6%	14.3%	21.4%	35.7%	21.4%	42.9%	0.0%
Roseau	1	8	1	0	0	5	1	1	2
	10.0%	80.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%
St. Louis	37	382	266	112	66	224	385	136	81
	4.3%	44.3%	30.8%	13.0%	7.6%	27.1%	46.6%	16.5%	9.8%
Scott	1	40	34	19	25	27	56	24	11
	0.8%	33.6%	28.6%	16.0%	21.0%	22.9%	47.5%	20.3%	9.3%
Sherburne	2	40	27	11	7	17	38	18	12
	2.3%	46.0%	31.0%	12.6%	8.0%	20.0%	44.7%	21.2%	14.1%
Sibley	0	10	4	8	8	10	15	5	0
	0.0%	33.3%	13.3%	26.7%	26.7%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Stearns	9	165	88	56	44	80	161	72	40
	2.5%	45.6%	24.3%	15.5%	12.2%	22.7%	45.6%	20.4%	11.3%
Steele	5	21	24	12	8	19	19	19	8
	41.7%	175.0%	200.0%	100.0%	66.7%	29.2%	29.2%	29.2%	12.3%

Table 12 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
<b>Stevens</b>	0	2	1	2	0	1	4	0	0
	0.0%	40.0%	0.2	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Swift</b>	0	7	2	0	5	5	5	3	1
	0.0%	50.0%	14.3%	0.0%	35.7%	35.7%	35.7%	21.4%	7.1%
<b>Todd</b>	1	15	8	5	1	7	11	9	2
	3.3%	50.0%	26.7%	16.7%	3.3%	24.1%	37.9%	31.0%	6.9%
<b>Traverse</b>	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
<b>Wabasha</b>	0	10	4	2	2	3	9	4	2
	0.0%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%	16.7%	50.0%	22.2%	11.1%
<b>Wadena</b>	4	28	19	8	5	12	24	14	10
	6.3%	43.8%	29.7%	12.5%	7.8%	20.0%	40.0%	23.3%	16.7%
<b>Waseca</b>	1	29	15	8	6	20	31	3	4
	1.7%	49.2%	25.4%	13.6%	10.2%	34.5%	53.4%	5.2%	6.9%
<b>Washington</b>	4	147	95	48	35	61	163	64	37
	1.2%	44.7%	28.9%	14.6%	10.6%	18.8%	50.2%	19.7%	11.4%
<b>Watsonwan</b>	1	13	5	3	1	4	11	4	3
	4.3%	56.5%	21.7%	13.0%	4.3%	18.2%	50.0%	18.2%	13.6%
<b>Wilkin</b>	0	7	2	1	0	3	3	2	2
	0.0%	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%	30.0%	30.0%	20.0%	20.0%
<b>Winona</b>	4	31	33	18	9	20	45	14	12
	4.2%	32.6%	34.7%	18.9%	9.5%	22.0%	49.5%	15.4%	13.2%
<b>Wright</b>	4	54	34	16	8	32	55	15	10
	3.4%	46.6%	29.3%	13.8%	6.9%	28.6%	49.1%	13.4%	8.9%
<b>Yellow Medicine</b>	1	5	2	2	2	6	2	2	1
	8.3%	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	54.5%	18.2%	18.2%	9.1%
<b>Northwest</b>	6	71	58	27	23	50	70	46	13
	3.2%	38.4%	31.4%	14.6%	12.4%	27.9%	39.1%	25.7%	7.3%
<b>West Central</b>	69	786	569	289	180	421	845	358	196
	3.6%	41.5%	30.1%	15.3%	9.5%	23.1%	46.4%	19.7%	10.8%
<b>Northeast</b>	50	512	368	166	89	300	530	196	109
	4.2%	43.2%	31.1%	14.0%	7.5%	26.4%	46.7%	17.3%	9.6%
<b>Central</b>	40	534	324	166	129	307	523	212	110
	3.4%	44.8%	27.2%	13.9%	10.8%	26.6%	45.4%	18.4%	9.5%
<b>Southwest</b>	11	121	66	32	41	74	108	52	26
	4.1%	44.6%	24.4%	11.8%	15.1%	28.5%	41.5%	20.0%	10.0%
<b>South Central</b>	11	246	144	79	52	150	239	87	45
	2.1%	46.2%	27.1%	14.8%	9.8%	28.8%	45.9%	16.7%	8.6%
<b>Southeast</b>	43	434	325	156	114	288	435	183	123
	4.0%	40.5%	30.3%	14.6%	10.6%	28.0%	42.3%	17.8%	12.0%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	44	917	685	334	273	472	1,044	441	252
	2.0%	40.7%	30.4%	14.8%	12.1%	21.4%	47.3%	20.0%	11.4%
<b>Core Metro</b>	216	4,086	2,882	1,684	1,743	2,109	4,866	2,256	1,162
	2.0%	38.5%	27.2%	15.9%	16.4%	20.3%	46.8%	21.7%	11.2%
<b>Minnesota</b>	490	7,707	5,421	2,933	2,644	4,171	8,660	3,831	2,036
	2.6%	40.2%	28.2%	15.3%	13.8%	22.3%	46.3%	20.5%	10.9%

**Table 13. All Children in December 2006 One-eligible-adult DWP Cases, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
<b>Aitkin</b>	2	4	4	2	1	2	0	11	0
	15.4%	30.8%	30.8%	15.4%	7.7%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Anoka</b>	18	93	64	25	18	24	86	59	31
	8.3%	42.7%	29.4%	11.5%	8.3%	12.0%	43.0%	29.5%	15.5%
<b>Becker</b>	3	13	4	0	0	3	9	4	1
	15.0%	65.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	52.9%	23.5%	5.9%
<b>Beltrami</b>	8	18	18	5	3	2	20	14	8
	15.4%	34.6%	34.6%	9.6%	5.8%	4.5%	45.5%	31.8%	18.2%
<b>Benton</b>	1	7	4	0	3	1	7	3	3
	6.7%	46.7%	26.7%	0.0%	20.0%	7.1%	50.0%	21.4%	21.4%
<b>Big Stone</b>	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
<b>Blue Earth</b>	4	10	8	3	6	5	16	4	2
	12.9%	32.3%	25.8%	9.7%	19.4%	18.5%	59.3%	14.8%	7.4%
<b>Brown</b>	1	3	3	1	2	0	4	3	2
	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	10.0%	20.0%	0.0%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%
<b>Carlton</b>	1	4	4	2	1	1	8	2	0
	8.3%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	8.3%	9.1%	72.7%	18.2%	0.0%
<b>Carver</b>	2	5	8	1	2	3	7	6	0
	11.1%	27.8%	44.4%	5.6%	11.1%	18.8%	43.8%	37.5%	0.0%
<b>Cass</b>	2	13	9	8	3	8	10	9	6
	5.7%	37.1%	25.7%	22.9%	8.6%	24.2%	30.3%	27.3%	18.2%
<b>Chippewa</b>	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Chisago</b>	3	9	9	6	2	3	15	7	1
	10.3%	31.0%	31.0%	20.7%	6.9%	11.5%	57.7%	26.9%	3.8%
<b>Clay</b>	5	9	9	8	2	2	16	7	3
	15.2%	27.3%	27.3%	24.2%	6.1%	7.1%	57.1%	25.0%	10.7%
<b>Clearwater</b>	3	3	0	1	1	1	4	0	0
	37.5%	37.5%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Cook</b>	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
<b>Cottonwood</b>	1	2	1	3	1	2	5	0	0
	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	37.5%	12.5%	28.6%	71.4%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Crow Wing</b>	2	19	14	7	3	4	25	10	4
	4.4%	42.2%	31.1%	15.6%	6.7%	9.3%	58.1%	23.3%	9.3%
<b>Dakota</b>	13	71	58	26	27	22	84	52	24
	6.7%	36.4%	29.7%	13.3%	13.8%	12.1%	46.2%	28.6%	13.2%
<b>Dodge</b>	0	3	1	3	2	1	7	1	0
	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	0.0%
<b>Douglas</b>	2	4	5	0	0	0	6	2	1
	18.2%	36.4%	45.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%
<b>Faribault</b>	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
<b>Fillmore</b>	1	4	4	1	0	1	5	1	2
	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%	10.0%	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	22.2%
<b>Freeborn</b>	2	6	1	5	1	3	7	3	0
	13.3%	40.0%	6.7%	33.3%	6.7%	23.1%	53.8%	23.1%	0.0%

Table 13 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
Goodhue	1	6	5	5	1	1	9	4	3
	5.6%	33.3%	27.8%	27.8%	5.6%	5.9%	52.9%	23.5%	17.6%
Grant	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hennepin	90	308	183	113	74	76	311	199	92
	11.7%	40.1%	23.8%	14.7%	9.6%	11.2%	45.9%	29.4%	13.6%
Houston	1	1	9	5	1	3	7	5	1
	5.9%	5.9%	52.9%	29.4%	5.9%	18.8%	43.8%	31.3%	6.3%
Hubbard	0	2	4	0	2	1	4	3	0
	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%
Isanti	0	8	11	3	1	4	10	6	3
	0.0%	34.8%	47.8%	13.0%	4.3%	17.4%	43.5%	26.1%	13.0%
Itasca	1	9	8	3	1	1	15	3	2
	4.5%	40.9%	36.4%	13.6%	4.5%	4.8%	71.4%	14.3%	9.5%
Jackson	1	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	1
	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Kanabec	3	5	5	1	1	3	3	3	3
	20.0%	33.3%	33.3%	6.7%	6.7%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Kandiyohi	1	4	12	4	5	4	12	8	1
	3.8%	15.4%	46.2%	15.4%	19.2%	16.0%	48.0%	32.0%	4.0%
Kittson	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Koochiching	1	5	1	2	0	1	3	2	2
	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	22.2%	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%
Lac Qui Parle	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lake	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	0
	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lake of Woods	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Le Sueur	2	1	4	1	0	1	1	4	0
	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%
Lincoln	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lyon	4	8	1	2	3	1	10	0	3
	22.2%	44.4%	5.6%	11.1%	16.7%	7.1%	71.4%	0.0%	21.4%
McLeod	0	5	5	1	3	2	11	0	1
	0.0%	35.7%	35.7%	7.1%	21.4%	14.3%	78.6%	0.0%	7.1%
Mahnommen	0	2	2	2	1	1	3	2	1
	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%
Marshall	0	5	2	0	0	1	5	1	0
	0.0%	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	0.0%
Martin	0	4	6	1	1	2	4	4	2
	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%
Meeker	1	3	6	1	0	1	7	1	1
	9.1%	27.3%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	10.0%	70.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Mille Lacs	0	9	2	1	3	0	8	4	3
	0.0%	60.0%	13.3%	6.7%	20.0%	0.0%	53.3%	26.7%	20.0%
Morrison	1	3	3	2	2	0	9	1	0
	9.1%	27.3%	27.3%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%

Table 13 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
<b>Mower</b>	1	5	5	4	4	2	7	6	3
	5.3%	26.3%	26.3%	21.1%	21.1%	11.1%	38.9%	33.3%	16.7%
<b>Murray</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Nicollet</b>	5	7	12	1	1	1	15	4	1
	19.2%	26.9%	46.2%	3.8%	3.8%	4.8%	71.4%	19.0%	4.8%
<b>Nobles</b>	3	0	2	1	9	3	9	0	0
	20.0%	0.0%	13.3%	6.7%	60.0%	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Norman</b>	1	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	1
	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%
<b>Olmsted</b>	8	29	27	15	8	13	35	20	11
	9.2%	33.3%	31.0%	17.2%	9.2%	16.5%	44.3%	25.3%	13.9%
<b>Otter Tail</b>	2	11	7	5	2	4	8	8	5
	7.4%	40.7%	25.9%	18.5%	7.4%	16.0%	32.0%	32.0%	20.0%
<b>Pennington</b>	0	3	1	0	1	2	2	1	0
	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%
<b>Pine</b>	2	10	7	1	2	5	9	4	2
	9.1%	45.5%	31.8%	4.5%	9.1%	25.0%	45.0%	20.0%	10.0%
<b>Pipestone</b>	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	0
	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%
<b>Polk</b>	6	5	7	0	0	3	4	3	2
	33.3%	27.8%	38.9%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
<b>Pope</b>	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
<b>Ramsey</b>	46	149	104	49	33	36	144	106	49
	12.1%	39.1%	27.3%	12.9%	8.7%	10.7%	43.0%	31.6%	14.6%
<b>Red Lake</b>	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%
<b>Redwood</b>	0	6	3	1	2	3	4	3	2
	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
<b>Renville</b>	1	3	2	0	1	0	2	3	1
	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
<b>Rice</b>	3	9	11	7	6	4	15	6	8
	8.3%	25.0%	30.6%	19.4%	16.7%	12.1%	45.5%	18.2%	24.2%
<b>Rock</b>	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	0
	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Roseau</b>	0	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	1
	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
<b>St. Louis</b>	12	52	31	10	3	12	55	17	12
	11.1%	48.1%	28.7%	9.3%	2.8%	12.5%	57.3%	17.7%	12.5%
<b>Scott</b>	1	11	13	1	2	2	12	9	4
	3.6%	39.3%	46.4%	3.6%	7.1%	7.4%	44.4%	33.3%	14.8%
<b>Sherburne</b>	4	9	9	3	4	1	10	12	2
	13.8%	31.0%	31.0%	10.3%	13.8%	4.0%	40.0%	48.0%	8.0%
<b>Sibley</b>	0	1	2	2	1	1	4	1	0
	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	0.0%
<b>Stearns</b>	9	23	17	10	5	5	26	14	10
	14.1%	35.9%	26.6%	15.6%	7.8%	9.1%	47.3%	25.5%	18.2%
<b>Steele</b>	1	11	6	3	2	1	12	8	1
	4.3%	47.8%	26.1%	13.0%	8.7%	4.5%	54.5%	36.4%	4.5%



Table 13 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Number of Children					Age of Youngest Child			
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	< 1 year	1-5	6-12	> 12
<b>Stevens</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Swift</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Todd</b>	0	4	4	2	1	1	7	0	0
	0.0%	36.4%	36.4%	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Traverse</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Wabasha</b>	0	4	3	0	3	1	4	4	1
	0.0%	40.0%	30.0%	0.0%	30.0%	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%	10.0%
<b>Wadena</b>	2	3	3	2	1	0	2	3	4
	18.2%	27.3%	27.3%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%
<b>Waseca</b>	1	4	3	1	2	0	6	3	1
	9.1%	36.4%	27.3%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%
<b>Washington</b>	3	17	20	9	2	1	20	18	9
	5.9%	33.3%	39.2%	17.6%	3.9%	2.1%	41.7%	37.5%	18.8%
<b>Watonwan</b>	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	0
	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	28.6%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
<b>Wilkin</b>	0	1	1	0	2	0	4	0	0
	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Winona</b>	0	10	4	3	1	1	11	4	2
	0.0%	55.6%	22.2%	16.7%	5.6%	5.6%	61.1%	22.2%	11.1%
<b>Wright</b>	0	14	14	6	5	5	18	8	8
	0.0%	35.9%	35.9%	15.4%	12.8%	12.8%	46.2%	20.5%	20.5%
<b>Yellow Medicine</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
<b>Northwest</b>	7	17	15	3	2	7	17	8	5
	15.9%	38.6%	34.1%	6.8%	4.5%	18.9%	45.9%	21.6%	13.5%
<b>West Central</b>	33	107	84	44	24	28	129	67	35
	11.3%	36.6%	28.8%	15.1%	8.2%	10.8%	49.8%	25.9%	13.5%
<b>Northeast</b>	17	77	49	19	7	17	92	26	17
	10.1%	45.6%	29.0%	11.2%	4.1%	11.2%	60.5%	17.1%	11.2%
<b>Central</b>	22	100	94	31	33	31	123	66	38
	7.9%	35.7%	33.6%	11.1%	11.8%	12.0%	47.7%	25.6%	14.7%
<b>Southwest</b>	11	20	16	11	16	12	38	7	6
	14.9%	27.0%	21.6%	14.9%	21.6%	19.0%	60.3%	11.1%	9.5%
<b>South Central</b>	17	32	40	12	15	12	53	25	9
	14.7%	27.6%	34.5%	10.3%	12.9%	12.1%	53.5%	25.3%	9.1%
<b>Southeast</b>	18	88	76	51	29	31	119	62	32
	6.9%	33.6%	29.0%	19.5%	11.1%	12.7%	48.8%	25.4%	13.1%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	40	206	172	68	53	55	224	151	69
	7.4%	38.2%	31.9%	12.6%	9.8%	11.0%	44.9%	30.3%	13.8%
<b>Core Metro</b>	136	457	287	162	107	112	455	305	141
	11.8%	39.8%	25.0%	14.1%	9.3%	11.1%	44.9%	30.1%	13.9%
<b>Minnesota</b>	301	1,104	833	401	286	305	1,250	717	352
	10.3%	37.7%	28.5%	13.7%	9.8%	11.6%	47.6%	27.3%	13.4%

**Table 14. Family Violence, Chemical Dependency, and Severe Mental Health Diagnosis for December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases, by Large County and Region**

	MFIP Family Violence Exemption or Extension in 1995-2006		Adult Chemical Dependency Diagnosis in 2004-2006		Adult Severe Mental Health Diagnosis in 2004-2006	
	MFIP	DWP	MFIP	DWP	MFIP	DWP
<b>Anoka</b>	43	1	211	22	383	40
	4.6%	0.5%	22.6%	10.1%	41.1%	18.3%
<b>Beltrami</b>	20	2	260	9	216	8
	2.9%	3.8%	37.4%	17.3%	31.1%	15.4%
<b>Dakota</b>	39	2	151	22	301	40
	5.3%	1.0%	20.7%	11.3%	41.2%	20.5%
<b>Hennepin</b>	389	6	1,134	80	1747	108
	6.6%	0.8%	19.3%	10.4%	29.8%	14.1%
<b>Olmsted</b>	35	2	63	20	103	23
	10.6%	2.3%	19.1%	23.0%	31.2%	26.4%
<b>Ramsey</b>	373	1	851	36	1624	49
	7.9%	0.3%	17.9%	9.4%	34.2%	12.9%
<b>St. Louis</b>	51	1	289	16	474	26
	5.9%	0.9%	33.5%	14.8%	54.9%	24.1%
<b>Washington</b>	25	0	76	6	125	10
	7.6%	0.0%	23.1%	11.8%	38.0%	19.6%
<b>All Other Counties</b>	245	13	1,115	161	1969	270
	5.2%	1.2%	23.7%	15.1%	41.9%	25.4%
<b>Northwest</b>	8	0	44	8	76	9
	4.3%	0.0%	23.8%	18.2%	41.1%	20.5%
<b>West Central</b>	74	6	599	47	727	77
	3.9%	2.1%	31.6%	16.1%	38.4%	26.4%
<b>Northeast</b>	71	1	368	26	635	45
	6.0%	0.6%	31.1%	15.4%	53.6%	26.6%
<b>Central</b>	86	4	293	45	506	75
	7.2%	1.4%	24.6%	16.1%	42.4%	26.8%
<b>Southwest</b>	9	0	47	13	115	11
	3.3%	0.0%	17.3%	17.6%	42.4%	14.9%
<b>South Central</b>	39	3	91	8	214	23
	7.3%	2.6%	17.1%	6.9%	40.2%	19.8%
<b>Southeast</b>	56	2	222	45	382	70
	5.2%	0.8%	20.7%	17.2%	35.6%	26.7%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	115	5	501	64	916	107
	5.1%	0.9%	22.2%	11.9%	40.7%	19.9%
<b>Core Metro</b>	762	7	1,985	116	3,371	157
	7.2%	0.6%	18.7%	10.1%	31.8%	13.7%
<b>Minnesota</b>	1,220	28	4,150	372	6,942	574
	6.4%	1.0%	21.6%	12.7%	36.2%	19.6%

**Table 15. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Exception, Exemptions, or Extension to the Life Time Limit, MFIP Counted Months, and New MFIP Cases in 2006, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted Cases		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months	Total		Out-of-State		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent			Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Aitkin	41	9	22.0%	7	17.1%	16	5	12.2%	18	43.9%	*	
Anoka	932	103	11.1%	130	13.9%	27	231	24.8%	225	24.1%	35	3.8%
Becker	133	21	15.8%	17	12.8%	25	27	20.3%	29	21.8%	4	3.0%
Beltrami	695	395	56.8%	41	5.9%	15	59	8.5%	106	15.3%	6	0.9%
Benton	105	15	14.3%	21	20.0%	22	14	13.3%	26	24.8%	*	
Big Stone	6	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	31	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blue Earth	142	10	7.0%	19	13.4%	26	32	22.5%	37	26.1%	5	3.5%
Brown	48	2	4.2%	8	16.7%	19	4	8.3%	13	27.1%	*	
Carlton	94	6	6.4%	26	27.7%	26	21	22.3%	14	14.9%	*	
Carver	58	2	3.4%	9	15.5%	24	7	12.1%	15	25.9%	*	
Cass	199	21	10.6%	20	10.1%	26	40	20.1%	43	21.6%	*	
Chippewa	25	4	16.0%	7	28.0%	14	1	4.0%	7	28.0%	0	0.0%
Chisago	84	9	10.7%	20	23.8%	21	9	10.7%	26	31.0%	*	
Clay	181	26	14.4%	28	15.5%	25	32	17.7%	43	23.8%	12	6.6%
Clearwater	38	7	18.4%	1	2.6%	28	11	28.9%	8	21.1%	*	
Cook	4	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	20	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Cottonwood	17	1	5.9%	4	23.5%	27	2	11.8%	3	17.6%	*	
Crow Wing	172	10	5.8%	42	24.4%	20	20	11.6%	47	27.3%	*	
Dakota	731	71	9.7%	143	19.6%	25	135	18.5%	187	25.6%	26	3.6%
Dodge	31	3	9.7%	5	16.1%	18	4	12.9%	11	35.5%	*	
Douglas	50	3	6.0%	11	22.0%	20	8	16.0%	18	36.0%	*	
Faribault	21	1	4.8%	5	23.8%	22	4	19.0%	7	33.3%	0	0.0%
Fillmore	38	0	0.0%	10	26.3%	15	3	7.9%	17	44.7%	*	
Freeborn	89	8	9.0%	21	23.6%	19	9	10.1%	32	36.0%	5	5.6%
Goodhue	82	3	3.7%	18	22.0%	26	19	23.2%	27	32.9%	*	

Table 15 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted Cases		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months	Total		Out-of-State		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent			Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Grant	9	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	10	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	0	0.0%
Hennepin	5,861	607	10.4%	627	10.7%	28	1,481	25.3%	1,414	24.1%	347	5.9%
Houston	62	2	3.2%	14	22.6%	18	4	6.5%	23	37.1%	13	21.0%
Hubbard	44	5	11.4%	10	22.7%	22	4	9.1%	9	20.5%	*	
Isanti	65	8	12.3%	12	18.5%	19	6	9.2%	23	35.4%	*	
Itasca	121	14	11.6%	20	16.5%	24	23	19.0%	32	26.4%	*	
Jackson	11	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	12	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
Kanabec	49	9	18.4%	12	24.5%	23	10	20.4%	15	30.6%	*	
Kandiyohi	155	29	18.7%	24	15.5%	17	13	8.4%	55	35.5%	10	6.5%
Kittson	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%
Koochiching	50	4	8.0%	11	22.0%	24	9	18.0%	12	24.0%	0	0.0%
Lac Qui Parle	6	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	23	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	*	
Lake	12	1	8.3%	2	16.7%	22	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	*	
Lake of the Woods	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%
Le Sueur	45	6	13.3%	7	15.6%	16	2	4.4%	12	26.7%	*	
Lincoln	7	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	23	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%
Lyon	57	4	7.0%	11	19.3%	21	9	15.8%	25	43.9%	5	8.8%
McLeod	48	4	8.3%	4	8.3%	17	7	14.6%	17	35.4%	*	
Mahnomen	80	12	15.0%	2	2.5%	26	18	22.5%	19	23.8%	0	0.0%
Marshall	7	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	24	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%
Martin	53	7	13.2%	18	34.0%	17	4	7.5%	16	30.2%	*	
Meeker	44	5	11.4%	9	20.5%	20	7	15.9%	14	31.8%	*	
Mille Lacs	55	9	16.4%	14	25.5%	22	7	12.7%	13	23.6%	*	
Morrison	46	3	6.5%	10	21.7%	15	3	6.5%	18	39.1%	*	
Mower	117	9	7.7%	18	15.4%	20	11	9.4%	33	28.2%	5	4.3%

Table 15 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted Cases		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48	Months	Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Murray	4	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	14	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	*	
Nicollet	111	12	10.8%	24	21.6%	19	10	9.0%	36	32.4%	6	5.4%
Nobles	62	5	8.1%	7	11.3%	22	10	16.1%	21	33.9%	7	11.3%
Norman	18	1	5.6%	2	11.1%	12	1	5.6%	9	50.0%	*	
Olmsted	330	52	15.8%	50	15.2%	20	39	11.8%	116	35.2%	23	7.0%
Otter Tail	108	9	8.3%	23	21.3%	15	6	5.6%	38	35.2%	6	5.6%
Pennington	34	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	21	6	17.6%	13	38.2%	*	
Pine	75	7	9.3%	18	24.0%	24	14	18.7%	20	26.7%	*	
Pipestone	13	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	14	1	7.7%	5	38.5%	*	
Polk	99	14	14.1%	21	21.2%	23	16	16.2%	30	30.3%	7	7.1%
Pope	21	1	4.8%	5	23.8%	22	3	14.3%	5	23.8%	*	
Ramsey	4,747	423	8.9%	562	11.8%	34	1,773	37.3%	847	17.8%	154	3.2%
Red Lake	10	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	18	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	*	
Redwood	23	3	13.0%	1	4.3%	23	5	21.7%	6	26.1%	0	0.0%
Renville	31	1	3.2%	4	12.9%	23	6	19.4%	7	22.6%	*	
Rice	139	10	7.2%	12	8.6%	20	17	12.2%	42	30.2%	7	5.0%
Rock	14	1	7.1%	5	35.7%	16	1	7.1%	7	50.0%	*	
Roseau	10	3	30.0%	2	20.0%	9	0	0.0%	7	70.0%	0	0.0%
St. Louis	863	63	7.3%	137	15.9%	27	176	20.4%	200	23.2%	21	2.4%
Scott	119	3	2.5%	15	12.6%	23	24	20.2%	30	25.2%	*	
Sherburne	87	12	13.8%	11	12.6%	21	10	11.5%	31	35.6%	*	
Sibley	30	9	30.0%	6	20.0%	20	5	16.7%	10	33.3%	0	0.0%
Stearns	362	42	11.6%	58	16.0%	22	52	14.4%	122	33.7%	45	12.4%
Steele	70	3	4.3%	11	15.7%	21	8	11.4%	23	32.9%	7	10.0%
Stevens	5	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	14	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	*	

Table 15 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted Cases		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48	Months	Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Swift	14	1	7.1%	2	14.3%	24	3	21.4%	5	35.7%	*	
Todd	30	3	10.0%	3	10.0%	22	5	16.7%	10	33.3%	0	0.0%
Traverse	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	28	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wabasha	18	1	5.6%	5	27.8%	18	1	5.6%	4	22.2%	*	
Wadena	64	3	4.7%	14	21.9%	23	9	14.1%	17	26.6%	*	
Waseca	59	12	20.3%	9	15.3%	18	8	13.6%	24	40.7%	7	11.9%
Washington	328	22	6.7%	57	17.4%	26	56	17.1%	82	25.0%	9	2.7%
Watonwan	23	2	8.7%	10	43.5%	17	2	8.7%	6	26.1%	0	0.0%
Wilkin	10	1	10.0%	2	20.0%	14	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	*	
Winona	95	12	12.6%	16	16.8%	27	24	25.3%	25	26.3%	*	
Wright	115	24	20.9%	22	19.1%	17	8	7.0%	45	39.1%	*	
Yellow Medicine	12	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	29	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
Northwest	185	19	10.3%	29	15.7%	20	24	13.0%	67	36.2%	11	5.9%
West Central	1,893	526	27.8%	232	12.3%	20	246	13.0%	424	22.4%	41	2.2%
Northeast	1,185	98	8.3%	203	17.1%	26	238	20.1%	283	23.9%	26	2.2%
Central	1,193	165	13.8%	209	17.5%	21	154	12.9%	388	32.5%	71	6.0%
Southwest	271	24	8.9%	47	17.3%	21	38	14.0%	91	33.6%	19	7.0%
South Central	532	61	11.5%	106	19.9%	21	71	13.3%	161	30.3%	23	4.3%
Southeast	1,072	103	9.6%	180	16.8%	21	139	13.0%	353	32.9%	70	6.5%
Metro Suburban	2,253	210	9.3%	374	16.6%	26	462	20.5%	565	25.1%	75	3.3%
Core Metro	10,611	1,030	9.7%	1,189	11.2%	30	3,254	30.7%	2,261	21.3%	501	4.7%
Minnesota	19,195	2,236	11.6%	2,569	13.4%	27	4,626	24.1%	4,593	23.9%	837	4.4%

**Table 16. December 2006 One-eligible-adult DWP Cases with MFIP Counted Months and New DWP Cases in 2006, by Large County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Mean	Over 48	Months	Total		Out-of-State	
			Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Prcnt
<b>Anoka</b>	264	8	7	2.7%	138	52.3%	44	16.7%
<b>Beltrami</b>	69	10	4	5.8%	28	40.6%	4	5.8%
<b>Dakota</b>	239	9	6	2.5%	117	49.0%	30	12.6%
<b>Hennepin</b>	915	11	46	5.0%	514	56.2%	275	30.1%
<b>Olmsted</b>	103	10	6	5.8%	44	42.7%	16	15.5%
<b>Ramsey</b>	488	10	17	3.5%	267	54.7%	130	26.6%
<b>St. Louis</b>	139	8	4	2.9%	79	56.8%	23	16.5%
<b>Washington</b>	64	9	1	1.6%	36	56.3%	11	17.2%
<b>All Other Counties</b>	1,402	9	48	3.4%	679	48.4%	219	15.6%
<b>Northwest</b>	64	8	1	1.6%	33	51.6%	16	25.0%
<b>West Central</b>	384	11	17	4.4%	163	42.4%	49	12.8%
<b>Northeast</b>	221	10	7	3.2%	120	54.3%	34	15.4%
<b>Central</b>	360	9	12	3.3%	167	46.4%	45	12.5%
<b>Southwest</b>	95	9	6	6.3%	53	55.8%	19	20.0%
<b>South Central</b>	163	8	6	3.7%	84	51.5%	30	18.4%
<b>Southeast</b>	331	9	11	3.3%	158	47.7%	57	17.2%
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	662	8	16	2.4%	343	51.8%	97	14.7%
<b>Core Metro</b>	1,403	11	63	4.5%	781	55.7%	405	28.9%
<b>Minnesota</b>	3,683	10	139	3.8%	1,902	51.6%	752	20.4%

**Table 17. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases Receiving Food-only Assistance, Budgeted Earnings, Working Adults, Earned Income, and Month Work Hours, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Welfare		Monthly Work and Income					
	Food-only MFIP		Budgeted Earnings		Working		Income	Work Hours
	Count	Percent	Count	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Mean
Aitkin	8	19.5%	11	\$371	13	31.7%	\$492	63
Anoka	168	18.0%	230	\$394	353	37.9%	\$958	105
Becker	23	17.3%	37	\$317	50	37.6%	\$706	97
Beltrami	90	12.9%	135	\$422	192	27.6%	\$917	116
Benton	21	20.0%	36	\$365	48	45.7%	\$668	97
Big Stone	2	33.3%	4	*	6	100.0%	\$771	108
Blue Earth	29	20.4%	62	\$367	74	52.1%	\$825	100
Brown	13	27.1%	23	\$401	32	66.7%	\$862	109
Carlton	9	9.6%	24	\$254	34	36.2%	\$739	88
Carver	16	27.6%	16	\$425	25	43.1%	\$1,047	108
Cass	32	16.1%	47	\$394	58	29.1%	\$721	92
Chippewa	7	28.0%	7	\$386	11	44.0%	\$604	79
Chisago	16	19.0%	30	\$338	42	50.0%	\$692	73
Clay	39	21.5%	64	\$375	89	49.2%	\$751	91
Clearwater	6	15.8%	12	\$489	15	39.5%	\$757	80
Cook	1	25.0%	4	*	3	75.0%	*	*
Cottonwood	4	23.5%	10	\$296	11	64.7%	\$507	61
Crow Wing	28	16.3%	52	\$343	64	37.2%	\$705	85
Dakota	114	15.6%	178	\$352	257	35.2%	\$927	100
Dodge	6	19.4%	10	\$381	16	51.6%	\$851	110
Douglas	9	18.0%	15	\$392	19	38.0%	\$714	104
Faribault	2	9.5%	7	\$260	11	52.4%	\$658	90
Fillmore	11	28.9%	14	\$312	16	42.1%	\$800	100
Freeborn	25	28.1%	40	\$399	45	50.6%	\$792	88
Goodhue	18	21.7%	20	\$452	29	34.9%	\$770	88
Grant	3	33.3%	4	*	3	33.3%	*	*
Hennepin	1,070	18.3%	1,495	\$452	1,918	32.7%	\$949	100
Houston	12	19.4%	27	\$373	32	51.6%	\$697	93
Hubbard	12	27.3%	16	\$421	17	38.6%	\$774	98
Isanti	17	26.2%	23	\$375	29	44.6%	\$785	101
Itasca	33	27.3%	33	\$329	40	33.1%	\$748	88
Jackson	2	18.2%	3	\$402	5	45.5%	\$840	108
Kanabec	9	18.4%	9	\$384	17	34.7%	\$954	106
Kandiyohi	23	14.7%	38	\$350	57	36.5%	\$888	104
Kittson	1	16.7%	1	*	3	50.0%	*	*
Koochiching	11	22.0%	18	\$380	22	44.0%	\$789	93
Lac Qui Parle	3	50.0%	5	\$412	5	83.3%	\$684	87
Lake	2	16.7%	5	\$148	5	41.7%	\$576	81
Lake of the Woods	0	0.0%	1	*	4	80.0%	*	*
Le Sueur	15	33.3%	21	\$339	21	46.7%	\$728	96
Lincoln	1	14.3%	2	*	3	42.9%	*	*
Lyon	18	31.6%	26	\$520	35	61.4%	\$964	114
McLeod	8	16.7%	14	\$335	19	39.6%	\$1,107	115
Mahnomen	14	17.5%	13	\$377	16	20.0%	\$745	88
Marshall	0	0.0%	3	*	3	42.9%	*	*
Martin	15	28.3%	19	\$413	23	43.4%	\$916	108
Meeker	15	34.1%	16	\$379	20	45.5%	\$775	89
Mille Lacs	16	29.1%	10	\$446	13	23.6%	\$718	69
Morrison	11	23.9%	21	\$311	25	54.3%	\$472	60
Mower	20	17.1%	55	\$386	74	63.2%	\$830	100



Table 17 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Welfare		Monthly Work and Income					
	Food-only MFIP		Budgeted Earnings		Working		Income	Work Hours
	Count	Percent	Count	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Mean
Murray	1	25.0%	0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Nicollet	21	18.9%	34	\$402	51	45.9%	\$620	72
Nobles	8	12.9%	23	\$367	28	45.2%	\$1,096	128
Norman	4	22.2%	9	\$370	11	61.1%	\$1,003	118
Olmsted	61	18.5%	93	\$381	144	43.6%	\$827	98
Otter Tail	25	23.1%	30	\$355	43	39.8%	\$674	78
Pennington	4	11.8%	9	\$239	18	52.9%	\$562	78
Pine	18	24.0%	33	\$403	37	49.3%	\$804	106
Pipestone	2	15.4%	7	\$357	8	61.5%	\$1,277	143
Polk	22	22.0%	35	\$435	46	46.0%	\$687	86
Pope	3	14.3%	6	\$307	10	47.6%	\$560	78
Ramsey	721	15.2%	1,108	\$456	1,444	30.4%	\$974	107
Red Lake	2	20.0%	4	*	2	20.0%	*	*
Redwood	8	34.8%	7	\$671	9	39.1%	\$1,061	122
Renville	5	16.1%	11	\$347	13	41.9%	\$532	63
Rice	23	16.5%	42	\$332	57	41.0%	\$721	81
Rock	4	28.6%	9	\$383	12	85.7%	\$792	100
Roseau	3	30.0%	0	\$0	4	40.0%	*	*
St. Louis	183	21.2%	270	\$380	330	38.2%	\$826	100
Scott	25	21.0%	36	\$432	48	40.3%	\$832	98
Sherburne	25	28.7%	28	\$329	32	36.8%	\$725	79
Sibley	9	30.0%	10	\$369	15	50.0%	\$970	116
Stearns	70	19.3%	102	\$389	148	40.9%	\$859	100
Steele	15	21.4%	27	\$398	30	42.9%	\$964	108
Stevens	2	40.0%	1	*	3	60.0%	*	*
Swift	3	21.4%	4	*	5	35.7%	\$782	105
Todd	9	30.0%	15	\$402	17	56.7%	\$779	103
Traverse	0	0.0%	0	\$0	2	66.7%	*	*
Wabasha	4	22.2%	7	\$372	10	55.6%	\$637	82
Wadena	9	14.1%	22	\$304	23	35.9%	\$649	85
Waseca	11	18.6%	17	\$381	29	49.2%	\$844	95
Washington	66	20.1%	97	\$412	130	39.5%	\$890	95
Watonwan	3	13.0%	6	\$278	11	47.8%	\$855	97
Wilkin	3	30.0%	5	\$441	7	70.0%	\$835	94
Winona	28	29.5%	39	\$398	44	46.3%	\$773	95
Wright	21	18.1%	31	\$332	54	46.6%	\$765	85
Yellow Medicine	1	8.3%	4	*	3	25.0%	*	*

Table 17 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Welfare		Monthly Work and Income					
	Food-only MFIP		Budgeted Earnings		Working		Income	Work Hours
	Count	Percent	Count	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Mean
Northwest	36	19.5%	61	\$388	87	47.0%	\$663	84
West Central	318	16.8%	496	\$378	657	34.7%	\$772	97
Northeast	247	20.8%	365	\$363	447	37.7%	\$797	96
Central	248	20.8%	351	\$370	487	40.8%	\$813	96
Southwest	64	23.6%	111	\$413	141	52.0%	\$899	108
South Central	118	22.2%	199	\$373	267	50.2%	\$795	96
Southeast	223	20.8%	374	\$382	497	46.4%	\$800	95
Metro Suburban	405	18.0%	587	\$384	855	37.9%	\$921	100
Core Metro	1,791	16.9%	2,603	\$454	3,362	31.7%	\$960	103
Minnesota	3,450	18.0%	5,147	\$417	6,800	35.4%	\$892	100

\* For cells with less than 5 cases, data were removed to protect individual information.



**Table 18. December 2006 One-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Sanctions and Child Support Payments, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Sanctions		Child Support: Current Payments		
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Median
Aitkin	0	0.0%	7	17.1%	\$373
Anoka	56	6.0%	130	13.9%	\$193
Becker	9	6.8%	17	12.8%	\$212
Beltrami	31	4.5%	41	5.9%	\$185
Benton	12	11.4%	21	20.0%	\$276
Big Stone	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	*
Blue Earth	9	6.3%	19	13.4%	\$194
Brown	5	10.4%	8	16.7%	\$273
Carlton	10	10.6%	26	27.7%	\$197
Carver	4	6.9%	9	15.5%	\$218
Cass	17	8.5%	20	10.1%	\$178
Chippewa	0	0.0%	7	28.0%	\$300
Chisago	5	6.0%	20	23.8%	\$207
Clay	11	6.1%	28	15.5%	\$244
Clearwater	2	5.3%	1	2.6%	*
Cook	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0
Cottonwood	0	0.0%	4	23.5%	*
Crow Wing	15	8.7%	42	24.4%	\$182
Dakota	60	8.2%	143	19.6%	\$215
Dodge	3	9.7%	5	16.1%	\$295
Douglas	6	12.0%	11	22.0%	\$238
Faribault	3	14.3%	5	23.8%	\$179
Fillmore	4	10.5%	10	26.3%	\$204
Freeborn	14	15.7%	21	23.6%	\$187
Goodhue	6	7.2%	18	21.7%	\$239
Grant	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	*
Hennepin	346	5.9%	627	10.7%	\$180
Houston	4	6.5%	14	22.6%	\$175
Hubbard	6	13.6%	10	22.7%	\$178
Isanti	3	4.6%	12	18.5%	\$266
Itasca	10	8.3%	20	16.5%	\$232
Jackson	1	9.1%	4	36.4%	*
Kanabec	5	10.2%	12	24.5%	\$232
Kandiyohi	17	10.9%	24	15.4%	\$173
Kittson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0
Koochiching	6	12.0%	11	22.0%	\$197
Lac Qui Parle	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	*
Lake	3	25.0%	2	16.7%	*
Lake of the Woods	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0
Le Sueur	2	4.4%	7	15.6%	\$330
Lincoln	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	*
Lyon	2	3.5%	11	19.3%	\$179
McLeod	10	20.8%	4	8.3%	*
Mahnomen	11	13.8%	2	2.5%	\$165
Marshall	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0
Martin	6	11.3%	18	34.0%	\$207
Meeker	1	2.3%	9	20.5%	\$195
Mille Lacs	5	9.1%	14	25.5%	\$253

Table 18 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Sanctions		Child Support: Current Payments		
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Median
Morrison	1	2.2%	10	21.7%	\$245
Mower	10	8.5%	18	15.4%	\$215
Murray	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	*
Nicollet	4	3.6%	24	21.6%	\$262
Nobles	1	1.6%	7	11.3%	\$208
Norman	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	*
Olmsted	26	7.9%	50	15.2%	\$214
Otter Tail	5	4.6%	23	21.3%	\$193
Pennington	5	14.7%	2	5.9%	*
Pine	7	9.3%	18	24.0%	\$230
Pipestone	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	*
Polk	8	8.0%	21	21.0%	\$176
Pope	2	9.5%	5	23.8%	\$228
Ramsey	165	3.5%	562	11.8%	\$184
Red Lake	2	20.0%	2	20.0%	*
Redwood	2	8.7%	1	4.3%	*
Renville	6	19.4%	4	12.9%	*
Rice	16	11.5%	12	8.6%	\$266
Rock	0	0.0%	5	35.7%	\$148
Roseau	1	10.0%	2	20.0%	*
St. Louis	80	9.3%	137	15.9%	\$177
Scott	11	9.2%	15	12.6%	\$250
Sherburne	11	12.6%	11	12.6%	\$216
Sibley	3	10.0%	6	20.0%	\$160
Stearns	20	5.5%	58	16.0%	\$197
Steele	7	10.0%	11	15.7%	\$188
Stevens	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	\$0
Swift	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	*
Todd	0	0.0%	3	10.0%	*
Traverse	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	*
Wabasha	2	11.1%	5	27.8%	\$231
Wadena	1	1.6%	14	21.9%	\$277
Waseca	3	5.1%	9	15.3%	\$202
Washington	22	6.7%	57	17.3%	\$184
Watonwan	3	13.0%	10	43.5%	\$328
Wilkin	2	20.0%	2	20.0%	*
Winona	10	10.5%	16	16.8%	\$183
Wright	20	17.2%	22	19.0%	\$204
Yellow Medicine	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	*
Northwest	16	8.6%	29	15.7%	\$233
West Central	122	6.4%	232	12.3%	\$209
Northeast	109	9.2%	203	17.1%	\$193
Central	117	9.8%	209	17.5%	\$216
Southwest	6	2.2%	47	17.3%	\$219
South Central	38	7.1%	106	19.9%	\$235
Southeast	102	9.5%	180	16.8%	\$211
Metro Suburban	158	7.0%	374	16.6%	\$208
Core Metro	511	4.8%	1,189	11.2%	\$182
Minnesota	1,179	6.1%	2,569	13.4%	\$197

\* For cells with fewer than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect individual information.

**Table 19. December 2006 Two-eligible-adult MFIP Cases with Exception, Exemptions, or Extensions to the Life Time Limit, MFIP Counted Months, and New MFIP Cases in 2006, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted Cases		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months		Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Aitkin	8	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	9	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	*	
Anoka	137	7	5.1%	8	5.8%	23	23	16.8%	45	32.8%	7	5.1%
Becker	31	1	3.2%	3	9.7%	23	4	12.9%	7	22.6%	*	
Beltrami	196	120	61.2%	0	0.0%	15	9	4.6%	37	18.9%	*	
Benton	16	0	0.0%	1	6.3%	20	2	12.5%	5	31.3%	0	0.0%
Big Stone	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	60	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Blue Earth	39	4	10.3%	0	0.0%	25	5	12.8%	11	28.2%	*	
Brown	8	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	12	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	*	
Carlton	14	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	23	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	*	
Carver	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	*	
Cass	52	6	11.5%	1	1.9%	26	8	15.4%	11	21.2%	0	0.0%
Chippewa	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chisago	16	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	14	1	6.3%	6	37.5%	*	
Clay	43	7	16.3%	1	2.3%	21	6	14.0%	15	34.9%	*	
Clearwater	13	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	17	1	7.7%	6	46.2%	0	0.0%
Cook	0	0		0		18	0		0		0	
Cottonwood	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Crow Wing	20	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	24	1	5.0%	6	30.0%	*	
Dakota	78	8	10.3%	1	1.3%	5	13	16.7%	23	29.5%	*	
Dodge	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Douglas	10	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	18	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%
Faribault	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
Fillmore	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%
Freeborn	20	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	19	2	10.0%	5	25.0%	0	0.0%
Goodhue	13	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	27	2	15.4%	4	30.8%	*	
Grant	4	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	24	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hennepin	716	47	6.6%	20	2.8%	14	120	16.8%	182	25.4%	48	6.7%
Houston	17	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	28	0	0.0%	8	47.1%	*	
Hubbard	11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
Isanti	19	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	27	3	15.8%	5	26.3%	0	0.0%

Table 19 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months		Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Itasca	38	3	7.9%	8	21.1%	27	9	23.7%	15	39.5%	*	
Jackson	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
Kanabec	7	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	17	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Kandiyohi	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	3	15.8%	6	31.6%	*	
Kittson	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Koochiching	18	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	26	4	22.2%	3	16.7%	*	
Lac Qui Parle	0	0		0		15	0		0		0	
Lake	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lake of the Woods	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Le Sueur	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%
Lincoln	0	0		0		21	0		0		0	
Lyon	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
McLeod	4	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	33	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	*	
Mahnomen	19	6	31.6%	3	15.8%	11	3	15.8%	5	26.3%	*	
Marshall	0	0		0		16	0		0		0	
Martin	6	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	31	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Meeker	4	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	15	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
Mille Lacs	11	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	19	1	9.1%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
Morrison	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
Mower	20	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	17	1	5.0%	7	35.0%	*	
Murray	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nicollet	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	1	5.9%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%
Nobles	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Norman	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	20	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	*	
Olmsted	45	3	6.7%	1	2.2%	20	6	13.3%	17	37.8%	*	
Otter Tail	19	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	27	3	15.8%	5	26.3%	0	0.0%
Pennington	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pine	26	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	31	3	11.5%	8	30.8%	*	
Pipestone	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Polk	23	4	17.4%	0	0.0%	31	1	4.3%	7	30.4%	*	

Table 19 – Page 3

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months		Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Pope	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Ramsey	963	68	7.1%	86	8.9%	24	153	15.9%	196	20.4%	49	5.1%
Red Lake	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Redwood	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	13	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
Renville	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	*	
Rice	21	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	14	0	0.0%	7	33.3%	*	
Rock	5	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	11	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
Roseau	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
St. Louis	125	9	7.2%	5	4.0%	26	24	19.2%	32	25.6%	*	
Scott	13	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	25	3	23.1%	4	30.8%	*	
Sherburne	21	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	24	4	19.0%	4	19.0%	0	0.0%
Sibley	8	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	15	1	12.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%
Stearns	51	3	5.9%	3	5.9%	19	6	11.8%	25	49.0%	8	15.7%
Steele	19	3	15.8%	0	0.0%	16	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	*	
Stevens	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Swift	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	*	
Todd	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%
Traverse	0	0		0		23	0		0		0	
Wabasha	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wadena	14	2	14.3%	1	7.1%	20	2	14.3%	4	28.6%	*	
Waseca	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	26	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	*	
Washington	42	5	11.9%	3	7.1%	20	7	16.7%	8	19.0%	*	
Watonwan	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Wilkin	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	*	
Winona	11	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	16	1	9.1%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
Wright	17	4	23.5%	2	11.8%	31	2	11.8%	6	35.3%	0	0.0%
Yellow Medicine	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%



Table 19 – Page 4

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Exemption, Exception, and Extended				Counted Months			New Cases in 2006			
		Exempt/Excepted		Extended Cases		Mean	Over 48 Months		Total		Out-of-State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Northwest	30	5	16.7%	0	0.0%	16	2	6.7%	8	26.7%	*	
West Central	453	147	32.5%	8	1.8%	19	41	9.1%	109	24.1%	10	2.2%
Northeast	205	15	7.3%	15	7.3%	25	39	19.0%	55	26.8%	8	3.9%
Central	203	14	6.9%	8	3.9%	20	27	13.3%	70	34.5%	12	5.9%
Southwest	35	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	20	3	8.6%	10	28.6%	*	
South Central	105	10	9.5%	1	1.0%	21	9	8.6%	29	27.6%	5	4.8%
Southeast	183	14	7.7%	2	1.1%	18	12	6.6%	56	30.6%	12	6.6%
Metro Suburban	288	23	8.0%	14	4.9%	23	48	16.7%	87	30.2%	14	4.9%
Core Metro	1,679	115	6.8%	106	6.3%	24	273	16.3%	378	22.5%	97	5.8%
Minnesota	3,181	345	10.8%	154	4.8%	23	454	14.3%	802	25.2%	162	5.1%

\* For cells with fewer than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect individual identities.

**Table 20. December 2006 Two-eligible-adult MFIP Cases Receiving Food-only Assistance, Budgeted Earnings, Working Adults, Earned Income, and Monthly Work Hours, by County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Welfare		Monthly Work and Income					
		Food-only MFIP		Budgeted Earnings		Working		Income	Work Hours
		Count	Percent	Count	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Mean
Aitkin	8	4	50.0%	6	\$549	6	75.0%	\$1,291	191
Anoka	137	31	22.6%	55	\$457	69	50.4%	\$991	128
Becker	31	5	16.1%	9	\$302	13	41.9%	\$1,087	145
Beltrami	196	31	15.8%	79	\$536	97	49.5%	\$1,138	136
Benton	16	3	18.8%	5	\$567	9	56.3%	\$1,156	128
Big Stone	1	1	100.0%	1	*	1	100.0%	*	*
Blue Earth	39	11	28.2%	31	\$642	32	82.1%	\$958	125
Brown	8	0	0.0%	4	*	6	75.0%	\$835	101
Carlton	14	5	35.7%	5	\$564	7	50.0%	\$1,084	126
Carver	2	1	50.0%	0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Cass	52	10	19.2%	19	\$449	21	40.4%	\$932	115
Chippewa	1	0	0.0%	0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Chisago	16	4	25.0%	9	\$482	9	56.3%	\$905	101
Clay	43	10	23.3%	22	\$507	27	62.8%	\$1,003	122
Clearwater	13	3	23.1%	5	\$605	4	30.8%	*	*
Cook	0	0		0	\$0	0		\$0	0
Cottonwood	4	3	75.0%	3	*	3	75.0%	*	*
Crow Wing	20	10	50.0%	15	\$412	15	75.0%	\$898	111
Dakota	78	19	24.4%	41	\$557	51	65.4%	\$1,331	143
Dodge	1	0	0.0%	1	*	1	100.0%	*	*
Douglas	10	4	40.0%	5	\$422	7	70.0%	\$808	84
Faribault	5	0	0.0%	3	*	4	80.0%	*	*
Fillmore	12	2	16.7%	5	\$417	4	33.3%	*	*
Freeborn	20	3	15.0%	12	\$454	16	80.0%	\$1,153	112
Goodhue	13	2	15.4%	7	\$441	8	61.5%	\$1,435	157
Grant	4	1	25.0%	2	*	1	25.0%	*	*
Hennepin	716	221	30.9%	362	\$667	415	58.0%	\$1,340	147
Houston	17	5	29.4%	13	\$509	16	94.1%	\$975	115
Hubbard	11	2	18.2%	6	\$503	6	54.5%	\$1,183	168
Isanti	19	4	21.1%	4	*	8	42.1%	\$1,513	145
Itasca	38	5	13.2%	13	\$420	21	55.3%	\$1,095	109
Jackson	3	0	0.0%	1	*	3	100.0%	*	*
Kanabec	7	2	28.6%	3	*	4	57.1%	*	*
Kandiyohi	19	7	36.8%	11	\$494	12	63.2%	\$843	100
Kittson	1	1	100.0%	0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Koochiching	18	2	11.1%	11	\$495	11	61.1%	\$1,075	134
Lac Qui Parle	0	0		0	\$0	0		\$0	0
Lake	2	0	0.0%	1	*	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Lake of the Woods	1	0	0.0%	1	*	1	100.0%	*	*
Le Sueur	12	4	33.3%	7	\$262	7	58.3%	\$546	84
Lincoln	0	0		0	\$0	0		\$0	0
Lyon	4	2	50.0%	2	*	2	50.0%	*	*
McLeod	4	1	25.0%	3	*	3	75.0%	*	*
Mahnomen	19	1	5.3%	3	*	7	36.8%	\$652	82
Marshall	0	0		0	\$0	0		\$0	0

Table 20 – Page 2

County/Region/ State	Number of Cases	Welfare		Monthly Work and Income					
		Food-only MFIP		Budgeted Earnings		Working		Income	Work Hours
		Count	Percent	Count	Mean	Count	Percent	Mean	Mean
Martin	6	1	16.7%	5	\$376	5	83.3%	\$806	89
Meeker	4	0	0.0%	2	*	3	75.0%	*	*
Mille Lacs	11	1	9.1%	6	\$401	6	54.5%	\$654	69
Morrison	6	0	0.0%	2	*	1	16.7%	*	*
Mower	20	6	30.0%	13	\$503	14	70.0%	\$1,170	141
Murray	1	1	100.0%	1	*	1	100.0%	*	*
Nicollet	17	7	41.2%	13	\$436	14	82.4%	\$1,121	106
Nobles	4	1	25.0%	4	*	4	100.0%	*	*
Norman	2	0	0.0%	0	\$0	1	50.0%	*	*
Olmsted	45	13	28.9%	22	\$525	30	66.7%	\$1,172	158
Otter Tail	19	6	31.6%	12	\$387	16	84.2%	\$1,085	115
Pennington	1	0	0.0%	0	\$0	1	100.0%	*	*
Pine	26	10	38.5%	10	\$403	17	65.4%	\$973	144
Pipestone	4	1	25.0%	4	*	3	75.0%	*	*
Polk	23	8	34.8%	12	\$688	17	73.9%	\$1,032	126
Pope	1	0	0.0%	0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	0
Ramsey	963	176	18.3%	424	\$662	490	50.9%	\$1,326	141
Red Lake	2	0	0.0%	1	*	0	0.0%	*	*
Redwood	2	0	0.0%	5	\$536	1	50.0%	*	*
Renville	8	3	37.5%	11	\$463	5	62.5%	\$1,055	128
Rice	21	4	19.0%	2	*	15	71.4%	\$1,895	186
Rock	5	2	40.0%	0	\$0	3	60.0%	*	*
Roseau	1	0	0.0%	67	\$449	0	0.0%	\$1,078	122
St. Louis	125	33	26.4%	6	\$520	82	65.6%	\$1,177	150
Scott	13	3	23.1%	7	\$176	7	53.8%	\$614	67
Sherburne	21	4	19.0%	1	*	10	47.6%	\$1,153	112
Sibley	8	1	12.5%	25	\$503	6	75.0%	\$1,049	109
Stearns	51	7	13.7%	10	\$598	32	62.7%	\$1,806	167
Steele	19	4	21.1%	2	*	11	57.9%	\$868	125
Stevens	1	0	0.0%	8	\$518	0	0.0%	\$1,110	129
Swift	4	0	0.0%	0	\$0	1	25.0%	*	*
Todd	10	1	10.0%	2	*	7	70.0%	\$1,642	105
Traverse	0	0		10	\$454	0		\$918	118
Wabasha	4	0	0.0%	3	*	2	50.0%	*	*
Wadena	14	5	35.7%	23	\$579	13	92.9%	\$1,483	148
Waseca	7	2	28.6%	2	*	3	42.9%	*	*
Washington	42	11	26.2%	2	*	27	64.3%	\$1,144	165
Watonwan	3	1	33.3%	9	\$751	2	66.7%	*	*
Wilkin	2	0	0.0%	9	\$421	2	100.0%	*	*
Winona	11	4	36.4%	2	*	10	90.9%	\$1,273	154
Wright	17	0	0.0%	1522	\$580	11	64.7%	\$1,220	136
Yellow Medicine	2	1	50.0%	0	\$0	2	100.0%	*	*
Northwest	30	9	30.0%	12	\$688	19	63.3%	\$1,005	123
West Central	453	89	19.6%	200	\$475	238	52.5%	\$1,047	127
Northeast	205	49	23.9%	103	\$460	127	62.0%	\$1,091	125
Central	203	42	20.7%	90	\$445	120	59.1%	\$1,046	117
Southwest	35	12	34.3%	23	\$526	24	68.6%	\$1,406	161
South Central	105	27	25.7%	69	\$506	79	75.2%	\$1,024	120
Southeast	183	43	23.5%	105	\$514	127	69.4%	\$1,206	138
Metro Suburban	288	69	24.0%	134	\$513	163	56.6%	\$1,182	135
Core Metro	1,679	397	23.6%	786	\$665	905	53.9%	\$1,333	144
Minnesota	3,181	737	23.2%	1,522	\$580	1,802	56.6%	\$1,220	136

\* For cells with fewer than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect private information.

**Table 21. December 2006 MFIP Two-eligible-adult Cases with Sanctions and Child Support Payments, by Large County and Region**

County/Region/ State	Sanctions		Child Support: Current Payments		
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Median
<b>Anoka</b>	9	6.6%	7	5.1%	\$258
<b>Beltrami</b>	7	3.6%	6	3.1%	\$306
<b>Dakota</b>	5	6.4%	6	7.7%	\$182
<b>Hennepin</b>	23	3.2%	16	2.2%	\$172
<b>Olmsted</b>	2	4.4%	5	11.1%	\$150
<b>Ramsey</b>	29	3.0%	22	2.3%	\$267
<b>St. Louis</b>	9	7.2%	6	4.8%	\$171
<b>Washington</b>	0	0.0%	2	4.8%	*
<b>All Other Counties</b>	62	7.1%	50	5.7%	\$189
<b>Northwest</b>	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	\$0
<b>West Central</b>	23	5.1%	22	4.9%	\$180
<b>Northeast</b>	13	6.3%	11	5.4%	\$160
<b>Central</b>	18	8.9%	10	4.9%	\$229
<b>Southwest</b>	0	0.0%	2	5.7%	*
<b>South Central</b>	9	8.6%	4	3.8%	*
<b>Southeast</b>	12	6.6%	16	8.7%	\$125
<b>Metro Suburban</b>	18	6.3%	17	5.9%	\$196
<b>Core Metro</b>	52	3.1%	38	2.3%	\$210
<b>Minnesota</b>	146	4.6%	120	3.8%	\$194

\* For cells with less than 5 cases, data have been removed to protect individual information.

This information is available in other forms to people with disabilities by contacting us at (651) 431-3936 (voice). TTY/TDD users can call the Minnesota Relay at 711 or (800) 627-3529. For the Speech-to-Speech Relay, call (877) 627-3848.