



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

November 10, 2011

TO: Members
Joint Finance Committee

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Children and Families: Request for Approval of Child Support Allocations to County Child Support Enforcement Agencies in Calendar Years 2012 and 2013 -- Agenda Item II

REQUEST

The Department of Children and Families (DCF) requests approval of its child support funding plan that specifies each county's allocation of child support enforcement funding in calendar years 2012 and 2013 and a description of the methodology used to determine the allocation amounts, pursuant to section 9108(2i) of 2011 Wisconsin Act 32.

BACKGROUND

Due to changes made at the federal level that eliminated the ability to receive federal matching funds for federal child support incentive payments, federal funding for local child support enforcement agencies is approximately \$25 million less than before these changes were enacted. As a result, if no additional state revenue is provided, federal funding for local child support agencies would be \$13 million annually, as opposed to \$38 million before these changes.

To partially address the \$25 million shortfall, Act 32 provided \$4.25 million GPR annually, which generates matching funds of \$8.25 million FED (at a 66% match rate), for a total of \$12.5 million annually. Because additional funds of \$4.25 million had previously been provided by the Joint Committee on Finance for local child support enforcement activities on December 14, 2010, the reduction in funding would first apply to the calendar year (CY) 2012 child support enforcement contracts.

Act 32 requires DCF to develop a detailed plan for distributing child support incentive payments to counties during CY 2012 and CY 2013 and submit the plan to the Joint Committee on Finance under a 14-day passive review process no later than August 31, 2011. The plan must describe the method DCF used to calculate the distributions to counties. The distribution method may reward counties that demonstrate proficiency in providing child support enforcement services. A county's proficiency level may be based on performance standards, determined by DCF, including the county's rate, per full-time employee, of establishing child support orders, establishing paternity, and collecting current child support.

DCF submitted its plan for distributing child support incentive payments to counties during CY 2012 and CY 2013 for approval on August 29, 2011. An objection to the DCF request was received on September 14, 2011. Therefore, the request has been included on the agenda for the Committee's November 10, 2011, meeting under s. 13.10 of the statutes.

CHILD SUPPORT PLAN

Attachment 1 shows child support allocations by county in CY 2011, DCF's proposed allocations in CY 2012 and CY 2013, and the resulting reduction. Funding in CY 2011 totals \$37.8 million. The proposed funding level in CY 2012 and CY 2013 would total \$29.3 million.

Overall Funding

As noted above, DCF's plan assumes total funding of \$29.3 million in CY 2012 and in CY 2013, for a total annual reduction of \$8.5 million. The \$29.3 million amount includes: (a) \$12.6 million in federal child support incentive payments; (b) \$5.7 million from state GPR funds; and (c) \$11.0 million from federal matching funds on the \$5.7 million GPR.

In CY 2012, the entire amount of \$4.25 million GPR budgeted in state fiscal year (SFY) 2011-12 plus one-third of the \$4.25 million GPR (\$1.42 million) budgeted in SFY 2012-13 would be allocated, for a total of \$5.67 million GPR. Similarly, in CY 2013, the remaining two-thirds of the \$4.25 million GPR budgeted in SFY 2012-13 (\$2.83 million) plus two-thirds of the \$4.25 million GPR (\$2.83 million) budgeted in SFY 2013-14 would be allocated, for a total of \$5.67 million GPR.

DCF assumes that \$4.25 million GPR would be budgeted in each year of the 2013-15 biennium. Beginning with the CY 2014 contracts, \$4.25 million GPR annually, rather than \$5.67 million GPR would be available for local child support enforcement activities, which would generate matching funds of \$8.25 million instead of \$11.0 million, for a total of \$12.5 million instead of \$16.7 million.

Method to Calculate Distributions

DCF established five performance measures, discussed in further detail below, to calculate the distributions to local child support agencies during CY 2012 and CY 2013. Overall funding of \$29.3 million is divided among these performance measures, for a total of \$5.9 million available to be earned for each performance measure.

The maximum allocation amount for each specific county child support agency that may be earned is based on that county agency's share of the overall state child support caseload.

The plan submitted by DCF uses the most recent performance data available, which is from federal fiscal year 2010 (FFY 2010). At the end of each federal fiscal year, DCF will measure each county's performance using data for the one-year period that ends on September 30 to set the funding levels for the following calendar year. Therefore, performance data from FFY 2011 (October 1, 2010, through September 30, 2011) will be used to calculate the final allocations for local child support enforcement agencies in CY 2012. Performance data from FFY 2012 (October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012) will be used to calculate the final allocations for local child support enforcement agencies in CY 2013. As a result, the allocations in Attachment 1 are estimates. The final allocations may differ from these estimates.

Performance Measures

The plan allocates funding based on each county's performance on five performance measures: (a) court order establishment rate; (b) paternity establishment rate; (c) current support collection rate; (d) arrears cases with collections rate; and (e) paternity and court order rate per full-time employee (FTE). Measures "a" through "d" are existing federal performance measures. Funding for these performance measures ("a" through "d") are allocated based on caseload totals as of the end of the FFY. Funds for the last performance measure are prorated for counties based on the total number of court orders and paternities established by each county during the FFY.

Court Order Establishment Rate

Under the federal court order establishment standard, the percentage of child support cases that have a child support order established must be at least 80%. For counties that meet this 80% threshold, 100% of their allocation amount for this performance measure is earned. For counties that fall below 80%, a percentage of their allocation amount is earned based on the actual percentage of court orders established and the federal guidelines for that actual percentage.

Two counties (Milwaukee and Marathon) fell below the 80% threshold and, thus, earned less than 100% of their allocations for this performance measure. A total of \$5.8 million was earned by local child support enforcement agencies under this measure.

Paternity Establishment Rate

Under the paternity establishment measure, at least 90% of the children born out of wedlock in the county must have paternity established. For counties that meet this 90% threshold, 100% of their allocation amount for this performance measure is earned. For counties that fall below 90%, a percentage of their allocation amount is earned based on the actual percentage of paternities established and the federal guidelines for that actual percentage.

All counties met the 90% threshold. Therefore the entire \$5.9 million was allocated for this performance measure.

Current Support Collection Rate

Under the current support collection measure, the percentage of current child support collected during the month due must be at least 80%. For counties that meet this threshold, 100% of their allocation amount for this performance measure is earned. For counties that fall below 80%, a percentage of their allocation amount is earned based on the actual percentage of current support collected and the federal guidelines for that actual percentage.

Nine counties (Columbia, Dodge, Grant, Green Lake, Iowa, Kewaunee, Taylor, Vernon, and Washington) met the 80% threshold. Consequently, a total of \$4.7 million was earned by local child support enforcement agencies under this measure.

Arrears Collections Rate

Under the arrears collection measure, the percentage of child support cases with a payment on arrears during the FFY must be at least 80%. For counties that meet this threshold, 100% of their allocation amount for this performance measure is earned. For counties that fall below 80%, a percentage of their allocation amount is earned based on the actual percentage of arrears collected and the federal guidelines for that actual percentage.

Seven counties (Burnett, Chippewa, Columbia, Grant, Iowa, Rusk, and Sheboygan) met the 80% threshold. Therefore, a total of \$4.3 million was earned by local child support enforcement agencies under this measure.

Paternity and Court Order Rate Per FTE

Under the paternity and court order rate per FTE, counties with an average of 80 paternities and court orders per full-time equivalent employee earn 100% of their allocation for this performance measure. For counties below 80 paternities and court orders established per FTE, counties may earn at least 80% up to 100% of their allocation based on the actual number of paternities and court orders established per FTE. For counties that establish more than 80

paternities and court orders per FTE, up to 120% of the allocation for that county may be earned. The statewide average number of paternity and court orders per FTE is 80.

Twenty counties had at least 80 paternity and court orders per FTE and, thus, earned at least 100% of the allocation amount. Milwaukee County earned the greatest amount under this performance measure at 119% of its allocated amount. A total of \$6.1 million was allocated under this performance measure.

Collection Rate Per FTE

DCF also considered the collection rate per FTE as a performance measure. However, DCF indicates that this was not included as one of the performance measures.

Excess Funds and Minimized Impact

A total of \$26.7 million was earned by local child support enforcement agencies under the five performance measures, which leaves \$2.6 million remaining for distribution. In addition, to minimize the impact of the funding reductions, DCF established a range of the percent of reduction any county may receive (from 18% to 26%). The allocation reductions for six counties that otherwise would have received a reduction less than 18% were increased to 18%, and the allocation reductions for 18 counties that would have received a reduction greater than 26% were decreased to 26% to fall within the floor of 18% and the cap of 26%.

After accounting for the floor and cap adjustments, the remaining excess funds were allocated to counties. Each county received an additional 9.4% of their earned allocation from the excess funds.

Attachment 1 shows the final allocations for each county under DCF's plan, which takes into account the amount earned for each of the five performance measures, adjustments for the floor and cap established, and distribution of the excess funds. As noted, these allocations are estimates based on FFY 2010 data.

ANALYSIS

The federal government distributes incentive payments to states in order to encourage and reward state programs that operate effectively. Under the program, the annual incentive payment to each state is based on that state's performance, relative to the other states, on several criteria. Currently, performance on five criteria determines the amount of the award: (a) paternity establishment; (b) establishment of support orders; (c) collection of current child support due; (d) collection of child support arrearages; and (e) cost-effectiveness. Cost-effectiveness is determined by dividing the total amount of child support dollars collected by the total amount expended for child support enforcement efforts.

The state distributes federal child support incentive payments earned and state funding to counties for child support enforcement activities. Under this incentive program, an allocation is determined for each county based on its share of statewide support cases that receive enforcement services from a county child support agency. Four standards are used to determine the amount of the award for each county: (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 the federal fiscal year; and (d) percentage of cases with arrearages during the federal fiscal year. These performance measures are the same measures required under federal law, except for the cost-effectiveness measure. In CY 2011, each county was guaranteed from 80% to 93% of the amount of the incentive payment allocated to each performance measure. The rest of the allocation was earned based on performance. In general, any amount that is unearned is reallocated across all child support agencies based on each agency's portion of the earnings.

The DCF plan for child support enforcement funding distributions to county child support agencies in CY 2012 and CY 2013 again incorporates the four performance measures mentioned above. In addition, the DCF plan incorporates a performance measure related to cost-effectiveness, pursuant to Act 32. Under this new, fifth performance measure, a county's efficiency with regard to child support enforcement activities is measured by the rate of court orders and paternities established per FTE. The Committee could approve the DCF plan, as it meets the requirements established under Act 32 (Alternative 1).

Rather than create a new measure related to cost-effectiveness, the Committee could approve a child support funding reduction plan that incorporates the same cost-effectiveness performance measure that is used at the federal level (Alternative 2). Under this alternative, the first four performance measures under DCF's plan would remain the same. The fifth measure would be replaced with a cost-effectiveness measure as determined by the total child support dollar amounts collected by county divided by total expenditures for child support enforcement. Counties could earn from 80% to 120% of their allocation amount depending on their cost-effectiveness ratio in comparison with the statewide average. Attachment 2 shows what these allocations would look like in CY 2012 and CY 2013, as well as the change to DCF's allocation amount. These estimates, which are based on 2010 data, include the same floor, cap, and excess distribution methodologies established in DCF's plan.

On the other hand, Act 32 also specified that the DCF plan could include the total amount of child support collected per FTE in its performance measures. Therefore, DCF could be required to include the total amount of child support collected per FTE as part of its existing fifth performance measure (Alternative 3). Estimated distributions to county child support agencies, as well as the change from DCF's plan are shown in Attachment 3. These estimated distributions maintain the minimized impact and excess funds redistribution methodology of the DCF plan.

However, DCF indicates that child support collections per FTE as a performance measure was considered, but rejected. DCF indicated that counties whose residents have higher per capita

incomes would likely be able to collect more per FTE than those with lower per capita incomes, even if both counties had the same number of cases from which a collection is made. Therefore, DCF determined that this measure was not a reliable indicator of program efficiency. As a result, DCF determined that the fifth measure of court orders and paternitys established per FTE was a more accurate measure of work effort and efficiency because much of the work effort required for a child support case is similar across counties.

Alternatively, the Committee could require DCF to implement across-the-board reductions from the CY 2011 distributions to county child support agencies (Alternative 4). This alternative would implement the same percentage reduction (22.41%) to each county. Because the "base" allocation amount from CY 2011 was already based on performance measures (described above), the final allocations after the 22.41% reduction would reflect the county's performance on these performance measures in CY 2011. Attachment 4 shows estimated allocations for each county under an across-the-board reduction, as well as the change of the reduction from DCF's plan.

Finally, the Committee could reject the plan submitted by DCF (Alternative 5). Any number of alternatives could be crafted based on which performance measures to use and on how much weight to give to any specific measure. County allocations would vary under these alternatives, depending on which performance measures are included and how much weight is given to each specific measure. The Committee could create its own plan to implement child support funding reductions or require DCF to modify its plan based on the comments and concerns noted by the Committee.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve DCF's plan to implement child support funding reductions for each county in CY 2012 and CY 2013. Attachment 1 shows estimates of allocations in CY 2012 and CY 2013 under this alternative, based on FFY 2010 data.

2. Modify DCF's plan to replace the fifth performance measure with a cost-effectiveness measure that divides total support collected by total child support enforcement expenditures for each county. Attachment 2 shows estimates of allocations in CY 2012 and CY 2013 under this alternative, based on FFY 2010 data.

3. Modify DCF's plan to require the fifth performance measure to include court order establishment, paternity establishment, and child support collected per FTE. Attachment 3 shows estimates of allocations in CY 2012 and CY 2013 under this alternative, based on FFY 2010 data.

4. Deny DCF's plan. Instead, require DCF to implement a 22.41% across-the-board reduction from CY 2011 allocations. Attachment 4 shows estimates of allocations in CY 2012 and CY 2013 under this alternative.

5. Deny DCF's plan. Require DCF to modify its plan to incorporate comments and concerns noted by the Committee.

Prepared by: Kim Swissdorf
Attachments

ATTACHMENT I

Proposed Child Support Allocations in 2012 and 2013 DCF Plan

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>CY 2012/2013 Allocation</u>	<u>Reduction Amount</u>
Adams	\$130,029	\$105,362	-\$24,667
Ashland	143,782	106,398	-37,383
Barron	330,755	244,759	-85,996
Bayfield	80,586	59,634	-20,952
Brown	1,531,701	1,168,381	-363,321
Buffalo	58,081	42,980	-15,101
Burnett	113,661	93,202	-20,459
Calumet	157,421	116,492	-40,929
Chippewa	346,440	273,015	-73,425
Clark	136,507	108,007	-28,500
Columbia	290,632	225,089	-65,544
Crawford	97,181	71,914	-25,267
Dane	2,475,432	1,876,109	-599,324
Dodge	446,689	357,345	-89,345
Door	128,096	101,196	-26,901
Douglas	367,240	271,758	-95,482
Dunn	236,416	175,448	-60,967
Eau Claire	568,080	437,030	-131,050
Florence	24,096	17,831	-6,265
Fond du Lac	547,393	420,679	-126,714
Forest	85,928	63,587	-22,341
Grant	211,297	173,263	-38,033
Green	170,606	136,501	-34,105
Green Lake	97,522	74,758	-22,763
Iowa	95,021	77,917	-17,104
Iron	30,689	22,710	-7,979
Jackson	147,533	109,174	-38,358
Jefferson	437,028	345,729	-91,300
Juneau	200,726	164,595	-36,131
Kenosha	1,397,013	1,135,836	-261,177
Kewaunee	77,517	61,917	-15,600
La Crosse	627,297	488,621	-138,676
Lafayette	69,333	53,956	-15,378
Langlade	183,109	135,500	-47,608
Lincoln	179,585	140,691	-38,894

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>CY 2012/2013 Allocation</u>	<u>Reduction Amount</u>
Manitowoc	\$434,414	\$341,996	-\$92,418
Marathon	705,838	522,320	-183,518
Marinette	284,381	225,946	-58,435
Marquette	78,767	60,904	-17,863
Milwaukee	11,964,283	9,428,544	-2,535,739
Monroe	301,430	243,700	-57,731
Oconto	216,866	163,277	-53,589
Oneida	212,774	158,530	-54,244
Outagamie	866,100	675,523	-190,577
Ozaukee	237,211	183,227	-53,984
Pepin	30,802	23,673	-7,129
Pierce	136,053	107,472	-28,581
Polk	186,746	147,233	-39,513
Portage	319,730	249,846	-69,883
Price	73,198	54,166	-19,031
Racine	2,012,489	1,489,242	-523,247
Richland	99,567	73,680	-25,888
Rock	1,333,476	986,772	-346,704
Rusk	119,004	89,516	-29,487
St. Croix	314,160	257,611	-56,549
Sauk	366,331	287,291	-79,040
Sawyer	161,627	119,604	-42,023
Shawano	199,703	158,870	-40,833
Sheboygan	577,400	473,468	-103,932
Taylor	106,614	82,379	-24,235
Trempealeau	147,987	115,223	-32,764
Vernon	117,640	92,552	-25,087
Vilas	82,746	63,251	-19,494
Walworth	520,115	397,018	-123,097
Washburn	120,936	98,234	-22,701
Washington	417,819	319,452	-98,368
Waukesha	1,016,815	768,090	-248,725
Waupaca	282,108	218,306	-63,802
Waushara	143,441	113,541	-29,899
Winnebago	944,186	723,844	-220,341
Wood	<u>471,695</u>	<u>378,281</u>	<u>-93,414</u>
Total	\$37,824,873	\$29,349,969	-\$8,474,904

ATTACHMENT 2

Proposed Child Support Allocations in 2012 and 2013 New Cost-Effectiveness Fifth Measure Based on Federal Measure

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Alternative 2 Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Adams	\$130,029	-\$31,472	\$98,557	-\$6,805
Ashland	143,782	-36,792	106,990	591
Barron	330,755	-74,996	255,758	11,000
Bayfield	80,586	-18,341	62,245	2,611
Brown	1,531,701	-398,523	1,133,178	-35,202
Buffalo	58,081	-13,013	45,068	2,088
Burnett	113,661	-23,927	89,735	-3,468
Calumet	157,421	-40,189	117,232	740
Chippewa	346,440	-70,525	275,915	2,900
Clark	136,507	-31,180	105,327	-2,680
Columbia	290,632	-65,867	224,766	-323
Crawford	97,181	-25,285	71,896	-18
Dane	2,475,432	-644,061	1,831,372	-44,737
Dodge	446,689	-90,671	356,019	-1,326
Door	128,096	-30,570	97,527	-3,669
Douglas	367,240	-92,265	274,975	3,218
Dunn	236,416	-54,175	182,241	6,793
Eau Claire	568,080	-143,388	424,692	-12,338
Florence	24,096	-6,242	17,855	23
Fond du Lac	547,393	-116,112	431,282	10,603
Forest	85,928	-22,168	63,760	173
Grant	211,297	-42,674	168,623	-4,640
Green	170,606	-38,499	132,107	-4,394
Green Lake	97,522	-19,582	77,940	3,181
Iowa	95,021	-17,641	77,380	-537
Iron	30,689	-7,985	22,704	-6
Jackson	147,533	-38,385	109,148	-27
Jefferson	437,028	-96,731	340,297	-5,432
Juneau	200,726	-49,371	151,355	-13,241
Kenosha	1,397,013	-363,460	1,033,553	-102,283
Kewaunee	77,517	-14,380	63,138	1,220
La Crosse	627,297	-158,275	469,022	-19,599
Lafayette	69,333	-13,144	56,189	2,234
Langlade	183,109	-45,915	137,194	1,693
Lincoln	179,585	-38,208	141,377	686

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Alternative 2 Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Manitowoc	\$434,414	-\$96,037	\$338,377	-\$3,619
Marathon	705,838	-167,859	537,979	15,659
Marinette	284,381	-63,352	221,029	-4,917
Marquette	78,767	-16,878	61,889	985
Milwaukee	11,964,283	-2,319,733	9,644,550	216,006
Monroe	301,430	-64,395	237,036	-6,664
Oconto	216,866	-42,730	174,136	10,859
Oneida	212,774	-46,496	166,278	7,748
Outagamie	866,100	-201,674	664,426	-11,097
Ozaukee	237,211	-50,281	186,931	3,703
Pepin	30,802	-7,635	23,167	-506
Pierce	136,053	-28,027	108,025	554
Polk	186,746	-44,493	142,253	-4,980
Portage	319,730	-71,207	248,522	-1,324
Price	73,198	-17,591	55,607	1,441
Racine	2,012,489	-523,609	1,488,880	-362
Richland	99,567	-24,490	75,078	1,398
Rock	1,333,476	-346,938	986,538	-234
Rusk	119,004	-24,227	94,776	5,260
St. Croix	314,160	-67,468	246,692	-10,920
Sauk	366,331	-77,165	289,166	1,875
Sawyer	161,627	-42,051	119,575	-28
Shawano	199,703	-46,638	153,065	-5,805
Sheboygan	577,400	-118,340	459,060	-14,408
Taylor	106,614	-22,931	83,683	1,304
Trempealeau	147,987	-34,249	113,738	-1,486
Vernon	117,640	-22,332	95,307	2,755
Vilas	82,746	-20,378	62,367	-884
Walworth	520,115	-131,106	389,009	-8,009
Washburn	120,936	-27,244	93,692	-4,542
Washington	417,819	-82,597	335,222	15,771
Waukesha	1,016,815	-244,339	772,477	4,387
Waupaca	282,108	-55,356	226,752	8,447
Waushara	143,441	-35,228	108,213	-5,329
Winnebago	944,186	-213,230	730,955	7,111
Wood	<u>471,695</u>	<u>-102,592</u>	<u>369,103</u>	<u>-9,178</u>
Total	\$37,824,873	-\$8,474,904	\$29,349,969	\$0

ATTACHMENT 3

Proposed Child Support Allocations in 2012 and 2013 Fifth Measure With Collections Per FTE

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Alternative 3 Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Adams	\$130,029	-\$27,846	\$102,183	-\$3,179
Ashland	143,782	-37,340	106,441	43
Barron	330,755	-76,261	254,493	9,735
Bayfield	80,586	-17,738	62,848	3,215
Brown	1,531,701	-372,224	1,159,477	-8,903
Buffalo	58,081	-11,548	46,533	3,553
Burnett	113,661	-20,421	93,241	38
Calumet	157,421	-29,458	127,963	11,472
Chippewa	346,440	-62,243	284,197	11,182
Clark	136,507	-25,476	111,031	3,024
Columbia	290,632	-61,280	229,352	4,263
Crawford	97,181	-25,238	71,942	29
Dane	2,475,432	-590,902	1,884,530	8,421
Dodge	446,689	-80,251	366,439	9,094
Door	128,096	-23,940	104,156	2,960
Douglas	367,240	-89,442	277,798	6,041
Dunn	236,416	-56,792	179,624	4,176
Eau Claire	568,080	-125,279	442,801	5,770
Florence	24,096	-5,512	18,584	753
Fond du Lac	547,393	-100,766	446,628	25,949
Forest	85,928	-22,317	63,611	25
Grant	211,297	-37,959	173,337	74
Green	170,606	-30,652	139,954	3,453
Green Lake	97,522	-17,521	80,001	5,243
Iowa	95,021	-17,069	77,952	35
Iron	30,689	-7,970	22,718	9
Jackson	147,533	-38,314	109,218	44
Jefferson	437,028	-80,101	356,928	11,199
Juneau	200,726	-38,441	162,286	-2,310
Kenosha	1,397,013	-346,464	1,050,549	-85,287
Kewaunee	77,517	-13,927	63,590	1,673
La Crosse	627,297	-144,084	483,214	-5,408
Lafayette	69,333	-12,456	56,877	2,922
Langlade	183,109	-47,554	135,554	54
Lincoln	179,585	-33,818	145,767	5,077

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Alternative 3 Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Manitowoc	\$434,414	-\$78,047	\$356,367	\$14,371
Marathon	705,838	-168,417	537,421	15,101
Marinette	284,381	-51,094	233,287	7,341
Marquette	78,767	-14,771	63,996	3,092
Milwaukee	11,964,283	-2,848,520	9,115,763	-312,781
Monroe	301,430	-54,156	247,274	3,574
Oconto	216,866	-46,193	170,673	7,395
Oneida	212,774	-44,213	168,562	10,031
Outagamie	866,100	-155,607	710,493	34,970
Ozaukee	237,211	-42,614	194,597	11,370
Pepin	30,802	-5,612	25,191	1,517
Pierce	136,053	-24,444	111,609	4,137
Polk	186,746	-36,177	150,568	3,336
Portage	319,730	-61,743	257,986	8,140
Price	73,198	-15,868	57,330	3,164
Racine	2,012,489	-522,659	1,489,831	589
Richland	99,567	-25,538	74,029	350
Rock	1,333,476	-346,320	987,156	384
Rusk	119,004	-27,021	91,982	2,466
St. Croix	314,160	-56,439	257,721	110
Sauk	366,331	-69,303	297,028	9,737
Sawyer	161,627	-41,978	119,649	45
Shawano	199,703	-35,880	163,823	4,953
Sheboygan	577,400	-103,727	473,673	205
Taylor	106,614	-21,934	84,681	2,302
Trempealeau	147,987	-28,435	119,552	4,328
Vernon	117,640	-21,136	96,504	3,951
Vilas	82,746	-18,268	64,477	1,226
Walworth	520,115	-100,124	419,991	22,973
Washburn	120,936	-24,354	96,582	-1,653
Washington	417,819	-75,064	342,755	23,304
Waukesha	1,016,815	-208,336	808,480	40,390
Waupaca	282,108	-50,684	231,424	13,119
Waushara	143,441	-26,484	116,956	3,415
Winnebago	944,186	-210,397	733,788	9,944
Wood	<u>471,695</u>	<u>-84,746</u>	<u>386,949</u>	<u>8,668</u>
Total	\$37,824,873	-\$8,474,904	\$29,349,969	\$0

ATTACHMENT 4

**Proposed Child Support Allocations in 2012 and 2013
Across-the-Board Reductions from CY 2011**

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Across the Board Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Adams	\$130,029	-\$29,134	\$100,895	-\$4,467
Ashland	143,782	-32,215	111,567	5,168
Barron	330,755	-74,108	256,647	11,889
Bayfield	80,586	-18,056	62,530	2,897
Brown	1,531,701	-343,187	1,188,514	20,133
Buffalo	58,081	-13,013	45,068	2,088
Burnett	113,661	-25,467	88,195	-5,008
Calumet	157,421	-35,271	122,150	5,658
Chippewa	346,440	-77,622	268,818	-4,197
Clark	136,507	-30,585	105,922	-2,085
Columbia	290,632	-65,118	225,514	426
Crawford	97,181	-21,774	75,407	3,493
Dane	2,475,432	-554,636	1,920,796	44,687
Dodge	446,689	-100,084	346,606	-10,739
Door	128,096	-28,701	99,396	-1,800
Douglas	367,240	-82,282	284,958	13,200
Dunn	236,416	-52,970	183,445	7,997
Eau Claire	568,080	-127,282	440,798	3,768
Florence	24,096	-5,399	18,697	866
Fond du Lac	547,393	-122,647	424,746	4,067
Forest	85,928	-19,253	66,675	3,089
Grant	211,297	-47,342	163,954	-9,309
Green	170,606	-38,225	132,380	-4,120
Green Lake	97,522	-21,850	75,671	913
Iowa	95,021	-21,290	73,731	-4,186
Iron	30,689	-6,876	23,813	1,103
Jackson	147,533	-33,056	114,477	5,303
Jefferson	437,028	-97,919	339,109	-6,619
Juneau	200,726	-44,974	155,752	-8,843
Kenosha	1,397,013	-313,010	1,084,003	-51,833
Kewaunee	77,517	-17,368	60,149	-1,768
La Crosse	627,297	-140,550	486,747	-1,874
Lafayette	69,333	-15,535	53,799	-157
Langlade	183,109	-41,027	142,082	6,582
Lincoln	179,585	-40,237	139,348	-1,343

<u>County</u>	<u>CY 2011 Allocation</u>	<u>Across the Board Reduction</u>	<u>Total Allocation</u>	<u>Difference from DCF Plan</u>
Manitowoc	\$434,414	-\$97,333	\$337,081	-\$4,915
Marathon	705,838	-158,147	547,690	25,370
Marinette	284,381	-63,717	220,664	-5,283
Marquette	78,767	-17,648	61,119	215
Milwaukee	11,964,283	-2,680,674	9,283,609	-144,935
Monroe	301,430	-67,537	233,893	-9,807
Oconto	216,866	-48,590	168,276	4,998
Oneida	212,774	-47,673	165,101	6,571
Outagamie	866,100	-194,055	672,045	-3,479
Ozaukee	237,211	-53,149	184,063	835
Pepin	30,802	-6,901	23,901	227
Pierce	136,053	-30,483	105,569	-1,903
Polk	186,746	-41,842	144,904	-2,329
Portage	319,730	-71,637	248,092	-1,754
Price	73,198	-16,400	56,797	2,631
Racine	2,012,489	-450,911	1,561,578	72,336
Richland	99,567	-22,309	77,259	3,579
Rock	1,333,476	-298,774	1,034,702	47,930
Rusk	119,004	-26,663	92,340	2,824
St. Croix	314,160	-70,390	243,771	-13,841
Sauk	366,331	-82,079	284,252	-3,039
Sawyer	161,627	-36,213	125,413	5,809
Shawano	199,703	-44,745	154,958	-3,912
Sheboygan	577,400	-129,370	448,030	-25,438
Taylor	106,614	-23,888	82,727	348
Trempealeau	147,987	-33,157	114,830	-394
Vernon	117,640	-26,358	91,282	-1,271
Vilas	82,746	-18,540	64,206	954
Walworth	520,115	-116,535	403,580	6,562
Washburn	120,936	-27,096	93,839	-4,395
Washington	417,819	-93,615	324,204	4,753
Waukesha	1,016,815	-227,824	788,991	20,901
Waupaca	282,108	-63,208	218,900	594
Waushara	143,441	-32,139	111,302	-2,240
Winnebago	944,186	-211,551	732,635	8,790
Wood	<u>471,695</u>	<u>-105,686</u>	<u>366,009</u>	<u>-12,272</u>
Total	\$37,824,873	-\$8,474,904	\$29,349,969	\$0