

# Bulletin

November 17, 2006

Minnesota Department of Human Services ■ P.O. Box 64962 ■ St. Paul, MN 55164-0962

**OF INTEREST TO**

- County Directors
- Financial Services Supervisors and Staff
- Tribal MFIP Directors and Staff

**ACTION**

No action needed.

**EXPIRATION DATE**

November 13, 2008

## Emergency Assistance to Families under MFIP

**TOPIC**

Share information with counties and tribes on emergency assistance spending before and after the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund.

**PURPOSE**

The 2003 Minnesota Legislature created the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Consolidated Fund. Under the new legislation, counties were no longer legally required to provide an Emergency Assistance program (EA). This report examines a snapshot comparison of EA expenditures in state fiscal year 2002 and calendar year 2005 to understand EA trends among counties after the legislative changes.

**CONTACT**

Paul H. Ramcharit, Administrative Planning Coordinator  
(651) 284-3315 or [paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us](mailto:paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us)

**SIGNED**

---

CHARLES E. JOHNSON

Assistant Commissioner

Children and Family Services Administration

**Special Needs**

This information is available in other forms to persons with disabilities by calling (651) 431-3809, or contact us through the Minnesota Relay Service at 1 (800) 627-3529 (TTY) or 1 (877) 627-3848 (speech-to-speech relay service).



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

## Emergency Assistance to Families under the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP)

\* \* \* \* \*

In 2003 the Minnesota Legislature created the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Consolidated Fund. Under the new legislation, counties were no longer legally required to provide emergency assistance (EA). The analysis examines county EA spending in relation to overall MFIP spending prior to and after the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund. Between July 1, 2003 and December 31, 2004, the Department moved from state fiscal year (SFY) to calendar year (CY) reporting for MFIP. Given this transition period and the availability of comparable data, this analysis was done using SFY 2002 and CY 2005 data. Tribal employment agencies are not required to provide EA, therefore, only county data is used for this report.

\* \* \* \* \*

**November 9, 2006**

For questions or inquiries on this report, contact:

Paul H. Ramcharit  
Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Community Partnerships Division  
P.O. Box 64962, St. Paul, MN 55164-0962  
(651) 431-3877  
[paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us](mailto:paul.ramcharit@state.mn.us)

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	3	
<b>Section I: Background</b>		
2003 Legislature Created Consolidated Funds .....	5	
Emergency Assistance .....	5	
<b>Section II: MFIP Expenditures Comparison</b>		
MFIP Expenditures in SFY 2002 and CY 2005 .....	7	
Emergency Assistance Expenditures in SFY 2002 and CY 2005 .....	9	
Factors Impacting County EA Spending .....	10	
Funding Levels .....	10	
Changes in Caseload .....	10	
MFIP Performance Measures .....	10	
Comparison of Budgeted to Expended EA Dollars .....	11	
<b>Section III: Conclusions and Observations</b> .....		13
Appendix 1: MFIP Expenditures for SFY 2002 and CY 2005 (dollars) .....	14	
Appendix 2: Percentage Distribution of MFIP Spending by Expenditure Cohorts.....	17	
Appendix 3: MFIP Expenditure Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005 .....	19	
Appendix 4: MFIP Caseloads in December 2002 and December 2005 .....	22	

## Summary

In 2003 the Minnesota Legislature integrated funds from ten MFIP self-sufficiency programs and related administrative costs, added funds and created the MFIP consolidated fund. With the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund, the emergency assistance (EA) program was repealed by the Legislature and counties were under no legal requirement to administer an EA program. This report provides an overview on county EA spending trends, given that they are no longer legally required to provide emergency assistance. For this analysis, a snapshot of state fiscal year 2002 (SFY) emergency assistance expenditures is compared with calendar year 2005 (CY).

The legislative changes in 2003 provided counties with greater flexibility to shift MFIP funds based on local MFIP priorities. Therefore, county EA expenditures should be examined under an array of factors, including the changing levels of funding and caseloads, local needs, policy changes, the greater focus in helping families transition to employment, and the incentives to achieve targeted performance on the Self-support Index and Work Participation Rates.

Key points and findings of this analysis are highlighted below:

- In 2005, counties were spending more MFIP funds on employment and other support services than in 2002. The implementation of the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) and the increased caseloads of employment services from universal participation contributed to the increase in employment and other support services expenditure. From 2002 to 2005 (statewide):
  - MFIP funds spent on employment and other support services increased 22 percent or \$10.6 million.
  - Funds spent on county administration decreased 15 percent or \$2.7 million. Eighty-nine percent of counties had lower administrative costs.
  - Funds spent on emergency assistance decreased 10 percent from \$21.6 million to \$19.4 million.
  - The proportion of MFIP funds spent on emergency assistance dropped to 21 percent from 25 percent.
- The number of counties addressing local EA needs remained fairly stable over the period, given the fact that they are no longer required by law to administer an EA program.
  - In 2002, all counties except one had emergency assistance expenditures. By 2005, all but four counties continued to administer EA.
- Some counties were spending more on EA in 2005 compared to 2002.
  - While most counties had a decrease in EA expenditures over the period, 24 counties (28 percent) were spending more on emergency assistance in 2005 than in 2002.

- Funding resources impact how a county prioritizes its overall needs and the amount it expends on EA services.
  - Among the 24 counties that were spending more on EA in 2005, nearly four-fifths (79.2 percent) had an increase in MFIP funding in 2005.
  - In counties with a decrease in EA expenditures over the period (n=63), 42.9 percent had a decrease in MFIP funding.
- Declining county caseloads have had some impact on the funding expended for assistance.
  - Between Dec. 2002 and Dec. 2005 the statewide MFIP caseload declined 13 percent, from 44,903 to 39,096. The majority of counties (n=79) had a decrease in caseloads ranging from 3 percent to 66 percent.
  - Counties (n=31) whose caseloads dropped more than a third (actual decreases of 33 percent to 66 percent) from 2002 to 2005 had an average *decrease* of 49 percent in emergency assistance expenditures. The rest of the counties (n=56) with smaller decreases or increases in caseloads, increased EA spending an average of 11 percent.
- Most of the emergency assistance expenditures were in the seven-county metropolitan area.
  - In 2002 the metro area accounted for 69 percent of MFIP expenditure, but 79 percent of emergency assistance spending. These proportions essentially remained the same in 2005; the metro area accounting for 70 percent of total MFIP expenditures, but 81 percent of total emergency assistance spending.
  - Twenty-four percent of the metro MFIP funds in 2005 were spent on emergency assistance compared to 13 percent in greater Minnesota.

## Section I: Background

### 2003 Legislature Created Consolidated Funds

In 2003, the Minnesota Legislature integrated several Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) funding streams and programs, added new funding and created the *MFIP Consolidated Fund*. The Legislature also integrated several social services funding streams and programs and created the *Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Consolidated Fund*. Both of these consolidated funds are administered by the Minnesota Department of Human Services using biennial service agreements with counties and tribes. The current service agreement is for the 2006-07 biennium.

Each county submits a joint MFIP/CCSA biennial service agreement that includes statements of needs, strategies for addressing identified needs, two calendar year budgets, and public input. The agreements also address the setting of targets for improving outcomes and strategies which support improvement in performance. Integrating the administrative process of the two consolidated funds not only simplifies the documentation process, but is also creating an opportunity for the Department and the counties to strategize about ways to integrate services for low income families and children. The creation of the MFIP Consolidated Funds gave counties greater flexibility to examine, prioritize and address local MFIP needs.

The MFIP consolidated funding model created a fundamental shift in the state and county/tribal relationship, focusing more on outcomes, particularly the measure of success in moving families to work and off assistance. MFIP measures include the Self-support Index and the Work Participation Rate. At the implementation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund, county/tribal allocations were based on their proportion of 2002 historic spending. Beginning calendar year 2006, initial allocations (excluding performance bonuses) were modified to include 90 percent of the county/tribe 2002 historic spending and 10 percent on adjusted caseload factor.<sup>1</sup>

### Emergency Assistance

With the creation of the consolidated fund, the Legislature repealed the Emergency Assistance Program effective July 1, 2003. Counties were no longer legally required to administer an Emergency Assistance Program; the commissioner of the Department of Human Services was no longer required to administer a compliance system for emergency assistance. However, current statutes require counties to inform applicants about resources available to meet emergency needs. Minnesota Statutes 256J.09, subdivision 10, states, “. . . The county must also inform applicants about resources available through the county or other agencies to meet short-term emergency needs.”

---

<sup>1</sup> For calendar year 2007 the initial allocation will be based on 70 percent of the county or tribe's 2002 historical spending and 30 percent on the county or tribe's adjusted caseload factor. For calendar year 2008 and beyond the initial allocation will be based on 50 percent of the county or tribe's 2002 historical spending and 50 percent on the county or tribe's adjusted caseload factor.

Counties determine what level of expenditure and what types of assistance they will provide to families in emergency situations. They also establish rules that govern local assistance. They are required to have written policies in place that govern the provision of short-term, non-recurring shelter and utility costs to families who are in crisis situations. County decisions on such assistance can be appealed and therefore, counties were advised to develop written policies. Details of the 2003 legislative changes and guidelines to counties and tribes were published in [Bulletin #03-11-01](#).

## Section II: MFIP Expenditures Comparison

This section gives a snapshot comparison of EA spending before and after the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund in 2003. State fiscal year 2002 data (July 1, 2001–June 30, 2002) was compared with calendar year 2005 data. Between July 2003 and December 2004 the Department moved from state fiscal year to calendar year reporting for MFIP. Given this transitional period and the availability of comparable data, SFY 2002 and CY 2005 seemed most appropriate for this comparison.

### MFIP Expenditures in SFY 2002 and CY 2005

In SFY 2002 counties spent 87.8 million of MFIP funding. These funds were spent in three primary areas: MFIP employment and support services (55 percent), emergency assistance (25 percent), and county administration (21 percent). In CY 2005 MFIP expenditures totaled 93.4 million, an increase of 6.4 percent or 5.7 million more than 2002.

During these two snapshot periods, county administration expenditures decreased by 15 percent (2.7 million), emergency assistance decreased by 10 percent (2.3 million), while employment and other support services increased by 22 percent, or 10.6 million. This increase in MFIP/DWP employment and other services was the most significant change between the two periods. A summary of this data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of SFY 2002 and CY 2005 MFIP Expenditures Statewide

Year	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP ES & other Support Services <sup>2</sup>	Total Net Expenses
<b>SFY 2002</b>				
	\$18,551,712	\$21,647,319	\$47,593,706	\$87,792,737
	21.1%	24.7%	55.3%	100.0%
<b>CY 2005</b>				
	\$15,834,204	\$19,393,137	\$58,222,133	\$93,449,474
	16.9%	20.8%	62.3%	100.0%
<b>Increase/Decrease</b>				
	-\$2,717,508	-\$2,254,182	\$10,628,428	\$5,656,738
	-14.6%	-10.4%	22.3%	6.4%

<sup>2</sup> Calendar year 2002 MFIP ES and Other Support Services expenditures include MFIP Employment Services, MFIP Bilingual Services, MFIP Functional Work Literacy, and Supported Work Programs. The 2005 MFIP ES and other Support Services expenditures include the Diversionary Work Program (DWP) expenditures. The 2000 Legislature provided social service funding for the “hard to employ” MFIP population in the form of Local Intervention Grants for Self-Sufficiency (LIGSS). LIGSS was operated as a separate program until it ended June 30, 2003 with the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund. In SFY 2002, counties and tribes expended 14.7 million under the LIGSS program. LIGSS expenditures were not included in this analysis.

The overall increase in employment and other support services spending is not surprising given the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) emphasis in helping participants to obtain employment and the financial incentives in place to achieve targeted performance on the Self-support Index and the Work Participation Rates. In addition, as footnoted earlier, Local Intervention Grants for Self-Sufficiency (LIGSS) targeting the “hard to employ” MFIP participants ended with the creation of the MFIP Consolidated Fund. Subsequently, counties and tribes used employment and other support services dollars to continue needed services to these participants with the sunset of LIGSS in 2003.

Sixty-nine percent of statewide MFIP funds were spent in the seven-county metro area in 2002. This increased slightly to 70 percent in 2005. In 2002, while both the seven-county metro area and greater Minnesota were spending about a fifth of their funding on county administration, greater Minnesota was spending nearly two-thirds (64 percent) of their funding on MFIP employment and other support services compared to one half (50 percent) in the seven-county metro area. These proportions changed by 2005 as the seven-county metro area increased their MFIP employment and other support services expenditures to 58 percent. A comparison of the seven-county metro and greater Minnesota expenditures is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: SFY 2002 and CY 2005 MFIP Expenditures for the Seven-County Metro and Greater Minnesota

Category	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP ES & Other Support Services	Total Net Expenses
<b>State Fiscal Year 2002</b>				
Seven-County Metro	\$13,234,066	\$17,105,675	\$30,054,340	\$60,394,081
	21.9%	28.3%	49.8%	100.0%
Greater Minnesota	5,317,646	4,541,644	17,539,366	27,398,656
	19.4%	16.6%	64.0%	100.0%
All Counties	18,551,712	21,647,319	47,593,706	87,792,737
	21.1%	24.7%	54.2%	100.0%
<b>Calendar Year 2005</b>				
Seven-County Metro	\$11,444,889	\$15,780,231	\$38,039,923	\$65,265,043
	17.5%	24.2%	58.3%	100.0%
Greater Minnesota	4,389,315	3,612,907	20,182,210	28,184,432
	15.6%	12.8%	71.6%	100.0%
All Counties	15,834,204	19,393,137	58,222,133	93,449,474
	16.9%	20.8%	62.3%	100.0%
<b>Increase/Decrease</b>				
Seven-County Metro	<b>\$-1,789,177</b>	<b>\$-1,325,444</b>	<b>\$7,985,583</b>	<b>\$4,870,962</b>
	<b>-13.5%</b>	<b>-7.7%</b>	<b>26.6%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
Greater Minnesota	<b>-928,331</b>	<b>-928,738</b>	<b>2,642,845</b>	<b>785,776</b>
	<b>-17.5%</b>	<b>-20.4%</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>
All Counties	<b>-2,717,508</b>	<b>-2,254,182</b>	<b>10,628,428</b>	<b>5,656,738</b>
	<b>-14.6%</b>	<b>-10.4%</b>	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>

### Emergency Assistance Expenditures in SFY 2002 and CY 2005

In SFY 2002 all counties except one had emergency assistance expenditures. The average proportion of MFIP funds expended on emergency assistance among individual counties was 15.5 percent, ranging from 1 percent to 37 percent.

In CY 2005 all but four counties continued to expend funds on emergency assistance; the average proportion of MFIP funds expended on emergency assistance among individual counties was 11.2 percent, ranging from less than one 1 percent to 30 percent. The proportion of MFIP funds spent on EA by counties in SFY 2002 and CY 2005 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Proportion of MFIP Dollars Spent on EA by the Number and Percent of Counties

Percentage of Funds Spent on Emergency Assistance (cohorts)	SFY 2002		CY 2005	
	Number and Percent of Counties		Number and Percent of Counties	
No Emergency Assistance	1	1%	<sup>3</sup> 4	5%
1% – 9%	21	24%	39	45%
10% – 19%	39	45%	31	36%
20 – 29%	19	22%	13	15%
30% +	7	8%	0	0%
Total	87	100%	87	100%

Statewide, emergency assistance spending decreased 10.4 percent from 2002 to 2005. The majority of counties (n=63 or 72 percent) had a decrease while 24 counties (28 percent) had an increase. Changes in EA spending from 2002 to 2005 are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Changes in Emergency Assistance Spending from 2002 to 2005

Percentage Increase/Decrease	Counties	Percent
<b>Increase</b>		
1%-24%	15	17.2%
25%-49%	1	1.1%
50%-74%	4	4.6%
75%+	4	4.6%
Total	24	27.6%
<b>Decrease</b>		
1%-24%	18	20.7%
25%-49%	22	25.3%
50%-74%	13	14.9%
75% +	10	11.5%
Total	63	72.4%

As show in Table 2, greater Minnesota had the largest decrease in EA spending (20 percent) compared to 8 percent in the metro area.

<sup>3</sup> Three of these four counties had an EA program but did not expend EA dollars.

### **Factors Impacting County EA Spending**

The extent to which a county administers emergency assistance is dependent on several factors, including the county's MFIP priorities, changing caseloads, performance on achieving MFIP outcomes, and the availability of funds that can be designated for emergency assistance. Changes in the nature and number of requests for emergency assistance over time may also impact emergency assistance spending. While no statistics are available on the latter factor, some of the preceding factors are analyzed below.

### **Funding Levels**

Counties that increased spending on EA in 2005 were likely to have had an increase in overall MFIP funding. Among the 24 counties with increased EA spending, four-fifths (79.2 percent) had an increase in overall MFIP funding. For the 63 counties with a decrease in EA expenditure, 42.9 percent had a decrease in MFIP funding over this period.

### **Changes in Caseload**

Counties with more acute decreases in caseloads between 2002 and 2005 tended to have the largest decreases in EA spending over the same period. Among counties (n=31) that had their caseloads decreased by more than a third between 2002 and 2005, the average percentage change in EA spending was -49.4 percent. Among the remaining counties (n=56) with smaller decreases or increases in caseloads, the average change in EA spending between 2002 and 2005 was +10.5 percent. Changes in caseload by county are presented in Appendix 4.

### **MFIP Performance Measures**

After 2002, the Self-support Index and MFIP Work Participation Rate were implemented as the two primary measures to encourage, maintain, and reward high performance in MFIP. The Self-support Index tracks eligible MFIP adults in a past quarter to determine whether they were working 30 or more hours per week or were no longer receiving a cash payment at follow-up points of one year, two years and three years. The MFIP Work Participation Rate is the percentage of participants in a given month who were fully engaged in work or work-related activity requirements. In 2005 counties and tribes could increase their MFIP allocation up to a maximum of 102.5 percent of their Consolidated Fund funding base. Up to 5 percent of a county's or tribal provider's funding base could be earned by performance on the three-year Self-support Index, and 2.5 percent of the base could be earned by performance achievement on the Work Participation Rate.

With financial incentives tied to performance, counties have the flexibility to allocate and spend funds based on local MFIP needs and priorities. Based on these factors, a county may decide to increase or decrease their EA spending. Performance and incentive policy changes after 2002 would explain some of the changes in EA spending as the two snapshot periods were compared.

Counties with the largest decreases in EA spending were spending more on employment and other support services. Counties with decreases of 75 percent or more in EA spending between 2002 and 2005 (n=10) had an average employment and other support services

expenditure increase of 35 percent compared to counties with an increase in their EA spending (n=24) with an average increase of 13 percent. A summary of other cohorts is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Change in EA Spending from SFY 2002 to CY 2005 with Corresponding Change in Employment and Other Support Services Spending within Cohorts

<b>Change in EA Spending by percentage cohorts</b>	<b>Counties</b>	<b>Average change in Employment and Other Support Services Spending</b>
<i>Decrease</i> 75-100%	10	34.6%
50-74%	13	15.3%
25-49%	22	18.5%
1-24%	18	18.6%
<i>Increase</i> 1% or more	24	12.6%

Appendices 1, 2 and 3 provide county-level data on MFIP expenditures for SFY 2002 and CY 2005 and changes between the two periods.

Click on [Self-support Index](#)<sup>4</sup> and the [MFIP Work Participation Rate](#)<sup>5</sup> for more details. Statistics on county performance on MFIP measures are reported in the quarterly [MFIP Management Indicators Report](#).<sup>6</sup>

### **Comparison of Budgeted to Expended EA Dollars**

While counties are no longer required by law to administer emergency assistance as a result of the 2003 legislative changes, the vast majority continue to budget funds for this purpose. In the 2004-05 Biennial Service Agreements submitted to the Department, all counties except for one had a budget for emergency assistance for CY 2005. More than a fifth (21.0 percent) of MFIP county allocations was budgeted for emergency assistance.<sup>7</sup> Individual county budgets for emergency assistance ranged from two to 38 percent of total county allocations. Most of the emergency assistance funds were budgeted and expended in the seven-county metro area. For CY 2005, while the metro area accounted for 68 percent of MFIP allocations, they had 79 percent of total funds budgeted for emergency assistance. In actual expenditures, the metro area accounted for 70 percent of total MFIP expenditures, but 81 percent of EA spending. A summary of county 2005 EA budget and a comparison to the actual expenditures for the metro and greater Minnesota is summarized in Table 6.

<sup>4</sup> <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DHS-4064O-ENG>

<sup>5</sup> <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DM-0157J-ENG>

<sup>6</sup> <http://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfserver/Legacy/DHS-4042A-ENG>

<sup>7</sup> In CY 2006, 20.9 percent of county allocations were budgeted for emergency assistance.

Table 6: A Comparison of Emergency Assistance Budgeted Allocations to Expenditure for CY 2005

<b>CY 2005 Budgeted Allocations</b>				
<b>Category</b>	<b>Emergency Assistance</b>			<b>Total MFIP Allocation</b>
	<b>Average Allocation Budgeted for EA</b>	<b>Percentage Range</b>	<b>Dollars Budgeted for EA</b>	
All Counties	13.8%	2% - 38%	\$22,568,563	\$107,410,735
Seven-County Metro	19.9%	10% - 26%	\$17,568,563	\$73,126,872
Greater Minnesota	13.3%	2% - 38%	\$4,804,761	\$34,283,863
<b>CY 2005 Expenditures</b>				
	<b>Average EA Expenditure</b>	<b>Percentage Range</b>	<b>Dollars Spent on EA</b>	<b>Total MFIP Payments</b>
All Counties	11.2%	1% - 29%	\$19,393,137	\$93,449,474
Seven-County Metro	24.2%	4% - 30%	\$15,780,231	\$65,265,043
Greater Minnesota	12.8%	0% - 29%	\$3,612,907	\$28,184,432

## Section III: Conclusions and Observations

With a greater focus in the past few years on MFIP outcomes and the bonus funding tied to targeted performance on the MFIP Self-support Index and Work Participation Rates, counties are shifting more funds to employment and other support services to help families prepare for and transition to employment. In addition, more than a third of counties had seen a decrease in the amount of MFIP funds allocated to their counties from 2002 to 2005. Further, with shrinking funding, counties are prompted to prioritize their local needs and shift limited funds accordingly.

These conditions and decisions have prompted counties to spend less on administrative costs and emergency assistance. And while a majority of counties (63) spent less on EA in 2005 than in 2002, data showed that nearly all counties continued to budget for and expend funding for emergency assistance. Data also revealed that some counties (24) were spending more on EA in 2005 than they did in 2002.

Because counties were spending more on MFIP employment, DWP and other supportive services, does not necessarily equate to a direct reduction in the amount of funding a county can allocate and spend on emergency assistance. Other factors such as the reductions in administrative spending and caseloads may also be contributing to the changes in EA spending.

Among the 63 counties with decreases in EA spending from 2002 to 2005, more than a third of these counties (23) had decreases of 50 percent or more. However, no data or information is currently available to understand the impact of these significant decreases in addressing local emergency needs. Further research is needed to understand how policy changes, including funding decreases and reductions in caseloads are impacting local emergency needs. For counties with large decreases in EA spending, a greater understanding of county-level EA policies and any impact that it may have on the behavior of participants on whether or not to apply for EA may be useful.

Finally, for calendar year 2005, 88 percent of statewide MFIP allocations were spent. The proportion of allocation spent ranged from 52 percent to 100 percent across counties. With better monitoring of MFIP spending during the year, counties with unspent funds can better leverage and maximize the use of their MFIP allocations. This may lead to more positive results for families especially if there are legitimate emergency needs that go unaddressed.

# Appendix 1

## MFIP Expenditures (dollars) for SFY 2002 and CY 2005

County	CY 2005				SFY 2002 (Jul 2001 - Jun 2002)			
	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES/DWP & Other Services	Total Net Expenses	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES & Other Services	Total Net Expenses
Aitkin	34,303	36,474	169,793	240,570	46,203	35,021	143,715	224,939
Anoka	853,082	772,432	2,541,246	4,166,760	989,867	805,928	1,970,541	3,766,336
Becker	60,511	63,492	286,033	410,036	73,152	109,965	309,318	492,435
Beltrami	106,583	173,936	671,778	952,297	134,086	228,165	600,401	962,652
Benton	62,073	52,350	306,831	421,254	88,772	109,847	217,999	416,618
Big Stone	17,285	1,029	52,283	70,597	24,712	4,331	39,007	68,050
Blue Earth	89,547	67,967	563,806	721,320	107,548	122,871	428,273	658,692
Brown	50,045	40,725	161,928	252,698	47,047	65,493	134,960	247,500
Carlton	80,665	76,190	276,086	432,941	99,595	45,316	272,425	417,336
Carver	77,641	16,617	229,631	323,889	67,092	81,141	153,194	301,427
Cass	62,513	23,965	303,797	390,275	83,646	44,515	247,135	375,296
Chippewa	33,246	356	108,112	141,714	49,416	14,194	70,004	133,614
Chisago	68,992	135,176	324,607	528,775	73,886	130,512	228,114	432,512
Clay	82,325	221,811	741,511	1,045,647	115,071	210,291	732,918	1,058,280
Clearwater	37,214	48,691	139,961	225,866	45,894	44,563	124,667	215,124
Cook	9,972	500	10,393	20,865	14,093	747	8,000	22,840
Cottonwood	25,973	27,414	77,919	131,306	34,120	12,591	70,589	117,300
Crow Wing	118,970	70,429	530,837	720,236	152,056	79,998	462,951	695,005
Dakota	910,110	1,082,994	1,657,942	3,651,046	807,190	961,879	1,438,783	3,207,852
Dodge	20,515	26,521	99,442	146,478	23,822	44,828	64,661	133,311
Douglas	66,927	66,053	152,996	285,976	73,733	5,614	160,625	239,972
Faribault/Martin	65,541	21,519	327,036	414,096	95,616	41,829	257,906	395,351
Fillmore	29,017	34,682	112,048	175,747	39,476	45,677	89,338	174,491
Freeborn	94,711	28,820	425,280	548,811	87,460	32,653	313,216	433,329
Goodhue	49,666	13,204	213,571	276,441	56,367	17,349	174,915	248,631
Grant	18,025	0	51,358	69,383	20,285	7,281	35,661	63,227
Hennepin	5,299,968	8,761,876	20,612,375	34,674,219	7,303,810	9,931,487	15,660,945	32,896,242
Houston	22,442	17,908	98,909	139,259	26,959	28,329	76,820	132,108
Hubbard	36,907	32,983	186,747	256,637	42,847	32,400	161,745	236,992
Isanti	59,047	139,375	360,576	558,998	83,212	158,415	219,962	461,589

## MFIP Expenditures (dollars) for SFY 2002 and CY 2005 (cont'd)

County	CY 2005				SFY 2002 (Jul 2001 - Jun 2002)			
	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES/DWP & Other Services	Total Net Expenses	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES & Other Services	Total Net Expenses
Itasca	90,495	19,044	403,744	513,283	118,616	35,761	417,153	571,530
Jackson	20,660	14,445	71,240	106,345	25,240	8,850	54,308	88,398
Kanabec	42,834	19,560	137,630	200,024	48,216	40,748	115,124	204,088
Kandiyohi	84,850	57,529	590,179	732,558	100,651	72,681	487,205	660,537
Kittson	10,618	0	49,131	59,749	11,933	6,151	33,620	51,704
Koochiching	33,433	17,339	150,553	201,325	45,877	11,256	144,934	202,067
Lac qui Parle	16,150	0	39,094	55,244	19,642	723	28,542	48,907
Lake	23,536	16,757	61,746	102,039	31,911	19,681	57,243	108,835
Lake of the Woods	9,533	1,406	21,356	32,295	13,330	2,137	25,419	40,886
LeSueur	26,924	21,929	202,496	251,349	50,176	34,371	117,191	201,738
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	81,986	35,638	213,264	330,888	111,651	40,301	186,134	338,086
Mahnomen	47,615	5,822	35,115	88,552	25,957	13,511	48,865	88,333
Marshall	24,798	2,364	58,197	85,359	29,322	3,565	51,706	84,593
McLeod	39,970	34,675	173,498	248,143	49,056	68,148	164,439	281,643
Meeker	33,364	26,043	125,298	184,705	38,411	58,248	114,472	211,131
Mille Lacs	47,015	42,251	264,358	353,624	59,625	78,589	203,458	341,672
Morrison	83,022	3,934	231,642	318,598	96,806	19,137	157,892	273,835
Mower	69,019	42,530	354,385	465,934	79,612	58,764	380,133	518,509
Nicollet	44,582	59,748	283,292	387,622	49,681	92,349	193,032	335,062
Nobles	46,590	10,740	200,243	257,573	50,127	8,552	188,222	246,902
Norman	16,000	2,731	67,061	85,792	24,355	6,219	54,734	85,308
Olmsted	217,790	152,106	1,356,873	1,726,769	217,037	382,673	975,341	1,575,051
Otter Tail	141,121	58,202	354,709	554,032	139,592	76,041	361,633	577,266
Pennington	28,093	2,137	96,266	126,496	27,862	8,559	107,069	143,490
Pine	45,254	44,329	271,613	361,196	60,975	75,596	304,605	441,176
Pipestone	24,091	12,873	92,367	129,331	26,381	12,303	51,435	90,119
Polk	87,218	20,194	532,162	639,574	108,566	66,435	551,365	726,366
Pope	22,598	12,000	38,453	73,051	27,621	5,491	32,085	65,197
Ramsey	3,785,410	4,940,022	11,478,683	20,204,115	3,627,253	4,602,395	9,842,865	18,072,513
Red Lake	13,238	819	15,639	29,696	20,284	0	27,550	47,834

### MFIP Expenditures (dollars) for SFY 2002 and CY 2005 (cont'd)

County	CY 2005				SFY 2002 (Jul 2001 - Jun 2002)			
	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES/DWP & Other Services	Total Net Expenses	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES & Other Services	Total Net Expenses
Redwood	25,533	12,527	103,184	141,244	30,958	14,253	92,194	137,405
Renville	43,042	77,550	150,662	271,254	54,324	69,382	143,695	267,401
Rice	71,206	13,806	422,525	507,537	85,702	54,861	322,903	463,466
Rock	25,247	5,064	30,408	60,719	28,643	5,085	31,166	64,894
Roseau	22,555	0	37,232	59,787	26,555	1,006	44,800	72,361
Scott	81,289	17,574	342,115	440,978	99,576	91,917	242,266	433,759
Sherburne	95,452	98,537	241,817	435,806	98,280	82,368	251,342	431,990
Sibley	22,694	12,213	98,180	133,087	25,834	21,828	79,799	127,461
St Louis	466,884	584,316	3,154,223	4,205,423	738,567	476,155	2,667,052	3,881,774
Stearns	208,125	343,891	750,766	1,302,782	134,878	301,799	747,391	1,184,068
Steele	57,615	29,711	302,033	389,359	59,271	54,686	295,402	409,359
Stevens	13,685	1,680	53,343	68,708	23,729	1,981	45,803	71,513
Swift	27,536	7,079	54,898	89,513	34,245	20,791	51,190	106,226
Todd	53,590	28,443	199,347	281,380	65,970	28,818	209,285	304,073
Traverse	17,785	9,198	36,537	63,520	23,208	8,585	33,378	65,171
Wabasha	24,427	22,559	102,775	149,761	28,919	13,051	75,161	117,131
Wadena	44,186	17,493	166,790	228,469	50,094	32,383	163,049	245,526
Waseca	31,201	17,573	199,898	248,672	46,490	34,722	161,180	242,392
Washington	437,389	188,716	1,177,931	1,804,036	339,278	630,929	745,746	1,715,953
Watsonwan	38,900	3,322	76,601	118,823	44,706	8,713	78,785	132,204
Wilkin	11,463	24,760	77,195	113,418	16,113	20,402	76,834	113,349
Winona	83,881	64,760	278,532	427,173	98,666	56,564	253,967	409,197
Wright	100,767	75,038	349,517	525,322	122,842	245,188	391,245	759,275
Yellow Medicine	28,129	4,675	50,505	83,309	32,065	9,387	43,509	84,961
State	\$ 15,834,204	\$ 19,393,137	\$ 58,222,133	\$ 93,449,474	\$ 18,551,712	\$ 21,647,319	\$ 47,593,706	\$ 87,792,737

## Appendix 2

### Percentage Distribution of County MFIP Spending by Expenditure Cohorts SFY 2002 and CY 2005

County	CY 2005				SFY 2002 (Jul 2001 - Jun 2002)			
	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES DWP & Other Services	Total Net Expenses	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES and Other Services	Total Net Expenses
Aitkin	14.3%	15.2%	70.6%	100.0%	20.5%	15.6%	63.9%	100.0%
Anoka	20.5%	18.5%	61.0%	100.0%	26.3%	21.4%	52.3%	100.0%
Becker	14.8%	15.5%	69.8%	100.0%	14.9%	22.3%	62.8%	100.0%
Beltrami	11.2%	18.3%	70.5%	100.0%	13.9%	23.7%	62.4%	100.0%
Benton	14.7%	12.4%	72.8%	100.0%	21.3%	26.4%	52.3%	100.0%
Big Stone	24.5%	1.5%	74.1%	100.0%	36.3%	6.4%	57.3%	100.0%
Blue Earth	12.4%	9.4%	78.2%	100.0%	16.3%	18.7%	65.0%	100.0%
Brown	19.8%	16.1%	64.1%	100.0%	19.0%	26.5%	54.5%	100.0%
Carlton	18.6%	17.6%	63.8%	100.0%	23.9%	10.9%	65.3%	100.0%
Carver	24.0%	5.1%	70.9%	100.0%	22.3%	26.9%	50.8%	100.0%
Cass	16.0%	6.1%	77.8%	100.0%	22.3%	11.9%	65.9%	100.0%
Chippewa	23.5%	0.3%	76.3%	100.0%	37.0%	10.6%	52.4%	100.0%
Chisago	13.0%	25.6%	61.4%	100.0%	17.1%	30.2%	52.7%	100.0%
Clay	7.9%	21.2%	70.9%	100.0%	10.9%	19.9%	69.3%	100.0%
Clearwater	16.5%	21.6%	62.0%	100.0%	21.3%	20.7%	58.0%	100.0%
Cook	47.8%	2.4%	49.8%	100.0%	61.7%	3.3%	35.0%	100.0%
Cottonwood	19.8%	20.9%	59.3%	100.0%	29.1%	10.7%	60.2%	100.0%
Crow Wing	16.5%	9.8%	73.7%	100.0%	21.9%	11.5%	66.6%	100.0%
Dakota	24.9%	29.7%	45.4%	100.0%	25.2%	30.0%	44.9%	100.0%
Dodge	14.0%	18.1%	67.9%	100.0%	17.9%	33.6%	48.5%	100.0%
Douglas	23.4%	23.1%	53.5%	100.0%	30.7%	2.3%	66.9%	100.0%
Faribault/Martin	15.8%	5.2%	79.0%	100.0%	24.2%	10.6%	65.2%	100.0%
Fillmore	16.5%	19.7%	63.8%	100.0%	22.6%	26.2%	51.2%	100.0%
Freeborn	17.3%	5.3%	77.5%	100.0%	20.2%	7.5%	72.3%	100.0%
Goodhue	18.0%	4.8%	77.3%	100.0%	22.7%	7.0%	70.4%	100.0%
Grant	26.0%	0.0%	74.0%	100.0%	32.1%	11.5%	56.4%	100.0%
Hennepin	15.3%	25.3%	59.4%	100.0%	22.2%	30.2%	47.6%	100.0%
Houston	16.1%	12.9%	71.0%	100.0%	20.4%	21.4%	58.1%	100.0%
Hubbard	14.4%	12.9%	72.8%	100.0%	18.1%	13.7%	68.2%	100.0%
Isanti	10.6%	24.9%	64.5%	100.0%	18.0%	34.3%	47.7%	100.0%
Itasca	17.6%	3.7%	78.7%	100.0%	20.8%	6.3%	73.0%	100.0%
Jackson	19.4%	13.6%	67.0%	100.0%	28.6%	10.0%	61.4%	100.0%
Kanabec	21.4%	9.8%	68.8%	100.0%	23.6%	20.0%	56.4%	100.0%
Kandiyohi	11.6%	7.9%	80.6%	100.0%	15.2%	11.0%	73.8%	100.0%
Kittson	17.8%	0.0%	82.2%	100.0%	23.1%	11.9%	65.0%	100.0%
Koochiching	16.6%	8.6%	74.8%	100.0%	22.7%	5.6%	71.7%	100.0%
Lac qui Parle	29.2%	0.0%	70.8%	100.0%	40.2%	1.5%	58.4%	100.0%
Lake	23.1%	16.4%	60.5%	100.0%	29.3%	18.1%	52.6%	100.0%
Lake of the Woods	29.5%	4.4%	66.1%	100.0%	32.6%	5.2%	62.2%	100.0%
LeSueur	10.7%	8.7%	80.6%	100.0%	24.9%	17.0%	58.1%	100.0%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	24.8%	10.8%	64.5%	100.0%	33.0%	11.9%	55.1%	100.0%
Mahnomen	53.8%	6.6%	39.7%	100.0%	29.4%	15.3%	55.3%	100.0%
Marshall	29.1%	2.8%	68.2%	100.0%	34.7%	4.2%	61.1%	100.0%
McLeod	16.1%	14.0%	69.9%	100.0%	17.4%	24.2%	58.4%	100.0%
Meeker	18.1%	14.1%	67.8%	100.0%	18.2%	27.6%	54.2%	100.0%
Mille Lacs	13.3%	11.9%	74.8%	100.0%	17.5%	23.0%	59.5%	100.0%
Morrison	26.1%	1.2%	72.7%	100.0%	35.4%	7.0%	57.7%	100.0%
Mower	14.8%	9.1%	76.1%	100.0%	15.4%	11.3%	73.3%	100.0%
Nicollet	11.5%	15.4%	73.1%	100.0%	14.8%	27.6%	57.6%	100.0%
Nobles	18.1%	4.2%	77.7%	100.0%	20.3%	3.5%	76.2%	100.0%
Norman	18.6%	3.2%	78.2%	100.0%	28.5%	7.3%	64.2%	100.0%
Olmsted	12.6%	8.8%	78.6%	100.0%	13.8%	24.3%	61.9%	100.0%
Otter Tail	25.5%	10.5%	64.0%	100.0%	24.2%	13.2%	62.6%	100.0%

**Percentage Distribution of County MFIP Spending by Expenditure Cohorts**  
**SFY 2002 and CY 2005 (cont'd)**

County	CY 2005				SFY 2002 (Jul 2001 - Jun 2002)			
	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES DWP & Other Services	Total Net Expenses	County Administration	Emergency Assistance	MFIP-ES and Other Services	Total Net Expenses
Pennington	22.2%	1.7%	76.1%	100.0%	19.4%	6.0%	74.6%	100.0%
Pine	12.5%	12.3%	75.2%	100.0%	13.8%	17.1%	69.0%	100.0%
Pipestone	18.6%	10.0%	71.4%	100.0%	29.3%	13.7%	57.1%	100.0%
Polk	13.6%	3.2%	83.2%	100.0%	14.9%	9.1%	75.9%	100.0%
Pope	30.9%	16.4%	52.6%	100.0%	42.4%	8.4%	49.2%	100.0%
Ramsey	18.7%	24.5%	56.8%	100.0%	20.1%	25.5%	54.5%	100.0%
Red Lake	44.6%	2.8%	52.7%	100.0%	42.4%	0.0%	57.6%	100.0%
Redwood	18.1%	8.9%	73.1%	100.0%	22.5%	10.4%	67.1%	100.0%
Renville	15.9%	28.6%	55.5%	100.0%	20.3%	25.9%	53.7%	100.0%
Rice	14.0%	2.7%	83.3%	100.0%	18.5%	11.8%	69.7%	100.0%
Rock	41.6%	8.3%	50.1%	100.0%	44.1%	7.8%	48.0%	100.0%
Roseau	37.7%	0.0%	62.3%	100.0%	36.7%	1.4%	61.9%	100.0%
Scott	18.4%	4.0%	77.6%	100.0%	23.0%	21.2%	55.9%	100.0%
Sherburne	21.9%	22.6%	55.5%	100.0%	22.8%	19.1%	58.2%	100.0%
Sibley	17.1%	9.2%	73.8%	100.0%	20.3%	17.1%	62.6%	100.0%
St Louis	11.1%	13.9%	75.0%	100.0%	19.0%	12.3%	68.7%	100.0%
Stearns	16.0%	26.4%	57.6%	100.0%	11.4%	25.5%	63.1%	100.0%
Steele	14.8%	7.6%	77.6%	100.0%	14.5%	13.4%	72.2%	100.0%
Stevens	19.9%	2.4%	77.6%	100.0%	33.2%	2.8%	64.0%	100.0%
Swift	30.8%	7.9%	61.3%	100.0%	32.2%	19.6%	48.2%	100.0%
Todd	19.0%	10.1%	70.8%	100.0%	21.7%	9.5%	68.8%	100.0%
Traverse	28.0%	14.5%	57.5%	100.0%	35.6%	13.2%	51.2%	100.0%
Wabasha	16.3%	15.1%	68.6%	100.0%	24.7%	11.1%	64.2%	100.0%
Wadena	19.3%	7.7%	73.0%	100.0%	20.4%	13.2%	66.4%	100.0%
Waseca	12.5%	7.1%	80.4%	100.0%	19.2%	14.3%	66.5%	100.0%
Washington	24.2%	10.5%	65.3%	100.0%	19.8%	36.8%	43.5%	100.0%
Watsonwan	32.7%	2.8%	64.5%	100.0%	33.8%	6.6%	59.6%	100.0%
Wilkin	10.1%	21.8%	68.1%	100.0%	14.2%	18.0%	67.8%	100.0%
Winona	19.6%	15.2%	65.2%	100.0%	24.1%	13.8%	62.1%	100.0%
Wright	19.2%	14.3%	66.5%	100.0%	16.2%	32.3%	51.5%	100.0%
Yellow Medicine	33.8%	5.6%	60.6%	100.0%	37.7%	11.0%	51.2%	100.0%
State	16.9%	20.8%	62.3%	100.0%	21.1%	24.7%	54.2%	100.0%

## Appendix 3

### MFIP Expenditure Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005

County	Dollar and Percentage Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005							
	County Administration		Emergency Assistance		MFIP-ES and Other Services		Total Grant Net Expenses	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
Aitkin	-11,900	-25.8%	1,453	4.1%	26,078	18.1%	15,631	6.9%
Anoka	-136,785	-13.8%	-33,496	-4.2%	570,705	29.0%	400,424	10.6%
Becker	-12,641	-17.3%	-46,473	-42.3%	-23,285	-7.5%	-82,399	-16.7%
Beltrami	-27,503	-20.5%	-54,229	-23.8%	71,377	11.9%	-10,355	-1.1%
Benton	-26,699	-30.1%	-57,498	-52.3%	88,832	40.7%	4,635	1.1%
Big Stone	-7,427	-30.1%	-3,302	-76.2%	13,276	34.0%	2,547	3.7%
Blue Earth	-18,001	-16.7%	-54,904	-44.7%	135,533	31.6%	62,628	9.5%
Brown	2,998	6.4%	-24,768	-37.8%	26,968	20.0%	5,198	2.1%
Carlton	-18,930	-19.0%	30,874	68.1%	3,661	1.3%	15,605	3.7%
Carver	10,549	15.7%	-64,525	-79.5%	76,437	49.9%	22,461	7.5%
Cass	-21,133	-25.3%	-20,550	-46.2%	56,662	22.9%	14,979	4.0%
Chippewa	-16,170	-32.7%	-13,838	-97.5%	38,108	54.4%	8,100	6.1%
Chisago	-4,894	-6.6%	4,663	3.6%	96,493	42.3%	96,262	22.3%
Clay	-32,746	-28.5%	11,519	5.5%	8,593	1.2%	-12,634	-1.2%
Clearwater	-8,680	-18.9%	4,128	9.3%	15,294	12.3%	10,742	5.0%
Cook	-4,121	-29.2%	-247	-33.0%	2,393	29.9%	-1,975	-8.6%
Cottonwood	-8,147	-23.9%	14,824	117.7%	7,330	10.4%	14,007	11.9%
Crow Wing	-33,086	-21.8%	-9,569	-12.0%	67,886	14.7%	25,231	3.6%
Dakota	102,920	12.8%	121,115	12.6%	219,159	15.2%	443,194	13.8%
Dodge	-3,307	-13.9%	-18,308	-40.8%	34,781	53.8%	13,166	9.9%
Douglas	-6,806	-9.2%	60,439	1077%	-7,629	-4.7%	46,004	19.2%
Faribault/Martin	-30,075	-31.5%	-20,311	-48.6%	69,130	26.8%	18,744	4.7%
Fillmore	-10,459	-26.5%	-10,995	-24.1%	22,710	25.4%	1,256	0.7%
Freeborn	7,251	8.3%	-3,833	-11.7%	112,064	35.8%	115,482	26.6%
Goodhue	-6,701	-11.9%	-4,145	-23.9%	38,656	22.1%	27,810	11.2%
Grant	-2,260	-11.1%	-7,281	-100.0%	15,697	44.0%	6,156	9.7%
Hennepin	-2,003,842	-27.4%	-1,169,610	-11.8%	4,951,430	31.6%	1,777,978	5.4%
Houston	-4,517	-16.8%	-10,421	-36.8%	22,089	28.8%	7,151	5.4%
Hubbard	-5,940	-13.9%	583	1.8%	25,002	15.5%	19,645	8.3%
Isanti	-24,165	-29.0%	-19,040	-12.0%	140,614	63.9%	97,409	21.1%

### MFIP Expenditure Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005 (cont'd)

County	Dollar and Percentage Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005							
	County Administration		Emergency Assistance		MFIP-ES and Other Services		Total Grant Net Expenses	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
Itasca	-28,121	-23.7%	-16,717	-46.7%	-13,409	-3.2%	-58,247	-10.2%
Jackson	-4,580	-18.1%	5,595	63.2%	16,932	31.2%	17,947	20.3%
Kanabec	-5,382	-11.2%	-21,188	-52.0%	22,506	19.5%	-4,064	-2.0%
Kandiyohi	-15,801	-15.7%	-15,152	-20.8%	102,974	21.1%	72,021	10.9%
Kittson	-1,315	-11.0%	-6,151	-100.0%	15,511	46.1%	8,045	15.6%
Koochiching	-12,444	-27.1%	6,083	54.0%	5,619	3.9%	-742	-0.4%
Lac qui Parle	-3,492	-17.8%	-723	-100.0%	10,552	37.0%	6,337	13.0%
Lake	-8,375	-26.2%	-2,924	-14.9%	4,503	7.9%	-6,796	-6.2%
Lake of the Woods	-3,797	-28.5%	-731	-34.2%	-4,063	-16.0%	-8,591	-21.0%
LeSueur	-23,252	-46.3%	-12,442	-36.2%	85,305	72.8%	49,611	24.6%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	-29,665	-26.6%	-4,662	-11.6%	27,130	14.6%	-7,197	-2.1%
Mahnomen	21,658	83.4%	-7,689	-56.9%	-13,750	-28.1%	218	0.2%
Marshall	-4,524	-15.4%	-1,202	-33.7%	6,491	12.6%	765	0.9%
McLeod	-9,086	-18.5%	-33,473	-49.1%	9,059	5.5%	-33,500	-11.9%
Meeker	-5,047	-13.1%	-32,205	-55.3%	10,826	9.5%	-26,426	-12.5%
Mille Lacs	-12,610	-21.1%	-36,337	-46.2%	60,900	29.9%	11,953	3.5%
Morrison	-13,784	-14.2%	-15,203	-79.4%	73,750	46.7%	44,763	16.3%
Mower	-10,593	-13.3%	-16,234	-27.6%	-25,748	-6.8%	-52,575	-10.1%
Nicollet	-5,099	-10.3%	-32,601	-35.3%	90,260	46.8%	52,560	15.7%
Nobles	-3,537	-7.1%	2,187	25.6%	12,021	6.4%	10,671	4.3%
Norman	-8,355	-34.3%	-3,488	-56.1%	12,327	22.5%	484	0.6%
Olmsted	753	0.3%	-230,568	-60.3%	381,532	39.1%	151,718	9.6%
Otter Tail	1,529	1.1%	-17,839	-23.5%	-6,924	-1.9%	-23,234	-4.0%
Pennington	231	0.8%	-6,422	-75.0%	-10,803	-10.1%	-16,994	-11.8%
Pine	-15,721	-25.8%	-31,267	-41.4%	-32,992	-10.8%	-79,980	-18.1%
Pipestone	-2,290	-8.7%	570	4.6%	40,932	79.6%	39,212	43.5%
Polk	-21,348	-19.7%	-46,241	-69.6%	-19,203	-3.5%	-86,792	-11.9%
Pope	-5,023	-18.2%	6,509	118.6%	6,368	19.8%	7,854	12.0%
Ramsey	158,157	4.4%	337,627	7.3%	1,635,818	16.6%	2,131,602	11.8%
Red Lake	-7,046	-34.7%	819	100.0%	-11,911	-43.2%	-18,138	-37.9%

### MFIP Expenditure Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005 (cont'd)

County Name	Dollar and Percentage Increase/Decrease from SFY 2002 to CY 2005							
	County Administration		Emergency Assistance		MFIP-ES and Other Services		Total Grant Net Expenses	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
Redwood	-5,425	-17.5%	-1,726	-12.1%	10,990	11.9%	3,839	2.8%
Renville	-11,282	-20.8%	8,167	11.8%	6,967	4.8%	3,852	1.4%
Rice	-14,496	-16.9%	-41,055	-74.8%	99,622	30.9%	44,071	9.5%
Rock	-3,396	-11.9%	-21	-0.4%	-758	-2.4%	-4,175	-6.4%
Roseau	-4,000	-15.1%	-1,006	-100.0%	-7,568	-16.9%	-12,574	-17.4%
Scott	-18,287	-18.4%	-74,343	-80.9%	99,849	41.2%	7,219	1.7%
Sherburne	-2,828	-2.9%	16,169	19.6%	-9,525	-3.8%	3,816	0.9%
Sibley	-3,140	-12.2%	-9,616	-44.1%	18,381	23.0%	5,625	4.4%
St Louis	-271,683	-36.8%	108,161	22.7%	487,171	18.3%	323,649	8.3%
Stearns	73,247	54.3%	42,091	13.9%	3,375	0.5%	118,713	10.0%
Steele	-1,656	-2.8%	-24,975	-45.7%	6,631	2.2%	-20,000	-4.9%
Stevens	-10,044	-42.3%	-300	-15.2%	7,540	16.5%	-2,804	-3.9%
Swift	-6,709	-19.6%	-13,712	-66.0%	3,708	7.2%	-16,713	-15.7%
Todd	-12,380	-18.8%	-374	-1.3%	-9,938	-4.7%	-22,692	-7.5%
Traverse	-5,423	-23.4%	613	7.1%	3,159	9.5%	-1,651	-2.5%
Wabasha	-4,492	-15.5%	9,508	72.9%	27,614	36.7%	32,630	27.9%
Wadena	-5,908	-11.8%	-14,890	-46.0%	3,741	2.3%	-17,057	-6.9%
Waseca	-15,289	-32.9%	-17,150	-49.4%	38,718	24.0%	6,279	2.6%
Washington	98,111	28.9%	-442,213	-70.1%	432,185	58.0%	88,083	5.1%
Watonwan	-5,806	-13.0%	-5,391	-61.9%	-2,184	-2.8%	-13,381	-10.1%
Wilkin	-4,650	-28.9%	4,358	21.4%	361	0.5%	69	0.1%
Winona	-14,785	-15.0%	8,197	14.5%	24,565	9.7%	17,977	4.4%
Wright	-22,075	-18.0%	-170,151	-69.4%	-41,728	-10.7%	-233,954	-30.8%
Yellow Medicine	-3,936	-12.3%	-4,712	-50.2%	6,996	16.1%	-1,652	-1.9%
State	-2,717,508	-14.6%	-2,254,182	-10.4%	10,628,428	22.3%	5,656,738	6.4%

## Appendix 4

### MFIP Caseloads in December 2002 and December 2005

County	December 2005					December 2002			Caseload Change from 2002 to 2005
	Eligible Adult Cases	Child Only Cases	Total MFIP Cases	DWP Cases	DWP and MFIP Cases	Eligible Adult Cases	Child Only Cases	MFIP Cases	
Aitkin	74	33	107	11	118	102	33	135	-12.6%
Anoka	1,195	469	1,664	277	1,941	1,628	365	1,993	-2.6%
Becker	207	104	311	29	340	371	69	440	-22.7%
Beltrami	896	387	1,283	78	1,361	1,014	319	1,333	2.1%
Benton	127	53	180	28	208	219	40	259	-19.7%
Big Stone	18	4	22	3	25	36	4	40	-37.5%
Blue Earth	217	51	268	48	316	378	70	448	-29.5%
Brown	53	13	66	9	75	114	18	132	-43.2%
Carlton	133	63	196	22	218	224	71	295	-26.1%
Carver	70	44	114	22	136	113	49	162	-16.0%
Cass	252	137	389	42	431	366	115	481	-10.4%
Chippewa	29	29	58	8	66	61	13	74	-10.8%
Chisago	131	33	164	49	213	207	37	244	-12.7%
Clay	215	90	305	42	347	459	100	559	-37.9%
Clearwater	59	30	89	8	97	92	31	123	-21.1%
Cook	7	6	13	-	13	14	6	20	-35.0%
Cottonwood	37	15	52	11	63	75	15	90	-30.0%
Crow Wing	221	108	329	64	393	362	99	461	-14.8%
Dakota	946	400	1,346	221	1,567	1,078	300	1,378	13.7%
Dodge	22	13	35	11	46	55	15	70	-34.3%
Douglas	70	37	107	15	122	125	28	153	-20.3%
Faribault/Martin	93	54	147	24	171	218	49	267	-36.0%
Fillmore	46	10	56	14	70	63	4	67	4.5%
Freeborn	130	54	184	32	216	240	50	290	-25.5%
Goodhue	131	24	155	29	184	172	20	192	-4.2%
Grant	11	4	15	1	16	27	4	31	-48.4%
Hennepin	7,223	3,204	10,427	959	11,386	10,522	3,154	13,676	-16.7%
Houston	67	11	78	13	91	83	15	98	-7.1%
Hubbard	67	41	108	10	118	163	46	209	-43.5%
Isanti	84	45	129	38	167	155	32	187	-10.7%
Itasca	154	113	267	25	292	284	106	390	-25.1%
Jackson	23	17	40	12	52	40	11	51	2.0%
Kanabec	65	30	95	15	110	102	34	136	-19.1%
Kandiyohi	211	84	295	44	339	368	73	441	-23.1%
Kittson	5	4	9	1	10	10	5	15	-33.3%
Koochiching	79	19	98	12	110	114	18	132	-16.7%
Lac qui Parle	11	4	15	4	19	26	6	32	-40.6%
Lake	9	13	22	7	29	59	6	65	-55.4%
Lake of the Woods	7	2	9	-	9	15	4	19	-52.6%
LeSueur	59	27	86	21	107	106	28	134	-20.1%
Lincoln/Lyon/Murray	78	48	126	26	152	152	41	193	-21.2%
McLeod	64	32	96	21	117	155	29	184	-36.4%
Mahnomen	95	55	150	7	157	121	34	155	1.3%
Marshall	17	10	27	5	32	36	13	49	-34.7%
Meeker	51	34	85	12	97	125	32	157	-38.2%
Mille Lacs	150	62	212	10	222	167	68	235	-5.5%
Morrison	55	33	88	13	101	140	42	182	-44.5%
Mower	138	76	214	47	261	262	56	318	-17.9%
Nicollet	121	23	144	20	164	166	19	185	-11.4%
Nobles	55	43	98	13	111	114	36	150	-26.0%
Norman	14	13	27	11	38	52	11	63	-39.7%
Olmsted	555	179	734	134	868	692	150	842	3.1%
Otter Tail	128	62	190	34	224	275	58	333	-32.7%
Pennington	45	25	70	13	83	109	21	130	-36.2%
Pine	129	52	181	51	232	255	49	304	-23.7%
Pipestone	33	16	49	7	56	58	11	69	-18.8%
Polk	155	45	200	22	222	314	42	356	-37.6%
Pope	21	10	31	5	36	43	10	53	-32.1%

## MFIP Caseloads in December 2002 and December 2005 (cont'd)

County	December 2005					December 2002			Caseload Change from 2002 to 2005
	Eligible Adult Cases	Child Only Cases	Total MFIP Cases	DWP Cases	DWP and MFIP Cases	Eligible Adult Cases	Child Only Cases	MFIP Cases	
Ramsey	6,159	2,050	8,209	642	8,851	6,426	2,011	8,437	4.9%
Red Lake	14	1	15	3	18	19	0	19	-5.3%
Redwood	42	23	65	11	76	83	17	100	-24.0%
Renville	50	29	79	10	89	90	13	103	-13.6%
Rice	187	83	270	50	320	288	73	361	-11.4%
Rock	22	8	30	6	36	37	6	43	-16.3%
Roseau	8	8	16	1	17	18	17	35	-51.4%
St. Louis	1,153	435	1,588	169	1,757	1,980	435	2,415	-27.2%
Scott	157	91	248	44	292	189	69	258	13.2%
Sherburne	116	71	187	37	224	214	49	263	-14.8%
Sibley	32	15	47	9	56	54	16	70	-20.0%
Stearns	422	152	574	96	670	702	137	839	-20.1%
Steele	97	46	143	17	160	226	39	265	-39.6%
Stevens	5	3	8	-	8	19	3	22	-63.6%
Swift	14	13	27	6	33	41	8	49	-32.7%
Todd	73	40	113	20	133	167	36	203	-34.5%
Traverse	8	2	10	3	13	16	3	19	-31.6%
Wabasha	33	20	53	13	66	62	13	75	-12.0%
Wadena	83	29	112	15	127	131	26	157	-19.1%
Waseca	71	32	103	18	121	164	32	196	-38.3%
Washington	452	152	604	82	686	701	133	834	-17.7%
Watsonwan	26	16	42	5	47	49	23	72	-34.7%
Wilkin	11	4	15	1	16	40	7	47	-66.0%
Winona	129	72	201	26	227	234	67	301	-24.6%
Wright	149	63	212	52	264	347	55	402	-34.3%
Yellow Medicine	12	10	22	2	24	28	10	38	-36.8%
	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
State	24,883	10,165	35,048	4,048	39,096	35,421	9,482	44,903	-12.9%
<b>Seven-County Metro</b>									
Anoka	1,195	469	1,664	277	1,941	1,628	365	1,993	-2.6%
Carver	70	44	114	22	136	113	49	162	-16.0%
Dakota	946	400	1,346	221	1,567	1,078	300	1,378	13.7%
Hennepin	7,223	3,204	10,427	959	11,386	10,522	3,154	13,676	-16.7%
Ramsey	6,159	2,050	8,209	642	8,851	6,426	2,011	8,437	4.9%
Scott	157	91	248	44	292	189	69	258	13.2%
Washington	452	152	604	82	686	701	133	834	-17.7%
<b>Seven-County Metro</b>	16,202	6,410	22,612	2,247	24,859	20,657	6,081	26,738	-7.0%
<b>Greater Minnesota</b>	8,681	3,755	12,436	1,801	14,237	14,764	3,401	18,165	-21.6%
<b>State</b>	24,883	10,165	35,048	4,048	39,096	35,421	9,482	44,903	-12.9%