

**Table 1
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Adjusted Number of Families and Children Served (FFY 2006)

States/Territories	Average Number of Families	Average Number of Children
Alabama	14,700	28,000
Alaska	2,900	4,900
American Samoa	-	-
Arizona	18,100	30,200
Arkansas	3,900	5,600
California	111,500	175,500
Colorado	8,900	16,300
Connecticut	6,300	10,100
Delaware	4,600	7,500
District of Columbia	2,600	3,700
Florida	67,900	108,600
Georgia	35,600	64,600
Guam	300	600
Hawaii	5,600	8,600
Idaho	5,400	9,900
Illinois	44,500	82,200
Indiana	17,300	32,800
Iowa	11,100	19,400
Kansas	12,000	22,400
Kentucky	16,200	28,900
Louisiana	23,200	39,100
Maine	3,700	5,400
Maryland	13,500	22,900
Massachusetts	23,900	32,100
Michigan	45,000	87,800
Minnesota	15,100	27,300
Mississippi	19,500	39,100
Missouri	19,200	33,600
Montana	2,900	4,800
Nebraska	7,400	13,100
Nevada	3,600	6,000
New Hampshire	5,100	7,500
New Jersey	26,000	37,900
New Mexico	12,700	21,600
New York	73,200	123,700
North Carolina	39,300	79,900
North Dakota	2,500	4,000
Northern Mariana Islands	200	400
Ohio	22,800	39,900
Oklahoma	14,600	25,000
Oregon	11,000	20,200
Pennsylvania	47,300	82,800
Puerto Rico	7,800	10,700
Rhode Island	4,400	7,100
South Carolina	11,300	19,700
South Dakota	3,100	4,900
Tennessee	22,200	42,500
Texas	68,200	126,200
Utah	7,000	13,000
Vermont	4,700	6,800
Virgin Islands	400	700
Virginia	17,200	27,900
Washington	32,700	53,200
West Virginia	5,600	9,300
Wisconsin	16,800	29,500
Wyoming	2,900	4,700
National Total	1,025,400	1,770,100

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- At the time of publication, American Samoa had not reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The reported results shown above have been rounded to the nearest 100. The national numbers are simply the sum of the State and Territory numbers.

**Table 2
Child Care and Development Fund**

Percent of Children Served by Payment Method (FFY 2006)

State	Grants / Contracts %	Certificates %	Cash %	Total
Alabama	0%	100%	0%	46,843
Alaska	0%	85%	15%	10,121
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0%	100%	0%	55,058
Arkansas	41%	59%	0%	24,533
California	37%	63%	0%	276,510
Colorado	1%	96%	3%	33,984
Connecticut	40%	60%	0%	27,661
Delaware	0%	100%	0%	12,307
District of Columbia	0%	100%	0%	4,470
Florida	51%	49%	0%	177,055
Georgia	0%	100%	0%	107,661
Guam	38%	62%	0%	2,375
Hawaii	46%	0%	54%	25,983
Idaho	0%	100%	0%	18,183
Illinois	7%	93%	0%	146,744
Indiana	3%	97%	0%	55,844
Iowa	0%	100%	0%	39,182
Kansas	0%	100%	0%	37,510
Kentucky	0%	100%	0%	55,171
Louisiana	0%	100%	0%	88,198
Maine	29%	69%	2%	8,646
Maryland	0%	100%	0%	40,798
Massachusetts	44%	56%	0%	69,872
Michigan	0%	71%	29%	133,244
Minnesota	0%	100%	0%	55,117
Mississippi	3%	97%	0%	42,582
Missouri	0%	100%	0%	59,707
Montana	0%	100%	0%	9,919
Nebraska	0%	100%	0%	25,481
Nevada	20%	80%	0%	15,440
New Hampshire	0%	100%	0%	12,650
New Jersey	19%	81%	0%	72,516
New Mexico	0%	100%	0%	36,567
New York	19%	81%	0%	225,158
North Carolina	0%	100%	0%	112,608
North Dakota	0%	100%	0%	8,020
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	100%	639
Ohio	0%	100%	0%	72,187
Oklahoma	0%	100%	0%	46,319
Oregon	3%	97%	0%	38,386
Pennsylvania	0%	78%	22%	127,848
Puerto Rico	71%	29%	0%	13,967
Rhode Island	0%	100%	0%	10,714
South Carolina	0%	100%	0%	36,764
South Dakota	1%	99%	0%	9,530
Tennessee	0%	100%	0%	73,229
Texas	0%	100%	0%	243,381
Utah	0%	0%	100%	23,290
Vermont	3%	97%	0%	10,906
Virgin Islands	0%	100%	0%	1,092
Virginia	0%	0%	100%	56,498
Washington	0%	81%	19%	95,355
West Virginia	0%	100%	0%	16,333
Wisconsin	0%	100%	0%	47,832
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	8,559
National Total	11%	85%	4%	3,106,546

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2006. The ACF-800 is based on an annual unduplicated count of families and children; i.e., a family or child that receives one hour of service on one day is counted the same as a family or child that receives full-time care throughout the fiscal year.
2. All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication American Samoa had not submitted any ACF-800 data for FFY 2006.

Table 3 Child Care and Development Fund Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served by Types of Care (FFY 2006)						
State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	7%	4%	88%	1%	100%
Alaska	15%	32%	6%	46%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	3%	16%	7%	74%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	18%	0%	82%	0%	100%
California	6%	37%	10%	46%	1%	100%
Colorado	6%	31%	0%	62%	1%	100%
Connecticut	25%	30%	0%	40%	4%	100%
Delaware	3%	35%	3%	58%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	0%	4%	0%	81%	14%	100%
Florida	1%	11%	0%	88%	0%	100%
Georgia	1%	13%	2%	85%	0%	100%
Guam	7%	7%	1%	86%	0%	100%
Hawaii	14%	53%	0%	33%	1%	100%
Idaho	1%	36%	14%	49%	0%	100%
Illinois	22%	44%	1%	33%	0%	100%
Indiana	1%	44%	0%	55%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	56%	6%	37%	1%	100%
Kansas	5%	20%	40%	35%	0%	100%
Kentucky	0%	20%	2%	79%	0%	100%
Louisiana	15%	11%	0%	74%	0%	100%
Maine	2%	44%	0%	52%	1%	100%
Maryland	13%	46%	0%	40%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	2%	4%	21%	67%	5%	100%
Michigan	29%	45%	10%	15%	1%	100%
Minnesota	14%	47%	0%	36%	3%	100%
Mississippi	3%	23%	1%	73%	1%	100%
Missouri	1%	40%	2%	54%	2%	100%
Montana	3%	22%	37%	38%	0%	100%
Nebraska	0%	38%	8%	53%	1%	100%
Nevada	7%	6%	1%	86%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	6%	32%	0%	61%	1%	100%
New Jersey	2%	18%	0%	76%	4%	100%
New Mexico	2%	38%	6%	53%	1%	100%
New York	17%	39%	9%	28%	6%	100%
North Carolina	0%	19%	0%	81%	0%	100%
North Dakota	0%	42%	31%	26%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	7%	45%	6%	41%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	32%	2%	59%	7%	100%
Oklahoma	0%	28%	0%	72%	0%	100%
Oregon	12%	66%	3%	19%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	6%	40%	4%	48%	3%	100%
Puerto Rico	3%	49%	1%	47%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	1%	32%	0%	67%	0%	100%
South Carolina	6%	13%	3%	78%	0%	100%
South Dakota	1%	48%	0%	51%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	15%	5%	79%	0%	100%
Texas	7%	12%	2%	79%	0%	100%
Utah	10%	44%	7%	38%	2%	100%
Vermont	0%	51%	0%	46%	3%	100%
Virgin Islands	11%	0%	3%	86%	0%	100%
Virginia	4%	35%	0%	61%	0%	100%
Washington	11%	32%	0%	43%	14%	100%
West Virginia	0%	36%	4%	59%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	0%	33%	0%	60%	6%	100%
Wyoming	6%	28%	6%	15%	45%	100%
National Total	7%	29%	5%	57%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages. National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.
- The current WY processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. WY is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

**Table 4
Child Care and Development Fund**

**Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in Regulated Settings vs.
Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation (FFY 2006)**

State	Licensed / Regulated	Legally Operating Without Regulation	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	79%	20%	1%	100%
Alaska	71%	28%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	89%	11%	0%	100%
Arkansas	99%	1%	0%	100%
California	68%	31%	1%	100%
Colorado	81%	19%	1%	100%
Connecticut	49%	47%	4%	100%
Delaware	89%	11%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	85%	1%	14%	100%
Florida	90%	9%	0%	100%
Georgia	95%	5%	0%	100%
Guam	85%	15%	0%	100%
Hawaii	38%	62%	1%	100%
Idaho	62%	38%	0%	100%
Illinois	49%	51%	0%	100%
Indiana	66%	34%	0%	100%
Iowa	80%	20%	1%	100%
Kansas	84%	16%	0%	100%
Kentucky	87%	13%	0%	100%
Louisiana	73%	27%	0%	100%
Maine	85%	13%	1%	100%
Maryland	77%	22%	1%	100%
Massachusetts	91%	4%	5%	100%
Michigan	32%	67%	1%	100%
Minnesota	69%	28%	3%	100%
Mississippi	74%	25%	1%	100%
Missouri	61%	36%	2%	100%
Montana	87%	13%	0%	100%
Nebraska	81%	18%	1%	100%
Nevada	73%	27%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	69%	30%	1%	100%
New Jersey	87%	9%	4%	100%
New Mexico	61%	38%	1%	100%
New York	46%	48%	6%	100%
North Carolina	98%	2%	0%	100%
North Dakota	65%	35%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	99%	1%	0%	100%
Ohio	93%	0%	7%	100%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	42%	58%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	60%	38%	3%	100%
Puerto Rico	48%	51%	1%	100%
Rhode Island	97%	3%	0%	100%
South Carolina	83%	17%	0%	100%
South Dakota	87%	13%	0%	100%
Tennessee	90%	10%	0%	100%
Texas	84%	16%	0%	100%
Utah	56%	42%	2%	100%
Vermont	97%	0%	3%	100%
Virgin Islands	97%	3%	0%	100%
Virginia	81%	19%	0%	100%
Washington	69%	16%	14%	100%
West Virginia	97%	3%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	59%	0%	41%	100%
Wyoming	29%	26%	45%	100%
National Total	73%	25%	2%	100%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
2. These percentages were based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
3. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
4. At the time of publication American Samoa had not reported any ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
5. For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
6. For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.
7. The current WY processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. WY is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

**Table 5
Child Care and Development Fund**

**Of Children in Settings Legally Operating Without Regulation,
Average Monthly Percent Served by Relatives vs. Non-Relatives (FFY 2006)**

State	Relative	Non-Relative	Total %	Total Count
Alabama	14%	86%	100%	5494
Alaska	78%	22%	100%	1406
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	100%	3,261
Arkansas	10%	90%	100%	40
California	65%	35%	100%	54,375
Colorado	71%	29%	100%	3,014
Connecticut	73%	27%	100%	4,732
Delaware	79%	21%	100%	822
District of Columbia	93%	7%	100%	30
Florida	3%	97%	100%	10,229
Georgia	80%	20%	100%	2,980
Guam	35%	65%	100%	91
Hawaii	84%	16%	100%	5327
Idaho	34%	66%	100%	3711
Illinois	34%	66%	100%	41,660
Indiana	7%	93%	100%	11,087
Iowa	16%	84%	100%	3,787
Kansas	84%	16%	100%	3,605
Kentucky	57%	43%	100%	3,670
Louisiana	51%	49%	100%	10,558
Maine	49%	51%	100%	730
Maryland	86%	14%	100%	5,088
Massachusetts	68%	32%	100%	1,392
Michigan	100%	0%	100%	58,765
Minnesota	42%	58%	100%	7,700
Mississippi	53%	47%	100%	9,952
Missouri	32%	68%	100%	12,241
Montana	55%	45%	100%	630
Nebraska	3%	97%	100%	2,332
Nevada	7%	93%	100%	1,601
New Hampshire	28%	72%	100%	2,282
New Jersey	35%	65%	100%	3,540
New Mexico	73%	27%	100%	8,294
New York	43%	57%	100%	59,609
North Carolina	75%	25%	100%	1,280
North Dakota	38%	62%	100%	1395
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	0%	100%	2
Ohio	NA	NA	NA	0
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	0
Oregon	29%	70%	100%	11,683
Pennsylvania	51%	49%	100%	31,370
Puerto Rico	83%	17%	100%	5,522
Rhode Island	46%	55%	100%	200
South Carolina	0%	100%	100%	3,353
South Dakota	57%	43%	100%	630
Tennessee	40%	60%	100%	4,374
Texas	100%	0%	100%	20,275
Utah	95%	5%	100%	5,513
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	0
Virgin Islands	52%	48%	100%	21
Virginia	49%	50%	100%	5,167
Washington	97%	3%	100%	8,719
West Virginia	30%	70%	100%	250
Wisconsin	0%	100%	100%	1
Wyoming	60%	40%	100%	1,226
National	58%	42%	100%	445,016

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006. In years prior to FFY 2005, this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. Percentages are based on these counts. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding. In this table, centers operating without regulation (data element 26 = 11) were considered Non-Relative.
- In some States there were no children served in unregulated settings and thus the percent is "NA" since division by zero is undefined. Ohio, Oklahoma, and Vermont have no Providers Legally Operating Without Regulation.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- The current WY processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. WY is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

Table 6
Child Care and Development Fund

Average Monthly Percentages of Children Served in All Types of Care (FFY 2006)

State	Total % of Children	Licensed or Regulated Providers				Providers Legally Operating without Regulation							Invalid / Not Reported
		Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Child's Home		Family Home		Group Home		Center	
						Relative	Non-Relative	Relative	Non-Relative	Relative	Non-Relative		
Alabama	100%	0%	4%	4%	71%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	17%	1%
Alaska	100%	0%	19%	6%	46%	14%	1%	8%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	100%	0%	8%	7%	74%	2%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Arkansas	100%	0%	18%	0%	82%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
California	100%	0%	15%	10%	43%	5%	2%	16%	6%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Colorado	100%	0%	18%	0%	62%	5%	1%	9%	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Connecticut	100%	0%	12%	0%	37%	18%	7%	16%	2%	0%	0%	4%	4%
Delaware	100%	0%	30%	3%	56%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
District of Columbia	100%	0%	4%	0%	81%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Florida	100%	0%	11%	0%	80%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%
Georgia	100%	0%	9%	2%	85%	1%	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Guam	100%	1%	1%	1%	82%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Hawaii	100%	0%	7%	0%	30%	12%	2%	40%	6%	0%	0%	2%	1%
Idaho	100%	0%	0%	14%	49%	0%	1%	12%	24%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Illinois	100%	0%	19%	1%	30%	10%	12%	7%	18%	0%	0%	4%	0%
Indiana	100%	0%	36%	0%	30%	0%	0%	2%	6%	0%	0%	25%	0%
Iowa	100%	0%	37%	6%	37%	0%	0%	3%	16%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Kansas	100%	0%	9%	40%	35%	3%	3%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	100%	0%	7%	2%	79%	0%	0%	7%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Louisiana	100%	0%	0%	0%	73%	10%	4%	4%	7%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Maine	100%	0%	33%	0%	52%	1%	1%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Maryland	100%	0%	37%	0%	40%	10%	3%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Massachusetts	100%	0%	2%	21%	67%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Michigan	100%	0%	7%	10%	15%	29%	0%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Minnesota	100%	0%	34%	0%	35%	8%	6%	4%	9%	0%	0%	2%	3%
Mississippi	100%	0%	0%	1%	73%	2%	1%	12%	11%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Missouri	100%	0%	12%	2%	47%	1%	1%	11%	17%	0%	0%	7%	2%
Montana	100%	0%	12%	37%	38%	2%	1%	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Nebraska	100%	0%	20%	8%	53%	0%	0%	1%	17%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Nevada	100%	0%	4%	1%	69%	2%	6%	0%	1%	0%	0%	18%	0%
New Hampshire	100%	0%	8%	0%	61%	3%	3%	5%	19%	0%	0%	0%	1%
New Jersey	100%	0%	11%	0%	76%	1%	1%	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%	4%
New Mexico	100%	0%	2%	6%	53%	1%	1%	27%	10%	0%	0%	0%	1%
New York	100%	0%	10%	9%	27%	10%	8%	11%	18%	0%	0%	1%	6%
North Carolina	100%	0%	17%	0%	81%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
North Dakota	100%	0%	8%	31%	26%	0%	0%	13%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Northern Mariana Islands	100%	7%	45%	6%	41%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ohio	100%	0%	32%	2%	59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%
Oklahoma	100%	0%	28%	0%	72%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Oregon	100%	0%	22%	2%	18%	5%	7%	11%	32%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Pennsylvania	100%	0%	8%	4%	48%	4%	2%	16%	16%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Puerto Rico	100%	2%	1%	1%	44%	1%	0%	42%	6%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Rhode Island	100%	0%	30%	0%	67%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Carolina	100%	0%	2%	3%	78%	0%	6%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Dakota	100%	0%	36%	0%	51%	0%	1%	7%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Tennessee	100%	0%	6%	5%	79%	1%	0%	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Texas	100%	0%	3%	2%	79%	7%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Utah	100%	0%	12%	7%	37%	10%	1%	30%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%
Vermont	100%	0%	51%	0%	46%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Virgin Islands	100%	8%	0%	3%	85%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Virginia	100%	1%	21%	0%	59%	1%	1%	8%	6%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Washington	100%	0%	27%	0%	43%	11%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
West Virginia	100%	0%	35%	4%	57%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Wisconsin	100%	0%	33%	0%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
Wyoming	100%	0%	8%	6%	15%	4%	2%	11%	9%	0%	0%	0%	45%
National Percentage	100%	0%	14%	5%	55%	5%	2%	9%	6%	0%	0%	2%	2%

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006. In years prior to FFY 2005 this table was based on the ACF-800 rather than the ACF-801. The CCB decided to use ACF-801 data wherever possible because it is now considered more representative.
- These percentages were based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the hours with each provider divided by the total hours of service.
- For consistency with related reports involving setting data, the Invalid/Not Reported category includes children with any element of any setting identified as invalid or not reported including zero hours served, zero cost, or no setting records.
- The current WY processing system is unable to extract a number of hours for full- and part-day authorizations resulting in a high percentage of invalid setting records. WY is developing a completely new processing system that will correct this problem in the future. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

**Table 7
Child Care and Development Fund and Additional State Efforts**

Number of Child Care Providers Receiving CCDF Funds (FFY 2006)

State	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Alabama	13	1,273	263	1,645	3,194
Alaska	809	1,254	153	284	2,500
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	834	3,885	345	1,296	6,360
Arkansas	0	619	0	957	1,576
California	12,463	59,037	6,471	5,499	83,470
Colorado	1,172	4,318	0	1,398	6,888
Connecticut	5,209	4,105	22	1,607	10,943
Delaware	653	1,412	50	403	2,518
District of Columbia	2	223	0	185	410
Florida	72	6,104	0	7,703	13,879
Georgia	1,295	3,922	249	3,738	9,204
Guam	177	14	3	51	245
Hawaii	1,188	4,909	4	245	6,346
Idaho	135	2,235	400	533	3,303
Illinois	33,044	50,505	299	3,579	87,427
Indiana	69	3,592	0	1,233	4,894
Iowa	213	7,559	366	726	8,864
Kansas	712	2,546	2,386	694	6,338
Kentucky	344	3,661	131	1,772	5,908
Louisiana	4,083	1,918	0	2,035	8,036
Maine	145	1,850	0	485	2,480
Maryland	2,932	5,920	0	1,572	10,424
Massachusetts	2,064	2,382	2,916	2,248	9,610
Michigan	28,787	39,706	2,810	2,476	73,779
Minnesota	3,390	14,267	0	2,179	19,836
Mississippi	680	5,355	33	1,362	7,430
Missouri	614	7,964	184	2,022	10,784
Montana	226	1,364	459	253	2,302
Nebraska	336	4,051	306	614	5,307
Nevada	82	619	11	614	1,326
New Hampshire	487	2,077	0	681	3,245
New Jersey	830	5,601	0	2,546	8,977
New Mexico	11	6,244	162	489	6,906
New York	21,503	48,435	4,074	4,309	77,871
North Carolina	101	4,165	0	4,592	8,858
North Dakota	1	1,788	671	140	2,600
Northern Mariana Islands	0	175	0	20	195
Ohio	14	10,955	210	3,747	14,926
Oklahoma	20	2671	0	1351	4042
Oregon	3,642	11,859	185	786	16,472
Pennsylvania	5,068	36,412	701	3,612	45,793
Puerto Rico	24	2,116	0	712	2,852
Rhode Island	124	1,130	6	352	1,612
South Carolina	798	2,293	179	1,163	4,433
South Dakota	72	1,368	82	246	1,768
Tennessee	112	1,958	387	1,631	4,088
Texas	10,101	13,999	935	6,434	31,469
Utah	2,792	6,968	382	570	10,712
Vermont	375	1,989	0	505	2,869
Virgin Islands	0	25	34	86	145
Virginia	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	10,043	9,426	0	2,029	21,498
West Virginia	12	2,573	92	427	3,104
Wisconsin	116	6,311	0	2,304	8,731
Wyoming	158	808	728	157	1,851
National Total	157,697	427,915	26,689	88,297	700,598

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2006, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because ACF-800 Data Element 6a is reported as a count of provider receiving CCDF funding.
3. Note that this table reports the number of providers (not the number of children). A provider that serves one child is counted the same as provider serving 200 children per day.
4. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-800 data for FFY 2006.
5. Virginia is not able to report the number of providers because payments are made locally and information on providers is kept at the local level. They are working towards an automated system in order to report the number of providers.

**Table 8
Child Care and Development Fund**

Consumer Education Strategies Summary (FFY 2006)

State	Grants / Contracts / Certificates Info	Resource and Referral	Provider List	Types/ Quality of Care Materials	Health and Safety	Child Care Regulatory Info	Child Care Complaint Policy	Mass Media	Other	Estimated Number of Families Receiving Consumer Education
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	33,611
Alaska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		11,478
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	179,239
Arkansas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	13,852
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2,091,932
Colorado	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	1,618,658
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	70,414
Delaware	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	19,601
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	30,000
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	219,039
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	45,415
Guam	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,216
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		8,304
Idaho	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	10,009
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	275,600
Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	23,062
Iowa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	31,284
Kansas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	149,456
Kentucky	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	47,081
Louisiana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	59,464
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	7,322
Maryland	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	235,826
Massachusetts	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	85,000
Michigan	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1,014,456
Minnesota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		1,895,127
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		23,433
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	45,893
Montana	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,295,443
Nebraska	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	455,129
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	10,192
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8,532
New Jersey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	108,955
New Mexico	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	22,510
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		865,923
North Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	264,317
North Dakota	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,692
Northern Mariana Islands	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	639
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	117,206
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	186,376
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		102,755
Pennsylvania	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	170,762
Puerto Rico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	10,930
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	8,800
South Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	21,164
South Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	186,266
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	90
Texas	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	124,794
Utah	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9,703
Vermont	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8,667
Virgin Islands	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	680
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		39,993
Washington	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		24,839
West Virginia	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8,587
Wisconsin	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	51,947
Wyoming	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	11,907
Total Yes	33	55	52	55	52	52	52	50	9	12,372,570

Notes applicable to this table:

Data as of: 18-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-800 data for FFY 2006, an unduplicated annual count.
2. This data has not been adjusted by the pooling factor (unadjusted data) because it is impossible to tell which families receiving consumer information also received CCDF funding.
3. NA=Not applicable, does not offer grants or contracts for subsidized child care slots.
4. A blank cell indicates that the State did not provide a response.
5. At the time of publication, American Samoa had not yet reported FFY 2006 ACF-800 data.

**Table 9
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Percentages of Children In Care By Age Group (FFY 2006)

State	0 to < 1 yr	1 yr to < 2 yrs	2 yrs to < 3 yrs	3 yrs to < 4 yrs	4 yrs to < 5 yrs	5 yrs to < 6 yrs	6 yrs to < 13 yrs	13+ yrs	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	11%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	6%	11%	12%	13%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Arkansas	12%	20%	22%	20%	17%	8%	0%	0%	0%	100%
California	3%	6%	10%	14%	16%	12%	39%	0%	0%	100%
Colorado	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Connecticut	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	8%	12%	13%	12%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	6%	14%	19%	19%	13%	7%	22%	0%	0%	100%
Florida	5%	11%	14%	14%	14%	11%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Georgia	8%	13%	14%	13%	12%	9%	30%	0%	0%	100%
Guam	10%	14%	16%	15%	15%	8%	20%	2%	0%	100%
Hawaii	5%	11%	13%	16%	20%	8%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Idaho	7%	12%	12%	13%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	6%	9%	11%	11%	11%	10%	42%	1%	0%	100%
Indiana	5%	10%	13%	13%	13%	12%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Iowa	9%	12%	13%	12%	11%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Kentucky	7%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	8%	14%	16%	14%	11%	8%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	4%	8%	12%	15%	16%	12%	34%	1%	0%	100%
Maryland	5%	10%	12%	12%	12%	10%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	5%	9%	13%	14%	15%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Michigan	6%	9%	10%	10%	10%	9%	45%	1%	0%	100%
Minnesota	7%	11%	13%	12%	13%	11%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Mississippi	5%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	35%	1%	0%	100%
Missouri	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	28%	0%	6%	100%
Montana	8%	12%	14%	14%	13%	12%	28%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	9%	13%	13%	13%	12%	10%	30%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	5%	10%	12%	14%	14%	12%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New Jersey	4%	10%	13%	13%	11%	9%	38%	2%	0%	100%
New Mexico	7%	11%	13%	13%	13%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
New York	4%	9%	11%	12%	13%	10%	40%	1%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	9%	11%	12%	12%	11%	39%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	10%	14%	15%	13%	11%	10%	27%	1%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	6%	9%	11%	12%	12%	14%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	7%	12%	13%	12%	11%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	13%	14%	14%	12%	10%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	7%	11%	11%	11%	11%	10%	37%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	5%	10%	11%	12%	12%	10%	40%	1%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	4%	6%	7%	14%	14%	11%	41%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	5%	9%	11%	12%	12%	11%	40%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	4%	8%	11%	13%	13%	11%	39%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	9%	13%	14%	14%	13%	11%	26%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	6%	12%	13%	13%	12%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	7%	12%	14%	13%	11%	10%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Utah	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	12%	34%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	5%	10%	12%	14%	14%	11%	33%	1%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	4%	10%	12%	17%	17%	9%	30%	1%	0%	100%
Virginia	5%	12%	14%	15%	12%	10%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Washington	6%	11%	13%	12%	13%	11%	34%	0%	0%	100%
West Virginia	6%	11%	13%	13%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	7%	11%	12%	12%	12%	10%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Wyoming	7%	12%	15%	14%	14%	11%	27%	0%	0%	100%
National	6%	10%	12%	13%	13%	10%	36%	0%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The Invalid/Not Reported category only includes children with an invalid year/month of birth or report date.

Table 10
Child Care and Development Fund

Reasons for Receiving Care, Average Monthly Percentage of Families (FFY 2006)

State	Employment	Training/ Education	Both Emp & Training/Education	Protective Services	Other	Invalid/ Not Reported	Total
Alabama	78%	7%	4%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Alaska	85%	4%	8%	0%	3%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	70%	1%	6%	22%	2%	0%	100%
Arkansas	43%	10%	7%	5%	35%	0%	100%
California	85%	6%	5%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	79%	14%	4%	0%	3%	0%	100%
Connecticut	94%	5%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Delaware	83%	5%	4%	2%	5%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	65%	25%	3%	1%	6%	0%	100%
Florida	73%	5%	4%	18%	1%	0%	100%
Georgia	80%	10%	2%	6%	0%	2%	100%
Guam	76%	15%	9%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Hawaii	82%	3%	10%	0%	4%	0%	100%
Idaho	75%	10%	15%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Illinois	90%	4%	1%	0%	5%	0%	100%
Indiana	68%	9%	8%	0%	15%	0%	100%
Iowa	84%	9%	0%	7%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	91%	5%	2%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Kentucky	77%	7%	2%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Louisiana	78%	7%	10%	5%	0%	0%	100%
Maine	85%	5%	5%	2%	2%	0%	100%
Maryland	81%	11%	6%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	80%	6%	0%	9%	4%	1%	100%
Michigan	86%	10%	2%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	78%	9%	9%	0%	4%	0%	100%
Mississippi	68%	7%	6%	1%	18%	0%	100%
Missouri	57%	18%	8%	7%	0%	9%	100%
Montana	66%	15%	17%	2%	0%	0%	100%
Nebraska	72%	12%	3%	13%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	90%	6%	2%	0%	2%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	82%	10%	0%	8%	1%	0%	100%
New Jersey	81%	3%	3%	5%	9%	0%	100%
New Mexico	75%	14%	12%	0%	0%	0%	100%
New York	73%	16%	3%	0%	8%	0%	100%
North Carolina	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	78%	13%	7%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	71%	24%	6%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Ohio	69%	16%	5%	0%	10%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	78%	18%	3%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	76%	3%	18%	3%	0%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	87%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	65%	26%	7%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	89%	9%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Carolina	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	61%	11%	12%	16%	0%	0%	100%
Tennessee	41%	37%	21%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Texas	75%	18%	3%	1%	3%	0%	100%
Utah	80%	4%	3%	0%	13%	0%	100%
Vermont	63%	14%	2%	16%	6%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	84%	12%	0%	4%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	87%	5%	5%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Washington	83%	7%	1%	9%	1%	0%	100%
West Virginia	78%	13%	9%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	93%	1%	5%	0%	2%	0%	100%
Wyoming	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
National	79%	10%	4%	4%	3%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

1. The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.

2. All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.

3. All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.

4. A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.

5. At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.

6. Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.

7. The Invalid/Not Reported only includes family records with an invalid or missing number for ACF-801 element 6, Reason for Receiving Subsidized Child Care.

8. Several States only capture the primary reason for receiving services and therefore do not report any families in Both Employment and Training/Education categories. States reporting no families in this combination category of Both Employment and Training/Education are Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Wyoming.

9. CCB has observed some issues with income reporting across most States to varying degrees. CCB is working with States to address and resolve internal inconsistencies between ACF-801 element 6 (reason for receiving a subsidy), element 9 (total income for determining eligibility), and elements 10 through 15 (sources of income).

**Table 11
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Racial Group (FFY 2006)

State	Native American / Alaskan Native	Asian	Black / African American	Native Hawaiian / Pacific	White	Multi-Racial	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	0%	0%	76%	0%	23%	0%	0%	100%
Alaska	10%	5%	10%	6%	47%	14%	8%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	5%	0%	14%	1%	77%	3%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	0%	61%	0%	38%	0%	0%	100%
California	2%	6%	23%	2%	65%	2%	0%	100%
Colorado	1%	0%	13%	0%	34%	2%	48%	100%
Connecticut	1%	0%	35%	0%	26%	6%	32%	100%
Delaware	0%	0%	66%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	1%	0%	90%	0%	7%	0%	2%	100%
Florida	0%	0%	50%	0%	47%	2%	0%	100%
Georgia	0%	0%	78%	0%	19%	2%	1%	100%
Guam	0%	7%	0%	84%	1%	9%	0%	100%
Hawaii	0%	34%	1%	35%	12%	18%	0%	100%
Idaho	1%	0%	1%	0%	96%	1%	0%	100%
Illinois	0%	1%	64%	1%	18%	2%	15%	100%
Indiana	1%	0%	53%	0%	39%	7%	0%	100%
Iowa	0%	0%	20%	0%	80%	0%	0%	100%
Kansas	2%	0%	27%	0%	64%	2%	5%	100%
Kentucky	0%	0%	31%	0%	60%	0%	8%	100%
Louisiana	0%	0%	77%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%
Maine	1%	1%	3%	0%	81%	5%	9%	100%
Maryland	0%	0%	80%	0%	16%	2%	2%	100%
Massachusetts	0%	2%	20%	0%	25%	1%	53%	100%
Michigan	0%	0%	58%	0%	40%	2%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	6%	34%	0%	55%	2%	0%	100%
Mississippi	0%	0%	87%	0%	11%	2%	0%	100%
Missouri	0%	0%	57%	0%	40%	1%	2%	100%
Montana	12%	0%	2%	0%	82%	4%	0%	100%
Nebraska	3%	0%	25%	0%	70%	1%	0%	100%
Nevada	3%	1%	31%	1%	56%	8%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	0%	0%	2%	0%	22%	1%	75%	100%
New Jersey	0%	1%	56%	13%	22%	1%	5%	100%
New Mexico	6%	0%	4%	0%	85%	3%	0%	100%
New York	1%	2%	54%	1%	39%	3%	0%	100%
North Carolina	2%	0%	61%	0%	36%	0%	0%	100%
North Dakota	24%	0%	3%	0%	69%	3%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	0%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Ohio	0%	0%	54%	0%	43%	1%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	1%	34%	0%	57%	0%	0%	100%
Oregon	2%	2%	10%	0%	85%	1%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	0%	1%	40%	0%	56%	2%	1%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	0%	0%	0%	41%	0%	59%	100%
Rhode Island	0%	0%	8%	0%	19%	0%	72%	100%
South Carolina	0%	0%	75%	0%	24%	0%	0%	100%
South Dakota	19%	0%	4%	0%	71%	5%	0%	100%
Tennessee	0%	0%	72%	0%	27%	0%	0%	100%
Texas	0%	0%	36%	0%	43%	1%	20%	100%
Utah	3%	2%	5%	0%	90%	0%	0%	100%
Vermont	0%	1%	2%	0%	94%	2%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	7%	0%	93%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Virginia	6%	1%	65%	0%	26%	1%	0%	100%
Washington	2%	2%	9%	0%	42%	0%	45%	100%
West Virginia	0%	0%	12%	0%	76%	10%	2%	100%
Wisconsin	2%	2%	41%	0%	43%	3%	9%	100%
Wyoming	3%	0%	4%	0%	81%	0%	12%	100%
National	1%	1%	44%	1%	44%	2%	7%	100%

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

Notes applicable to this report:

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The multi-racial category includes any child where more than one race was answered Yes (1). Several States do not capture and report more than one race per child and thus do not provide multi-racial data.
- The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where one or more race fields had anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1), blank, null, or space.
- Washington is still reporting ethnicity (Latino/Hispanic) as a race rather than as an ethnicity in accordance with the Pre-FFY 2000 Technical Bulletin 3 standard. In many of these instances if a child is designated as Latino, no race is designated.
- National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.

Table 12
Child Care and Development Fund

Average Monthly Percentages of Children by Latino Ethnicity (FFY 2006)

State	Latino	Not Latino	Invalid/Not Reported	Total
Alabama	1%	99%	0%	100%
Alaska	9%	91%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	47%	53%	0%	100%
Arkansas	0%	100%	0%	100%
California	50%	50%	0%	100%
Colorado	32%	68%	0%	100%
Connecticut	36%	64%	0%	100%
Delaware	9%	91%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	9%	91%	0%	100%
Florida	23%	77%	0%	100%
Georgia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	100%	0%	100%
Hawaii	5%	95%	0%	100%
Idaho	15%	85%	0%	100%
Illinois	14%	84%	3%	100%
Indiana	6%	94%	0%	100%
Iowa	6%	94%	0%	100%
Kansas	11%	89%	0%	100%
Kentucky	3%	92%	5%	100%
Louisiana	1%	98%	0%	100%
Maine	3%	97%	0%	100%
Maryland	3%	97%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	31%	69%	0%	100%
Michigan	4%	96%	0%	100%
Minnesota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Mississippi	1%	99%	0%	100%
Missouri	3%	97%	0%	100%
Montana	7%	93%	0%	100%
Nebraska	10%	90%	0%	100%
Nevada	29%	71%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	2%	0%	98%	100%
New Jersey	28%	72%	0%	100%
New Mexico	74%	26%	0%	100%
New York	26%	74%	0%	100%
North Carolina	5%	95%	0%	100%
North Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	4%	96%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	8%	92%	0%	100%
Oregon	20%	80%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	10%	90%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	100%	0%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	22%	78%	0%	100%
South Carolina	-	-	-	-
South Dakota	3%	97%	0%	100%
Tennessee	1%	99%	0%	100%
Texas	44%	56%	0%	100%
Utah	15%	85%	0%	100%
Vermont	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	9%	91%	0%	100%
Virginia	9%	91%	0%	100%
Washington	14%	86%	0%	100%
West Virginia	2%	98%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	8%	92%	0%	100%
Wyoming	12%	88%	0%	100%
National	19%	80%	1%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- All percentages are based on "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- South Carolina did not collect Ethnicity data in FFY 2006.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child. New Hampshire does not appear to properly report the ethnicity of all or nearly all the non-Latino children served.
- The Invalid/Not Reported category includes children where anything other than a No (0) or Yes (1) was in the Ethnicity field.
- National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.

**Table 13
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Percentages of Children in Child Care by Age Category and Care Type (FFY 2006)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Total
Infants (0 to <1 yr)	7%	35%	5%	53%	100%
Toddlers (1 yr to <3 yrs)	6%	29%	6%	60%	100%
Preschool (3 yrs to <6 yrs)	5%	24%	4%	66%	100%
School Age (6 yrs to <13 yrs)	11%	34%	4%	50%	100%
13 years and older	21%	48%	3%	28%	100%
All Ages	7%	30%	5%	58%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- Nationally 2.1% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of the child's setting record(s) were invalid or not reported.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes all this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The National values were determined by multiplying each State's percentage by the adjusted number of children served for each State, summing across the States and then dividing by the adjusted number of children served for the Nation. "Adjusted" means adjusted to represent CCDF funding only.
- Some children are reported to have multiple settings for the same month. If a child was in more than one of the above setting categories within the same month, the child was counted in each setting in proportion to the number of hours of service received in each setting. For example if the child spent 70-hours in a setting and 30-hours in a child's home, the child would be scored as 0.7 count in Center and 0.3 count in Child's Home (proportional counting).

**Table 14
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Hours for Children In Care By Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2006)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	159	160	156	162	161
1 to < 2 yrs	160	165	162	170	167
2 to < 3 yrs	167	168	161	171	169
3 to < 4 yrs	167	166	166	169	168
4 to < 5 yrs	165	162	160	166	164
5 to < 6 yrs	156	145	141	143	144
6 to < 13 yrs	141	130	117	112	122
13+ yrs	133	121	128	104	119
National	151	148	145	148	148

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- Nationally 2.1% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of a child's setting record was invalid or not reported.
- Average hours per month were based on sums of hours per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and payments for each State-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The State's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The national results shown above represent a weighted average of the State's fiscal annual results where the weight for each State is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each State for the fiscal year.
- Some States have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized rather than the actual number of service hours provided.

**Table 15
Child Care and Development Fund**

Average Monthly Payment to Provider (Including Family CoPay) by Age Group and Care Type (FFY 2006)

Age Group	Child's Home	Family Home	Group Home	Center	Weighted Averages
0 to < 1 yr	\$298	\$369	\$464	\$454	\$413
1 to < 2 yrs	\$303	\$380	\$491	\$457	\$425
2 to < 3 yrs	\$300	\$376	\$474	\$445	\$420
3 to < 4 yrs	\$295	\$358	\$464	\$428	\$407
4 to < 5 yrs	\$283	\$345	\$450	\$428	\$403
5 to < 6 yrs	\$282	\$321	\$396	\$377	\$357
6 to < 13 yrs	\$259	\$291	\$365	\$291	\$290
13+ yrs	\$273	\$287	\$323	\$286	\$285
National	\$275	\$330	\$429	\$386	\$363

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- Nationally 2.1% of the children served with CCDF funds were excluded from the above table because either their age was invalid/not reported or one or more setting elements of a child's setting record was invalid or not reported.
- Payment is defined as the total amount received by the provider. It is the sum of the State subsidy and the family copay.
- Average payment per month is based on sums of payments per month in categories divided by counts of children in categories as further defined below.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- For children served by multiple providers, the child's count is proportioned based on the ratio of the monthly hours with each provider divided by the monthly total hours of service. The average hours and payments for each State-month combination are based on the sum of hours in each category divided by the sum of proportional counts in each category. The State's annual results are determined by calculating a weighted average of the monthly results where the weight was the "adjusted" number of children served in each month. The national results shown above represent a weighted average of the State's fiscal annual results where the weight for each State is the average monthly "adjusted" number of children served in each State for the fiscal year.
- The current Technical Bulletin 3 indicates that a payment over \$1,000 per month is considered above the Out of Range Standard and therefore is considered invalid. However, the FFY 2005 market survey data from the highest cost areas of some States shows that the 75-percentile full-time child care market rate cost is above \$1,000 per month. In addition several States have indicated in their ACF-801 notes that they have valid costs over \$1,000. States that have been identified with this issue are: Minnesota, Massachusetts, District of Columbia, Wisconsin, California, Washington, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, New York and Oregon. Nationally approximately 1% of the reported cost data in FFY 2005 exceeded \$1,000 and no State had more than 5% exceeding \$1,000. It is anticipated that the percentage of valid costs that exceed \$1,000 would be slightly higher in FFY 2006 than in FFY 2005. (Note that some of these data percentages with costs over \$1,000 were very large and thus clearly invalid.) The Child Care Bureau has increased this Out of Range Standard to \$2,000 effective October 1, 2006 (FFY 2007), so this should not be an issue in FFY 2007 data.
- Some States have been reporting the maximum number of hours authorized and/or dollars authorized rather than the actual number provided.

Table 16
Child Care and Development Fund

Average Monthly Percent of Families Receiving TANF (FFY 2006)

State	TANF (% Yes)	TANF (% No)	Invalid / Not Reported	Total
Alabama	13%	87%	0%	100%
Alaska	15%	85%	0%	100%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-
Arizona	21%	79%	0%	100%
Arkansas	4%	96%	0%	100%
California	12%	87%	0%	100%
Colorado	12%	88%	0%	100%
Connecticut	43%	57%	0%	100%
Delaware	12%	88%	0%	100%
District of Columbia	14%	86%	0%	100%
Florida	7%	91%	2%	100%
Georgia	8%	92%	0%	100%
Guam	0%	100%	0%	100%
Hawaii	15%	85%	0%	100%
Idaho	2%	98%	0%	100%
Illinois	6%	94%	0%	100%
Indiana	27%	73%	0%	100%
Iowa	32%	68%	0%	100%
Kansas	8%	91%	0%	100%
Kentucky	1%	99%	0%	100%
Louisiana	10%	85%	5%	100%
Maine	4%	96%	0%	100%
Maryland	15%	85%	0%	100%
Massachusetts	18%	82%	0%	100%
Michigan	51%	49%	0%	100%
Minnesota	41%	59%	0%	100%
Mississippi	15%	85%	0%	100%
Missouri	19%	81%	0%	100%
Montana	15%	85%	0%	100%
Nebraska	28%	72%	0%	100%
Nevada	18%	82%	0%	100%
New Hampshire	28%	65%	8%	100%
New Jersey	13%	87%	0%	100%
New Mexico	17%	83%	0%	100%
New York	47%	53%	0%	100%
North Carolina	6%	94%	0%	100%
North Dakota	21%	79%	0%	100%
Northern Mariana Islands	0%	100%	0%	100%
Ohio	16%	84%	0%	100%
Oklahoma	11%	89%	0%	100%
Oregon	30%	70%	0%	100%
Pennsylvania	9%	91%	0%	100%
Puerto Rico	0%	100%	0%	100%
Rhode Island	9%	91%	0%	100%
South Carolina	29%	71%	0%	100%
South Dakota	7%	93%	0%	100%
Tennessee	63%	37%	0%	100%
Texas	1%	99%	0%	100%
Utah	16%	84%	0%	100%
Vermont	17%	83%	0%	100%
Virgin Islands	2%	98%	0%	100%
Virginia	29%	71%	0%	100%
Washington	19%	81%	0%	100%
West Virginia	7%	93%	0%	100%
Wisconsin	5%	95%	0%	100%
Wyoming	0%	100%	0%	100%
National	18%	82%	0%	100%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FFY 2006.
- These percentages were based on the "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). National percentages are based on the "adjusted" national numbers unless otherwise indicated. In other words, the national percentages are equivalent to a weighted average of the State percentages, where the weights are the "adjusted" number of families or children served as appropriate.
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The percentage shown as "Yes" is the number reported as "Yes" divided by the families that answered "Yes" or "No" excluding families that were in protective services. The Invalid/Not Reported column includes families that did not indicate whether TANF was a source of income and the family was reported as being in protective services.

Table 17
Child Care and Development Fund

Average Monthly Mean Family Co-payment as a Percent of Family Income (FFY 2006)

State/Territories	Percent of Families				Mean CoPay as a Percent of Income	
	Families with \$0 Income; Headed by a Child; In Protective Services; Invalid CoPay or Income (Category A)	Families with \$0 CoPay (and not in Category A)	Families with CoPay > \$0 (and not in Category A)	Total of All Families	Including Families with \$0 CoPay	Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay
Alabama	17%	8%	75%	100%	5%	5%
Alaska	10%	9%	81%	100%	4%	4%
American Samoa	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	25%	9%	66%	100%	4%	5%
Arkansas	14%	66%	20%	100%	2%	8%
California	5%	67%	28%	100%	1%	3%
Colorado	27%	8%	65%	100%	9%	10%
Connecticut	9%	4%	87%	100%	5%	5%
Delaware	9%	55%	36%	100%	4%	10%
District of Columbia	45%	18%	38%	100%	3%	4%
Florida	21%	0%	78%	100%	6%	6%
Georgia	16%	11%	73%	100%	6%	7%
Guam	8%	4%	89%	100%	6%	7%
Hawaii	4%	44%	52%	100%	2%	3%
Idaho	11%	0%	89%	100%	10%	10%
Illinois	3%	1%	95%	100%	6%	6%
Indiana	2%	78%	20%	100%	1%	7%
Iowa	11%	56%	34%	100%	2%	5%
Kansas	19%	17%	64%	100%	5%	6%
Kentucky	15%	22%	63%	100%	6%	8%
Louisiana	6%	6%	87%	100%	12%	13%
Maine	6%	3%	91%	100%	7%	8%
Maryland	4%	21%	76%	100%	6%	8%
Massachusetts	19%	24%	57%	100%	6%	9%
Michigan	4%	24%	73%	100%	2%	3%
Minnesota	6%	27%	67%	100%	3%	5%
Mississippi	27%	3%	69%	100%	4%	5%
Missouri	31%	23%	46%	100%	5%	7%
Montana	5%	0%	95%	100%	4%	4%
Nebraska	40%	45%	15%	100%	2%	9%
Nevada	2%	15%	83%	100%	6%	7%
New Hampshire	10%	39%	51%	100%	0%	0%
New Jersey	11%	14%	74%	100%	6%	7%
New Mexico	7%	18%	75%	100%	4%	5%
New York	10%	36%	55%	100%	3%	5%
North Carolina	16%	4%	79%	100%	8%	8%
North Dakota	30%	0%	70%	100%	17%	17%
Northern Mariana Islands	20%	5%	75%	100%	12%	13%
Ohio	7%	4%	89%	100%	6%	6%
Oklahoma	30%	23%	47%	100%	5%	7%
Oregon	25%	6%	69%	100%	8%	9%
Pennsylvania	8%	7%	85%	100%	5%	6%
Puerto Rico	21%	33%	45%	100%	2%	4%
Rhode Island	5%	27%	68%	100%	4%	5%
South Carolina	7%	0%	93%	100%	4%	4%
South Dakota	23%	45%	32%	100%	5%	11%
Tennessee	1%	86%	14%	100%	0%	1%
Texas	25%	6%	70%	100%	9%	10%
Utah	3%	18%	79%	100%	3%	4%
Vermont	30%	5%	64%	100%	5%	5%
Virgin Islands	7%	65%	28%	100%	0%	0%
Virginia	6%	29%	65%	100%	7%	10%
Washington	23%	57%	20%	100%	2%	7%
West Virginia	7%	14%	79%	100%	4%	4%
Wisconsin	15%	3%	82%	100%	6%	6%
Wyoming	15%	2%	84%	100%	5%	5%
National	13%	24%	63%	100%	5%	6%

Notes applicable to this report:

Data as of: 15-JUL-2008

- The source for this table is ACF-801 data for FY 2006.
- All counts are "adjusted" numbers of families and children unless otherwise indicated. These "adjusted" numbers represent the number funded through CCDF only. The "adjusted" number is the raw or "unadjusted" number reported by the State multiplied by the pooling factor as reported on the ACF-800. DC has indicated that the pooling factor reported on the ACF-800 is not applicable to the ACF-801. This report takes this factor into consideration in calculating the "adjusted" numbers or percentages.
- All States provide an actual unadjusted count of families served each month. For States reporting full population data, the number of child records reported each month were directly counted. However, for States that only submit samples, the ratio of children-to-families was determined each month from the samples and then multiplied by the reported number of families to obtain an estimate of the unadjusted number of children served each month. The unadjusted average number of families and children were obtained from the monthly numbers in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).
- A "0%" indication often means the value is less than 0.5% rather than actually zero. In a few instances, the sum of the categories may not appear to add up to exactly 100% because of rounding.
- At the time of publication American Samoa had not yet reported ACF-801 data for FFY 2006 and Guam had only submitted ten (10) months of data.
- Connecticut does not report ACF-801 data on all or nearly all children served by contracted centers. Alaska's reported population does not accurately reflect the population served from October 2005 through January 2006 by CCDF due to sampling difficulties. However, Alaska began reporting full population data in February 2006. Alaska does not report any children in foster care or families headed by a child.
- The "Mean CoPay/Income" columns exclude families with zero income because dividing by zero is undefined.
- The Column labeled as "Category A" includes: families with zero income; families in protective services or families headed by a child; families with invalid income or copay.
- The "Families with \$0 Copay ..." category is the percentage of families that had a \$0 co-payment and were not in Category A, divided by the count of all families. The sum of these three categories is 100%.
- The results shown under "Mean Copay/Income" feature two different statistics, "Including" and "Excluding" \$0 copay. The data analyzed for the "Including Families with \$0 CoPay" category includes all families except those families in the "Category A" data i.e., the total minus the Category A data. The data analyzed for "Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay" includes only those families in the category "Families with CoPay >\$0 (and not in Category A)". Alternatively, the data used for "Excluding Families with \$0 CoPay" is all the family data minus those families in Category A and minus those families with \$0 CoPay.
- The National weighted values were determined by multiplying each State's average co-payment/income percentage by the adjusted number of children in each State, summing across the States and then dividing by the adjusted number of children served for the Nation.