



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

---

April 30, 2009

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #241

### **Funding for Local Child Support Enforcement Activities (DCF -- Child Support)**

[LFB 2009-11 Budget Summary: Page 171, #2]

---

#### **CURRENT LAW**

The costs of administering child support enforcement activities performed by counties in Wisconsin are supported by a combination of federal funds, state general purpose revenue (GPR), and county revenue from local sales tax, property tax, and shared revenue. The largest source of funding for child support enforcement activities comes from the federal government in the form of federal child support incentive payments and federal matching funds.

The federal government distributes child support incentive payments to states in order to encourage and reward state programs that perform in a cost-effective and efficient manner. States must compete against each other for incentive dollars. These funds support both state operations of child support enforcement activities in the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and child support enforcement activities performed by counties through contracts with DCF.

DCF distributes the state's award of federal child support incentive payments to counties as follows: (a) the amount of the federal incentive payments awarded to the state if the award is less than \$12,340,000; or (b) \$12,340,000 plus 30% of the amount awarded to the state that exceeds \$12,340,000. DCF may retain 70% of the federal child support incentive payments awarded to the state that exceed \$12,340,000 to support state child support enforcement activities.

Prior to enactment of the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005, states could claim 66% federal child support matching funds if they reinvested their federal incentive payments into child support enforcement activities. Therefore, an expenditure of \$1 of federal incentive payments would generate a match of \$1.94, and fund nearly \$3 of child support

enforcement expenditures. The federal DRA eliminated the ability to receive federal matching funds for federal incentive payments, beginning October 1, 2007.

As a result of the inability to receive federal matching funds for federal incentive payments expended on child support enforcement activities, counties lost substantial federal funding for child support activities. To partially offset this reduction, 2007 Wisconsin Act 20 provided additional state funds for county child support enforcement activities in the amount of \$2,750,000 in 2007-08 and \$5,500,000 in 2008-09.

In addition, Act 20 restructured the state supplemental incentive payment program to cap the amount of state incentive payments at \$5,500,000 GPR per fiscal year, beginning in 2008-09, plus any amounts not obligated in the prior fiscal year. Prior to Act 20, the state could only provide state incentive payments if the federal incentive payment was less than \$12,340,000, and state law capped the total amount of federal incentive payments and state incentive payments combined at \$12,340,000.

Because federal legislation had been introduced to restore the ability to match federal incentive payments, Act 20 also specified that if the ability to match federal child support incentive payments were reinstated, then state law regarding the state incentive program prior to Act 20 would be reinstated. In other words, if federal legislation reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments, then the state could only provide state supplemental incentive payments if the federal incentive payment was less than \$12,340,000, and total federal and state incentive payments combined would be capped at \$12,340,000. Prior state law regarding the state supplemental incentive payment program would be reinstated on the effective date of the federal legislation as stated in a notice provided by DCF in the Wisconsin Administrative Register.

Finally, under Act 20, the additional GPR funding of \$2,750,000 in 2007-08 and \$5,500,000 in 2008-09 for county child support enforcement activities was placed in the Joint Committee on Finance's program supplements appropriation for release under s. 13.10 of the statutes to see if federal legislation would reinstate the ability to match federal child support incentive payments.

In December, 2007, a request was made under s. 13.10 of the statutes to release the funds for the child support enforcement program, since no federal legislation was passed that reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments. The Committee approved the request, but also directed the Department of Workforce Development (now DCF) to include a provision in the county child support contracts that specified if federal law is subsequently modified to restore the ability to match federal child support incentive payments at the previous 66% match rate or higher, then the counties could no longer access the GPR funding after the date on which the new federal provisions take effect.

The federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 provides for the temporary reinstatement of the ability to receive federal matching funds for federal incentive payments for the period of October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2010. Beginning October 1,

2010, the federal DRA's provision that eliminated the ability to receive federal matching funds for federal child support incentive payments will be reinstated.

## **GOVERNOR**

Provide \$9,500,000 (-\$5,500,000 GPR and \$15,000,000 FED) annually to reflect federal matching funds under the federal ARRA and a corresponding reduction of GPR funds.

*State Incentive Payments to Counties.* Reduce funding by \$5,500,000 GPR annually to reflect the elimination of state incentive payments to counties for the 2009-11 biennium. Because the counties will be able to receive federal matching funds for federal child support incentive payments from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2010, the bill would eliminate state incentive payments during the 2009-11 biennium.

*Federal Match on County Child Support Expenditures.* Increase funding by \$15,000,000 FED annually to reflect the estimated net increase of federal matching funds on child support incentive payments less the federal matching funds on state incentive GPR payments.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

### **Suggested Modifications**

1. The administration has requested a modification to AB 75 that would: (a) recognize savings of \$2,750,000 GPR in 2008-09; and (b) provide \$2,750,000 GPR in 2010-11 for local child support enforcement activities. Of the \$5,500,000 GPR budgeted for state supplemental child support incentive payments in 2008-09 under 2007 Act 20, \$2,750,000 GPR was spent from July 1, 2008, through September 30, 2008, and \$2,750,000 GPR remains unspent. Act 20 required the child support local assistance appropriation, which funds state supplemental incentive payments, to be repealed on the date stated in the notice in the Wisconsin Administrative Register once federal legislation reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments. Once this appropriation is repealed, the \$2,750,000 remaining unspent funds will lapse to the general fund.

The ARRA temporarily reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments. The required notice in the Wisconsin Administrative Register was issued on April 14, 2009, with an effective date of April 15, 2009. The bill should be modified to reflect that the opening general fund balance will be increased by \$2,750,000 GPR due to the lapse of these funds by June 30, 2009 (Alternative 2).

2. Also, the administration has requested that an additional \$2,750,000 GPR in 2010-11 be provided for local child support enforcement activities. The administration indicates that due to the timing of the federal funds (the federal match for federal incentive payments ends on September 31, 2010), the additional GPR would be needed to be able to provide sufficient funding for local child support enforcement activities in 2010-11 (Alternative 3).

3. Since the combined total of federal incentive payments (\$12,539,200 for the county share) and state incentive payments (\$2,750,000 GPR) would be greater than the combined cap of \$12,340,000, the state supplemental incentive payment program would have to be changed to allow for the provision of \$2.75 million GPR in 2010-11 for state supplemental incentive payments to counties.

4. Finally, estimates of federal matching funds under AB 75 overestimate the amount of federal incentive matching payments that would be distributed to county child support agencies. The bill passes through the federal matching funds to counties for the total child support incentive payment. However, the entire child support incentive payment would not be distributed to counties. Rather, the child support incentive payment would be distributed to both DCF for state child support enforcement operations and to counties for local child support enforcement activities according to the distribution formula noted above under current law. In addition, the bill assumes federal matching funds will be available for the entire child support incentive payment in 2010-11. However, federal matching funds will be allowed for the child support incentive payment only through September 30, 2010. Assuming that counties can spend one-half of their child support incentive payment in 2010-11 by September 30, 2010, one-half of the child support incentive payment amount would be eligible for federal matching funds. If the Committee does not add an additional \$2,750,000 GPR in 2010-11, then the amounts in the bill would have to be reduced by \$1,190,200 FED in 2009-10 and \$13,506,100 FED in 2010-11 (Alternative 1). If the Committee does add an additional \$2,750,000 GPR in 2010-11, then federal funding would have to be reduced by \$1,190,200 in 2009-10 and \$8,167,900 in 2010-11 (Alternative 3).

5. It should be noted that federal matching funds under the federal ARRA are estimates. If local child support agencies receive more than the estimated amounts, it is assumed that DCF would not have to return to the Committee to access these excess amounts.

### **Funding for Local Child Support Enforcement Activities**

6. Counties are required to contract with DCF to implement and administer the child support enforcement program at the local level. County responsibilities include: (a) establishing child support and medical support orders; (b) establishing paternity; (c) providing data related to support orders; and (d) enforcing medical and financial child support orders.

7. DCF distributes federal child support incentive payments and state funding to counties for child support enforcement activities. Allocations are determined for each county based on its share of statewide support cases that receive enforcement services from a child support agency. Each county is guaranteed 80% to 90% of its allocation of the amount of the incentive funding. The remainder is awarded based on the county's performance on one or more standards. Four standards were used to determine calendar year (CY) 2009 awards: (a) percentage of cases with a child support order; (b) percentage of children for whom paternity was established; (c) percentage of child support received compared to the total amount of child support due in each month; and (d) percentage of cases with arrearages for which a collection was made on the arrearages during the federal fiscal year.

8. The federal DRA eliminated the ability to match federal child support incentive

payments. As a result, 2007 Act 20 provided \$5,500,000 GPR in 2008-09 to partially offset the loss of funding. Attachment 1 shows the preliminary allocations of federal child support incentive payments, the \$5,500,000 GPR funding, and federal matching funds for the GPR funding for each county in CY 2009. The \$5.5 million in GPR funding for local child support enforcement activities in CY 2009 assumed that \$2.75 million would be provided for the first six months of CY 2009 in 2008-09 under Act 20, and an additional \$2.75 million would be provided for local child support enforcement activities for the last six months of CY 2009 in the 2009-11 biennial budget.

9. However, the federal ARRA reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments for the period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2010. As a result, counties would not get the \$2.75 million GPR allocated for the first six months of CY 2009 under Act 20 pursuant to the December, 2007, s. 13.10 provision that prohibited counties from accessing the allocated GPR funding subsequent to the date the federal match was restored. Information provided by DCF indicates that \$2.75 million GPR was spent from July 1, 2008, through September 30, 2008, before the ARRA provision allowed reinstatement of the ability to match federal child support incentive payments on October 1, 2008. Attachment 2 shows the current funding allocations for local child support enforcement activities for each county in CY 2009 under the ARRA provision. Attachment 3 shows estimated allocations for local child support enforcement activities for each county under the ARRA provision for CY 2010. Attachment 4 shows estimated CY 2011 allocations for local child support enforcement activities for each county under the ARRA provision with no additional GPR added in 2010-11. Finally, Attachment 5 shows estimated CY 2011 allocations for local child support enforcement activities for each county under the ARRA provision with the additional \$2.75 million GPR in 2010-11 suggested by the administration.

10. It should be noted that counties also fund child support enforcement activities with federal medical support liability incentive funds, county tax revenue, and shared revenue. Federal law permits child support agencies to attempt to recover birth costs that were paid by Medicaid, rather than the responsible parents, by allowing the child support agency to retain an incentive payment equal to 15% of the amount of medical support recovered by the agency. A total of \$3.3 million was earned by counties for CY 2008. Counties are eligible for federal matching funds on medical support liability incentive funds at the rate of 66% if these funds are expended on child support enforcement activities. Assuming counties do spend the medical support liability incentive payments on child support enforcement activities, counties are eligible for a federal match of \$6.3 million. It is estimated that counties provided an additional \$13.5 million in county tax revenue and shared revenue to support child support enforcement activities in CY 2008. These county revenues are eligible for a federal match of \$26.2 million.

11. Due to the federal DRA provision that eliminated the ability to match federal child incentive payments, it was estimated that counties would lose \$25.3 million annually in funding for child support enforcement activities. In order to restore this loss in funding, the state would have had to provide \$8.6 million GPR, which would have drawn down an additional \$16.7 million FED in matching funds, for a total of \$25.3 million. However 2007 Act 20 provided \$5.5 million GPR, which drew an additional \$10.7 million in federal matching funds, for a total of \$16.2 million. Local child support agencies absorbed the remaining loss in funds of \$9.1 million by either increasing county tax revenue or reducing expenditures.

12. Two additional funding sources for local child support enforcement activities have also been reduced during the 2007-09 biennium as a result of determinations made by the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: (a) local child support agencies are no longer allowed to claim matching funds under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (relating to child support enforcement) for costs associated with the administration of non IV-D support cases; and (b) the amount of birth costs in a medical support order, which determines the amount of the medical support liability incentive payment, must be based on the parent's ability to pay instead of assigning one-half of the birthing costs to be paid by each parent.

13. The OCSE conducted an audit of selected costs claimed and reported by Wisconsin's Bureau of Child Support (BCS) in the Department of Workforce Development (now DCF) for the quarter that ended March 31, 2007. The purpose of the audit was to determine whether selected costs claimed for federal matching funds of child support enforcement activities conformed with requirements for allocability, allowability, and reasonableness as defined under federal regulations and standards. On November 24, 2008, the OCSE issued the results of the audit. The audit concluded that certain costs claimed were either not allocable or allowed under Title IV-D. The main finding indicated that local child support enforcement agencies were claiming costs for maintaining financial information in the state case registry and income withholding information for non IV-D cases. These activities are not eligible for federal matching funds. A IV-D case involves a person who has received public assistance, such as Wisconsin Works (W-2), FoodShare, or Medicaid, and has been referred for child support enforcement services, as well as a person who has never received public assistance but has applied for services to collect child support. A non IV-D case refers to a person who has never received public assistance and has never applied for services to collect child support. As a result of the audit, local child support enforcement agencies have lost federal revenue of approximately \$600,000 annually.

14. In addition, the OCSE notified Wisconsin that the state's request for the federal income tax refund offset would not be certified for birth cost orders that were not set in accordance with the parent's ability to pay. The federal income tax refund offset is one of the primary tools to collect birth costs owed to the state. This decision required local child support agencies to review birth expenses assessed on all cases between 1989 and 2008 and adjust amounts to coincide with the parent's ability to pay as set forth in rules promulgated by DCF. Attachment 6 shows the maximum birth cost amounts for low-income payers, effective March 1, 2009.

15. Due to this decision, local child support agencies had an unfunded increase in workload. Another effect of this decision was the reduction of the amount of birth costs owed to the state and, therefore, collected. As a result, the medical incentive payments decreased because they total 15% of the total birth costs collected. According to DCF, loss of funding due to a reduction in medical support incentive payments is estimated at \$1.0 million annually. In addition, counties would lose federal matching funds for this revenue source of \$1.9 million, for a total loss of \$2.9 million annually.

16. Finally, counties have indicated that county tax revenue may decline due to the state of the economy. Because of the reduction of all of these funding sources, and the increased

workload, local child support enforcement agencies indicate that additional funding would be needed. Instead of the \$5.5 million GPR (and \$10.7 million in federal matching funds) that the state provides, an additional \$3 million GPR would be needed, for a total of \$8.5 million GPR annually (and \$16.5 million in federal matching funds) to fully fund ongoing expenses. However, with the ARRA provision that reinstates the ability to match federal child support incentive payments, funding is not an issue until 2010-11, with the CY 2011 allocations to each county.

17. Without the ARRA provision and with the suggested increase in GPR funds of \$8.5 million annually, total funding for counties would be approximately \$37.5 million annually (\$12.5 million FED in incentive payments, \$8.5 million GPR, and \$16.5 million FED match on the GPR). Under the ARRA provision, local child support enforcement agencies would receive \$37.4 million in CY 2009 and \$37.1 million in CY 2010. However, in CY 2011, local child support enforcement agencies would receive \$12.5 million, with no additional GPR added, or \$28.7 million with an additional \$2.75 million GPR added in 2010-11 as suggested by the administration.

18. The Committee could provide \$4,417,200 GPR in 2010-11 and reduce federal funding by \$1,190,200 FED in 2009-10 and by \$4,931,500 FED in 2010-11 compared to the bill (Alternative 4). Attachment 7 shows the allocation for each county in CY 2011 under this alternative. This alternative would provide \$38.5 million in CY 2011 for local child support enforcement activities, which is approximately the ongoing amount local child support agencies indicated would be needed to help offset the reduction of other revenue sources. To maintain the same level of funding in the next biennium, \$8.5 million GPR annually would be needed.

19. As noted above for Alternative 3 in paragraph #3, the state supplemental incentive payment program would have to be changed to allow for the provision of \$4,417,200 GPR in 2010-11 for state supplemental incentive payments to counties.

20. Although the ability to match federal child support incentive payments ends September 30, 2010, it is possible that subsequent federal legislation could extend this ability to match. 2007 Act 20 had restructured the state supplemental incentive payment program to cap the amount of state incentive payments at \$5,500,000 GPR per fiscal year. However, Act 20 also required reinstatement of the state supplemental incentive payment program as it existed prior to Act 20, which only allowed state supplemental payments if federal child support incentive payments to counties fell below \$12,340,000 and capped both state and federal incentive payments combined at \$12,340,000, if federal legislation reinstated the ability to match federal child support incentive payments. A similar requirement could be made to ensure that if the ability to match federal child incentive payments were extended or later reinstated, state funding would not be used unless federal incentive payments fall below the threshold of \$12,340,000 (Alternative 5).

21. In addition, the Committee could require DCF to include a provision in the county child support contracts that would eliminate the ability to access GPR funding after the date on which new federal provisions that would restore the ability to match federal child support incentive payments at 66% or higher take effect (Alternative 6).

22. Finally, the Committee could provide no additional state funding for local child support enforcement activities (Alternative 1). As a result, \$12.5 million would be provided for

local child support agencies in CY 2011, as shown in Attachment 4. Local child support agencies would have to increase funding from county tax revenue or reduce expenditures.

23. However, the state's share of federal child support incentive payments is based on the state's performance on certain measures. With reductions to staff and other expenditures, the state's ability to perform well would decline. A decline in performance could mean that the state's share of the federal child support incentive payments would be reduced. In addition, collections of assigned child support helps to fund temporary assistance for needy families (TANF) related programs. If the state is unable to collect these amounts due to a reduction in funding, the state could also fail to meet its TANF maintenance of effort requirement. A reduction in the TANF block grant to the state could result as a penalty to meet the maintenance of effort requirement. Under federal law, the state's basic TANF block grant will be reduced by the amount by which qualified state expenditures in the previous year are less than the maintenance of effort requirement.

## ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to reduce funding by \$5,500,000 GPR annually, but modify the recommendation to reduce federal funding, compared to the bill, by \$1,190,200 FED in 2009-10 and by \$13,506,100 FED in 2010-11 to reflect the counties' actual share of the federal child support incentive payments and matching funds and that only half of the incentive payment in 2010-11 would be matched. Funding for counties would total \$37.1 million in CY 2010 and \$12.5 million in CY 2011 (Attachments 3 and 4).

<b>ALT 1</b>	<b>Change to Bill</b>
	Funding
FED	- \$14,696,300

2. Increase the 2009-10 opening general fund balance by \$2,750,000 to reflect the lapse of unspent funding for local child support agencies in 2008-09.

<b>ALT 2</b>	<b>Change to Bill</b>
	2009-10
	Opening Balance
GPR	\$2,750,000

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation, at the administration's request, to provide \$2,750,000 GPR in 2010-11. In addition, reduce funding by \$1,190,200 FED in 2009-10 and by \$8,167,900 FED in 2010-11 to reflect the counties' actual share of the federal child support incentive payments and matching funds, that only half of the incentive payment in 2010-11 would be matched, and that there would be matching funds for the GPR funding in 2010-11. Funding for counties would total \$37.1 million in CY 2010 and \$28.7 million in CY 2011 (Attachments 3 and 5).

<b>ALT 3</b>	<b>Change to Bill Funding</b>
GPR	\$2,750,000
FED	<u>- 9,358,100</u>
Total	- \$6,608,100

4. Modify the Governor's recommendation to provide \$4,417,200 GPR in 2010-11. In addition, reduce funding by \$1,190,200 FED and by \$4,931,500 FED in 2010-11 to reflect the counties' actual share of the federal child support incentive payments and matching funds, that only half of the incentive payment in 2010-11 would be matched, and that there would be matching funds for the GPR funding in 2010-11. Funding for counties would total \$37.1 million in CY 2010 and \$38.5 million in CY 2011 (Attachments 3 and 7).

<b>ALT 4</b>	<b>Change to Bill Funding</b>
GPR	\$4,417,200
FED	<u>- 6,121,700</u>
Total	- \$1,704,500

5. In addition to Alternative 3 or Alternative 4, modify the state supplemental child support incentive payment program to allow maximum state payments equal to the amount of GPR provided in 2010-11 (\$2,750,000 GPR under Alternative 3 or \$4,417,200 GPR under Alternative 4). Create a continuing appropriation for state supplemental child support incentive payments. In addition, require these changes to be repealed and current law to be reinstated if federal legislation reinstates the ability to match federal child support incentive payments.

6. In addition to Alternative 3 or Alternative 4, direct DCF to include a provision in the county child support contracts specifying that if federal law is subsequently modified to restore the ability to match federal child support incentive payments at the previous 66% match rate or higher, the counties could no longer access the GPR funding provided under either Alternative 3 or Alternative 4 after the date on which the new federal provisions take effect.

Prepared by: Kim Swissdorf  
Attachments



## ATTACHMENT 1

### CY 2009 Preliminary County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$5.5 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Adams	\$41,793	\$18,098	\$35,131	\$95,022
Ashland	50,192	21,734	42,190	114,116
Barron	113,837	49,294	95,688	258,819
Bayfield	29,216	12,650	24,556	66,422
Brown	524,129	226,962	440,573	1,191,664
Buffalo	19,663	8,514	16,527	44,704
Burnett	39,047	16,908	32,821	88,776
Calumet	53,097	22,992	44,632	120,721
Chippewa	114,753	49,692	96,461	260,906
Clark	44,659	19,338	37,538	101,535
Columbia	96,921	41,970	81,471	220,362
Crawford	33,634	14,564	28,271	76,469
Dane	808,165	349,956	679,326	1,837,447
Dodge	150,416	65,134	126,437	341,987
Door	44,301	19,182	37,236	100,719
Douglas	130,953	56,706	110,076	297,735
Dunn	77,497	33,558	65,142	176,197
Eau Claire	191,135	82,766	160,663	434,564
Florence	8,757	3,792	7,361	19,910
Fond du Lac	183,811	79,596	154,510	417,917
Forest	29,415	12,736	24,723	66,874
Grant	71,487	30,956	60,091	162,534
Green	57,476	24,890	48,316	130,682
Green Lake	35,266	15,270	29,642	80,178
Iowa	33,435	14,478	28,104	76,017
Iron	10,229	4,430	8,599	23,258
Jackson	48,918	21,182	41,118	111,218
Jefferson	144,526	62,584	121,487	328,597
Juneau	68,024	29,456	57,179	154,659
Kenosha	461,280	199,746	387,742	1,048,768
Kewaunee	27,345	11,840	22,984	62,169
La Crosse	207,335	89,782	174,283	471,400
Lafayette	25,195	10,910	21,178	57,283
Langlade	60,819	26,336	51,123	138,278
Lincoln	54,212	23,474	45,567	123,253
Manitowoc	145,481	62,998	122,290	330,769
Marathon	236,670	102,484	198,940	538,094
Marinette	92,901	40,228	78,090	211,219
Marquette	25,394	10,996	21,345	57,735
Milwaukee	4,038,458	1,748,762	3,394,656	9,181,876

**ATTACHMENT 1 (continued)**

**CY 2009 Preliminary County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$5.5 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Monroe	\$97,000	\$42,004	\$81,537	\$220,541
Oconto	75,666	32,766	63,605	172,037
Oneida	72,720	31,490	61,128	165,338
Outagamie	281,289	121,806	236,447	639,542
Ozaukee	71,725	31,060	60,293	163,078
Pepin	9,752	4,222	8,196	22,170
Pierce	44,619	19,320	37,504	101,443
Polk	62,690	27,146	52,695	142,531
Portage	100,543	43,538	84,515	228,596
Price	27,026	11,702	22,716	61,444
Racine	695,083	300,990	584,275	1,580,348
Richland	33,833	14,650	28,438	76,921
Rock	463,270	200,608	389,416	1,053,294
Rusk	40,201	17,408	33,792	91,401
St. Croix	97,558	42,246	82,007	221,811
Sauk	117,817	51,020	99,039	267,876
Sawyer	56,322	24,388	47,341	128,051
Shawano	66,034	28,594	55,506	150,134
Sheboygan	197,902	85,698	166,355	449,955
Taylor	36,977	16,012	31,082	84,071
Trempealeau	51,545	22,320	43,327	117,192
Vernon	37,972	16,442	31,917	86,331
Vilas	27,146	11,754	22,817	61,717
Walworth	187,513	81,198	157,620	426,331
Washburn	37,694	16,322	31,684	85,700
Washington	134,893	58,412	113,388	306,693
Waukesha	332,357	143,920	279,374	755,651
Waupaca	94,135	40,764	79,130	214,029
Waushara	43,823	18,976	36,836	99,635
Winnebago	318,027	137,716	267,331	723,074
Wood	<u>158,337</u>	<u>68,564</u>	<u>133,095</u>	<u>359,996</u>
Total	\$12,701,311	\$5,500,000	\$10,676,471	\$28,877,782

## ATTACHMENT 2

### CY 2009 Preliminary County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments and Federal Matching Funds

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Adams	\$41,793	\$81,128	\$122,921
Ashland	50,192	97,432	147,624
Barron	113,837	220,978	334,815
Bayfield	29,216	56,713	85,929
Brown	524,129	1,017,427	1,541,556
Buffalo	19,663	38,169	57,832
Burnett	39,047	75,797	114,844
Calumet	53,097	103,071	156,168
Chippewa	114,753	222,756	337,509
Clark	44,659	86,691	131,350
Columbia	96,921	188,141	285,062
Crawford	33,634	65,290	98,924
Dane	808,165	1,568,791	2,376,956
Dodge	150,416	291,984	442,400
Door	44,301	85,996	130,297
Douglas	130,953	254,203	385,156
Dunn	77,497	150,435	227,932
Eau Claire	191,135	371,027	562,162
Florence	8,757	16,999	25,756
Fond du Lac	183,811	356,810	540,621
Forest	29,415	57,100	86,515
Grant	71,487	138,769	210,256
Green	57,476	111,571	169,047
Green Lake	35,266	68,458	103,724
Iowa	33,435	64,903	98,338
Iron	10,229	19,856	30,085
Jackson	48,918	94,958	143,876
Jefferson	144,526	280,550	425,076
Juneau	68,024	132,047	200,071
Kenosha	461,280	895,426	1,356,706
Kewaunee	27,345	53,081	80,426
La Crosse	207,335	402,474	609,809
Lafayette	25,195	48,908	74,103
Langlade	60,819	118,060	178,879
Lincoln	54,212	105,235	159,447
Manitowoc	145,481	282,404	427,885
Marathon	236,670	459,418	696,088
Marinette	92,901	180,337	273,238
Marquette	25,394	49,294	74,688
Milwaukee	4,038,458	7,839,360	11,877,818

**ATTACHMENT 2 (continued)**

**CY 2009 Preliminary County Allocations for Child Support  
Federal Incentive Payments and Federal Matching Funds**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Monroe	\$97,000	\$188,294	\$285,294
Oconto	75,666	146,881	222,547
Oneida	72,720	141,162	213,882
Outagamie	281,289	546,032	827,321
Ozaukee	71,725	139,231	210,956
Pepin	9,752	18,930	28,682
Pierce	44,619	86,613	131,232
Polk	62,690	121,692	184,382
Portage	100,543	195,172	295,715
Price	27,026	52,462	79,488
Racine	695,083	1,349,279	2,044,362
Richland	33,833	65,676	99,509
Rock	463,270	899,289	1,362,559
Rusk	40,201	78,037	118,238
St. Croix	97,558	189,377	286,935
Sauk	117,817	228,704	346,521
Sawyer	56,322	109,331	165,653
Shawano	66,034	128,184	194,218
Sheboygan	197,902	384,163	582,065
Taylor	36,977	71,779	108,756
Trempealeau	51,545	100,058	151,603
Vernon	37,972	73,710	111,682
Vilas	27,146	52,695	79,841
Walworth	187,513	363,996	551,509
Washburn	37,694	73,171	110,865
Washington	134,893	261,851	396,744
Waukesha	332,357	645,164	977,521
Waupaca	94,135	182,733	276,868
Waushara	43,823	85,068	128,891
Winnebago	318,027	617,347	935,374
Wood	<u>158,337</u>	<u>307,360</u>	<u>465,697</u>
Total	\$12,701,311	\$24,655,486	\$37,356,797

### ATTACHMENT 3

#### CY 2010 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments and Federal Matching Funds

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Adams	\$41,506	\$80,571	\$122,077
Ashland	49,848	96,763	146,610
Barron	113,056	219,461	332,517
Bayfield	29,015	56,324	85,340
Brown	520,532	1,010,444	1,530,976
Buffalo	19,528	37,907	57,435
Burnett	38,779	75,277	114,056
Calumet	52,733	102,363	155,096
Chippewa	113,965	221,227	335,192
Clark	44,352	86,096	130,449
Columbia	96,256	186,850	283,105
Crawford	33,403	64,841	98,245
Dane	802,618	1,558,024	2,360,642
Dodge	149,384	289,980	439,364
Door	43,997	85,406	129,403
Douglas	130,054	252,458	382,512
Dunn	76,965	149,403	226,368
Eau Claire	189,823	368,480	558,304
Florence	8,697	16,882	25,579
Fond du Lac	182,549	354,361	536,910
Forest	29,213	56,708	85,921
Grant	70,996	137,816	208,813
Green	57,082	110,805	167,887
Green Lake	35,024	67,988	103,012
Iowa	33,206	64,458	97,663
Iron	10,159	19,720	29,879
Jackson	48,582	94,307	142,889
Jefferson	143,534	278,625	422,159
Juneau	67,557	131,140	198,697
Kenosha	458,114	889,280	1,347,395
Kewaunee	27,157	52,717	79,874
La Crosse	205,912	399,712	605,624
Lafayette	25,022	48,572	73,594
Langlade	60,402	117,250	177,652
Lincoln	53,840	104,513	158,353
Manitowoc	144,483	280,466	424,949
Marathon	235,046	456,265	691,311
Marinette	92,263	179,100	271,363
Marquette	25,220	48,956	74,176
Milwaukee	4,010,741	7,785,557	11,796,298

**ATTACHMENT 3 (continued)**

**CY 2010 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support  
Federal Incentive Payments and Federal Matching Funds**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for Incentive Payment</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Monroe	\$96,334	\$187,002	\$283,336
Oconto	75,147	145,873	221,020
Oneida	72,221	140,194	212,414
Outagamie	279,358	542,284	821,643
Ozaukee	71,233	138,275	209,508
Pepin	9,685	18,800	28,486
Pierce	44,313	86,019	130,332
Polk	62,260	120,857	183,117
Portage	99,853	193,832	293,685
Price	26,841	52,102	78,943
Racine	690,313	1,340,018	2,030,331
Richland	33,601	65,225	98,826
Rock	460,091	893,117	1,353,207
Rusk	39,925	77,502	117,427
St. Croix	96,888	188,078	284,966
Sauk	117,008	227,134	344,142
Sawyer	55,935	108,581	164,516
Shawano	65,581	127,304	192,885
Sheboygan	196,544	381,526	578,070
Taylor	36,723	71,286	108,009
Trempealeau	51,191	99,371	150,562
Vernon	37,711	73,204	110,916
Vilas	26,960	52,334	79,293
Walworth	186,226	361,498	547,724
Washburn	37,435	72,669	110,104
Washington	133,967	260,054	394,021
Waukesha	330,076	640,736	970,812
Waupaca	93,489	181,479	274,967
Waushara	43,522	84,484	128,007
Winnebago	315,844	613,110	928,954
Wood	<u>157,250</u>	<u>305,251</u>	<u>462,501</u>
Total	\$12,614,140	\$24,486,272	\$37,100,412

## ATTACHMENT 4

### CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments and No Additional GPR

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>
Adams	\$41,259
Ashland	49,551
Barron	112,384
Bayfield	28,843
Brown	517,438
Buffalo	19,412
Burnett	38,549
Calumet	52,419
Chippewa	113,288
Clark	44,089
Columbia	95,684
Crawford	33,205
Dane	797,848
Dodge	148,496
Door	43,735
Douglas	129,281
Dunn	76,508
Eau Claire	188,695
Florence	8,645
Fond du Lac	181,465
Forest	29,039
Grant	70,574
Green	56,742
Green Lake	34,816
Iowa	33,008
Iron	10,098
Jackson	48,294
Jefferson	142,681
Juneau	67,156
Kenosha	455,391
Kewaunee	26,996
La Crosse	204,688
Lafayette	24,873
Langlade	60,043
Lincoln	53,520

**ATTACHMENT 4 (continued)**

**CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support  
Federal Incentive Payments and No Additional GPR**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>
Manitowoc	\$143,624
Marathon	233,649
Marinette	91,715
Marquette	25,070
Milwaukee	3,986,904
Monroe	95,762
Oconto	74,700
Oneida	71,792
Outagamie	277,698
Ozaukee	70,809
Pepin	9,628
Pierce	44,049
Polk	61,890
Portage	99,259
Price	26,681
Racine	686,210
Richland	33,401
Rock	457,356
Rusk	39,688
St. Croix	96,313
Sauk	116,313
Sawyer	55,603
Shawano	65,191
Sheboygan	195,376
Taylor	36,505
Trempealeau	50,887
Vernon	37,487
Vilas	26,799
Walworth	185,119
Washburn	37,213
Washington	133,171
Waukesha	328,114
Waupaca	92,933
Waushara	43,264
Winnebago	313,967
Wood	<u>156,316</u>
Total	\$12,539,170

## ATTACHMENT 5

### CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$5.5 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Adams	\$41,259	\$18,098	\$35,131	\$94,489
Ashland	49,551	21,734	42,190	113,475
Barron	112,384	49,294	95,688	257,366
Bayfield	28,843	12,650	24,556	66,049
Brown	517,438	226,962	440,573	1,184,973
Buffalo	19,412	8,514	16,527	44,453
Burnett	38,549	16,908	32,821	88,278
Calumet	52,419	22,992	44,632	120,043
Chippewa	113,288	49,692	96,461	259,441
Clark	44,089	19,338	37,538	100,965
Columbia	95,684	41,970	81,471	219,125
Crawford	33,205	14,564	28,271	76,040
Dane	797,848	349,956	679,326	1,827,131
Dodge	148,496	65,134	126,437	340,066
Door	43,735	19,182	37,236	100,153
Douglas	129,281	56,706	110,076	296,064
Dunn	76,508	33,558	65,142	175,208
Eau Claire	188,695	82,766	160,663	432,124
Florence	8,645	3,792	7,361	19,798
Fond du Lac	181,465	79,596	154,510	415,570
Forest	29,039	12,736	24,723	66,498
Grant	70,574	30,956	60,091	161,621
Green	56,742	24,890	48,316	129,948
Green Lake	34,816	15,270	29,642	79,728
Iowa	33,008	14,478	28,104	75,591
Iron	10,098	4,430	8,599	23,128
Jackson	48,294	21,182	41,118	110,594
Jefferson	142,681	62,584	121,487	326,752
Juneau	67,156	29,456	57,179	153,791
Kenosha	455,391	199,746	387,742	1,042,880
Kewaunee	26,996	11,840	22,984	61,819
La Crosse	204,688	89,782	174,283	468,753
Lafayette	24,873	10,910	21,178	56,962
Langlade	60,043	26,336	51,123	137,501
Lincoln	53,520	23,474	45,567	122,561
Manitowoc	143,624	62,998	122,290	328,912
Marathon	233,649	102,484	198,940	535,072
Marinette	91,715	40,228	78,090	210,033
Marquette	25,070	10,996	21,345	57,411
Milwaukee	3,986,904	1,748,762	3,394,656	9,130,322

**ATTACHMENT 5 (continued)**

**CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$5.5 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Monroe	\$95,762	\$42,004	\$81,537	\$219,303
Oconto	74,700	32,766	63,605	171,071
Oneida	71,792	31,490	61,128	164,409
Outagamie	277,698	121,806	236,447	635,951
Ozaukee	70,809	31,060	60,293	162,162
Pepin	9,628	4,222	8,196	22,045
Pierce	44,049	19,320	37,504	100,873
Polk	61,890	27,146	52,695	141,731
Portage	99,259	43,538	84,515	227,312
Price	26,681	11,702	22,716	61,099
Racine	686,210	300,990	584,275	1,571,474
Richland	33,401	14,650	28,438	76,489
Rock	457,356	200,608	389,416	1,047,380
Rusk	39,688	17,408	33,792	90,888
St. Croix	96,313	42,246	82,007	220,566
Sauk	116,313	51,020	99,039	266,372
Sawyer	55,603	24,388	47,341	127,332
Shawano	65,191	28,594	55,506	149,291
Sheboygan	195,376	85,698	166,355	447,429
Taylor	36,505	16,012	31,082	83,599
Trempealeau	50,887	22,320	43,327	116,534
Vernon	37,487	16,442	31,917	85,846
Vilas	26,799	11,754	22,817	61,370
Walworth	185,119	81,198	157,620	423,937
Washburn	37,213	16,322	31,684	85,219
Washington	133,171	58,412	113,388	304,971
Waukesha	328,114	143,920	279,374	751,408
Waupaca	92,933	40,764	79,130	212,827
Waushara	43,264	18,976	36,836	99,075
Winnebago	313,967	137,716	267,331	719,014
Wood	<u>156,316</u>	<u>68,564</u>	<u>133,095</u>	<u>357,975</u>
Total	\$12,539,170	\$5,500,000	\$10,676,471	\$28,715,641

## ATTACHMENT 6

### Maximum Birth Cost Judgment Amounts for Low-Income Payers Over 36 Months

<u>Monthly Income Up To:</u>	<u>Percent of Income</u>	<u>Maximum Birth Cost Judgment Amount</u>
\$675	3.28%	\$797
700	3.38	852
725	3.47	906
750	3.57	964
775	3.66	1,021
800	3.76	1,083
825	3.85	1,143
850	3.95	1,209
875	4.04	1,273
900	4.14	1,341
925	4.24	1,412
950	4.33	1,481
975	4.43	1,555
1,000	5.52	1,987
1,025	4.62	1,705
1,050	4.71	1,780
1,075	4.81	1,861
1,100	4.91	1,944
1,125	5.00	2,025



## ATTACHMENT 7

### CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$8.8 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Adams	\$41,259	\$29,070	\$56,430	\$126,759
Ashland	49,551	34,910	67,767	152,229
Barron	112,384	79,179	153,700	345,262
Bayfield	28,843	20,319	39,443	88,605
Brown	517,438	364,559	707,673	1,589,670
Buffalo	19,412	13,676	26,547	59,634
Burnett	38,549	27,159	52,720	118,427
Calumet	52,419	36,931	71,690	161,040
Chippewa	113,288	79,818	154,941	348,047
Clark	44,089	31,062	60,296	135,447
Columbia	95,684	67,415	130,863	293,962
Crawford	33,205	23,393	45,411	102,009
Dane	797,848	562,118	1,091,171	2,451,138
Dodge	148,496	104,622	203,089	456,207
Door	43,735	30,811	59,810	134,357
Douglas	129,281	91,084	176,811	397,176
Dunn	76,508	53,903	104,635	235,045
Eau Claire	188,695	132,943	258,066	579,705
Florence	8,645	6,091	11,824	26,560
Fond du Lac	181,465	127,851	248,182	557,498
Forest	29,039	20,457	39,711	89,208
Grant	70,574	49,723	96,522	216,819
Green	56,742	39,980	77,608	174,330
Green Lake	34,816	24,528	47,612	106,956
Iowa	33,008	23,255	45,143	101,406
Iron	10,098	7,116	13,813	31,027
Jackson	48,294	34,024	66,046	148,363
Jefferson	142,681	100,526	195,138	438,345
Juneau	67,156	47,314	91,845	206,314
Kenosha	455,391	320,843	622,813	1,399,047
Kewaunee	26,996	19,018	36,917	82,931
La Crosse	204,688	144,213	279,942	628,843
Lafayette	24,873	17,524	34,018	76,415
Langlade	60,043	42,302	82,116	184,461
Lincoln	53,520	37,705	73,192	164,418
Manitowoc	143,624	101,191	196,429	441,244
Marathon	233,649	164,615	319,548	717,812
Marinette	91,715	64,616	125,432	281,763
Marquette	25,070	17,662	34,286	77,018
Milwaukee	3,986,904	2,808,957	5,452,681	12,248,542

**ATTACHMENT 7 (continued)**

**CY 2011 Estimated County Allocations for Child Support Federal Incentive Payments, \$8.8 Million GPR, and Federal Matching Funds for GPR Funds**

<u>County</u>	<u>Incentive Payment</u>	<u>GPR Funds</u>	<u>Federal Matching Funds for GPR</u>	<u>Total Funding</u>
Monroe	\$95,762	\$67,469	\$130,969	\$294,200
Oconto	74,700	52,631	102,165	229,496
Oneida	71,792	50,581	98,187	220,559
Outagamie	277,698	195,651	379,794	853,144
Ozaukee	70,809	49,890	96,846	217,545
Pepin	9,628	6,782	13,164	29,573
Pierce	44,049	31,033	60,240	135,322
Polk	61,890	43,603	84,642	190,135
Portage	99,259	69,933	135,753	304,945
Price	26,681	18,796	36,487	81,964
Racine	686,210	483,467	938,494	2,108,170
Richland	33,401	23,532	45,679	102,612
Rock	457,356	322,228	625,500	1,405,084
Rusk	39,688	27,962	54,279	121,928
St. Croix	96,313	67,858	131,724	295,894
Sauk	116,313	81,951	159,082	357,346
Sawyer	55,603	39,173	76,042	170,819
Shawano	65,191	45,929	89,157	200,277
Sheboygan	195,376	137,653	267,208	600,237
Taylor	36,505	25,719	49,926	112,150
Trempealeau	50,887	35,852	69,594	156,333
Vernon	37,487	26,410	51,267	115,164
Vilas	26,799	18,880	36,649	82,329
Walworth	185,119	130,425	253,177	568,721
Washburn	37,213	26,217	50,892	114,322
Washington	133,171	93,825	182,130	409,126
Waukesha	328,114	231,172	448,746	1,008,032
Waupaca	92,933	65,477	127,103	285,514
Waushara	43,264	30,480	59,168	132,911
Winnebago	313,967	221,207	429,402	964,576
Wood	<u>156,316</u>	<u>110,131</u>	<u>213,784</u>	<u>480,231</u>
Total	\$12,539,170	\$8,834,400	\$17,149,129	\$38,522,699