SECTION 8. CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

CONTENTS

Background
- **Overview**
- **Demographic Trends**
- **Program Trends**

The Federal Role
The State Role
The Child Support Enforcement Process
- **Locating Absent Parents**
- **Establishing Paternity**
- **Establishing Orders**
- **Reviewing and Modifying Orders**
- **Promoting Medical Support**
- **Collecting Child Support**
- **Interstate Enforcement**
- **Private Collection Activities**

State Collection and Disbursement of Support Payments
Bankruptcy and Child Support Enforcement
Automated Systems
Audits and Financial Penalties
Assignment and Distribution of Child Support Collections
- **Distribution of Payments While the Family Receives Public Assistance**
- **Distribution of Payments After the Family Leaves Public Assistance**

Funding of State Programs
How Effective is Child Support Enforcement?
- **Impact on Taxpayers**
- **Impact on Poverty**
- **Impact on National Child Support Payments**

Legislative History
Statistical Tables
References

BACKGROUND

OVERVIEW

In 1950, when only a small minority of children were in female-headed families, the Federal Government took its first steps into the child support arena. Congress amended the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) law by requiring State welfare agencies to notify law enforcement officials when benefits were being furnished to a child who had been abandoned by one of her

parents. Presumably, local officials would then undertake to locate nonresident parents and make them pay child support. From 1950 to 1975, the Federal Government confined its child support efforts to these welfare children. With this exception, most Americans thought that child support establishment and collection was a domestic relations issue that should be dealt with at the State level by the courts.

By the early 1970s, however, Congress recognized that the composition of the AFDC caseload had changed drastically. In earlier years the majority of children needed financial assistance because their fathers had died; by the 1970s, the majority needed aid because their parents were separated, divorced, or never married. The Child Support Enforcement and Paternity Establishment Program (CSE), enacted in 1975, was a response by Congress to reduce public expenditures on welfare by obtaining support from noncustodial parents on an ongoing basis, to help non-AFDC families get support so they could stay off public assistance, and to establish paternity for children born outside marriage so child support could be obtained for them.

The 1975 legislation (Public Law 93–647) added a new part D to title IV of the Social Security Act. This statute, as amended, authorizes Federal matching funds to be used for enforcing support obligations by locating nonresident parents, establishing paternity, establishing child support awards, and collecting child support payments. Since 1981, child support agencies have also been permitted to collect spousal support on behalf of custodial parents, and in 1984 they were required to petition for medical support as part of most child support orders.

Basic responsibility for administering the program is left to States, but the Federal Government plays a major role in: dictating the major design features of State programs; funding, monitoring and evaluating State programs; providing technical assistance; and giving assistance to States in locating absent parents and obtaining support payments. The program requires the provision of child support enforcement services for both welfare and nonwelfare families and requires States to publicize frequently, through public service announcements, the availability of child support enforcement services, together with information about the application fee and a telephone number or address to obtain additional information. Local family and domestic courts and administrative agencies handle the actual establishment and enforcement of child support obligations according to Federal, State, and local laws.

The child support program generally does not provide services aimed at other issues between parents, such as property settlement, custody, and access to children. These issues are handled by local courts with the help of private attorneys.

Any parent who needs help in locating an absent parent, establishing paternity, establishing a support obligation, or enforcing a support obligation may apply for services. Parents receiving benefits (or who formerly received benefits) under the successor program to AFDC (TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), the federally assisted foster care program, or the Medicaid Program, automatically receive services. Services are free to such recipients, but others are charged up to $25 for services. In the non-

welfare program, States also can charge fees on a sliding scale, pay the fee out of State funds, or recover the fees from the noncustodial parent.

In 1996, Public Law 104–193, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, abolished AFDC and related programs and replaced them with a block grant program of TANF. Under the new law, each State must operate a CSE Program meeting Federal requirements in order to be eligible for TANF funds. In addition to abolishing AFDC, Public Law 104–193 made about 50 changes to the CSE Program, many of them major. These changes include requiring States to increase the percentage of fathers identified, establishing an integrated, automated network linking all States to information about the location and assets of parents, requiring States to implement more enforcement techniques, and revising the rules governing the distribution of past due (arrearage) child support payments to former recipients of public assistance.

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

The need for an effective child support program is clearly supported by a brief review of the demographic trends of the American family. By 1998, there were an estimated 11.9 million single-parent families with children under age 18; about 9.8 million (82 percent) maintained by the mother and roughly 2.1 million maintained by the father. It appears that the rate of growth in the number of single parents has stabilized (Office of Child Support, 1995a, p. 5). The average annual percent increase in the number of one-parent families was 2.3 percent from 1990 to 1998 and 4.1 percent from 1980 to 1990 as compared with 8.2 percent from 1970 to 1980. In 1998, one-parent families comprised nearly 32 percent of all families. The corresponding share of single-parent families in 1970 was 13 percent. In 1998, about 40 percent of the mothers had never been married, 34 percent were divorced, 21 percent were separated from their spouse, and about 4 percent were widowed (U.S. Census Bureau, 1998, p. 36).

Of equal concern, dynamic estimates indicate that at least half of all children born in the United States during the late 1970s and early 1980s will live with a single parent before reaching adulthood. For black children, the projection is about 80 percent (Bumpass, 1984). Currently, about 29 percent of the 68 million children under age 18 living in the United States reside in a one-parent family. Although the number of families with a mother who has divorced has tripled since 1970, the number with a mother who has never married has increased fifteenfold from 248,000 to 3,831,000. In these latter cases, paternity must be determined before the other parent has a legal obligation to financially support the child. The 3.8 million families maintained by a never-married mother in 1998 represent a major concern because only about one-third of the children in these families have had their paternity established; for the other two-thirds, a child support obligation cannot be established until a paternity determination is made.

Poverty is endemic among mother-headed families. In 1998, 38.7 percent of the 8.9 million families maintained solely by a mother with children under 18 had incomes below the poverty threshold

(U.S. Census Bureau, 1998, p.17). A little more than 16 percent of these families were poor despite the fact that the mother worked year round, full time. Today, an unprecedented number of children live in single-parent homes, nearly 40 percent are poor, and many lack adequate or any support from the nonresident parent.

PROGRAM TRENDS

In response to these demographic trends, the Federal-State child support program grew rapidly. By 1998, about half of all child support eligible families were actually receiving government funded child support services. Most of the information in this chapter applies to the families receiving these government services.

Table 8–1 summarizes trends for the child support program since 1978. In 1998, almost $3.6 billion was spent by State child support programs to collect $14.3 billion in child support. The combined Federal-State program had 55,300 employees. A sum of $4 was collected for every dollar of administrative expense, up by 38 percent from the low point of only $2.89 in 1982. In addition, in 1998 nearly 6.6 million absent parents were located; 848,000 paternities were established; over 1.1 million support orders were established; 3.5 million cases had collections; 356,000 families were removed from TANF because of child support collections (not shown in table 8–1, fiscal year 1997 data); and 16.1 percent of TANF payments were recovered as a result of child support enforcement.

These program trends demonstrate that more and more positive child support outcomes are achieved by the Federal-State program. But whether these trends indicate program success is a complex matter that will be discussed in more detail below. We turn now to a detailed explanation of the Federal-State program and both its achievements and problems.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The Federal statute requires the national child support program to be administered by a separate organizational unit under the control of a person designated by and reporting directly to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Presently, this office is known as the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE). The Family Support Act of 1988 required the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Family Support within DHHS to administer a number of programs, including the Child Support Enforcement Program. Currently, this position is entitled the Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families.

A primary responsibility of the Assistant Secretary is to establish standards for State programs for locating absent parents, establishing paternity, and obtaining child support and support for the spouse (or former spouse) with whom the child is living. In addition to this broad statutory mandate, the Assistant Secretary is required to establish minimum organizational and staffing requirements for State child support agencies, and to review and approve State plans.

TABLE 8–1.—SUMMARY OF NATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT PROGRAM STATISTICS, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1978–98

[Numbers in thousands, dollars in millions]

Measure	1978	1982	1986	1988	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Total child support collections	$1,047	$1,770	$3,246	$4,605	$6,010	$6,886	$7,965	$8,907	$9,850	$10,827	$12,019	$13,363	$14,347
In 1996 dollars [1]	2,555	2,885	4,609	6,125	7,272	7,919	8,921	9,620	10,441	11,152	12,019	13,363	14,347
Total TANF collections [2]	472	786	1,225	1,486	1,750	1,984	2,259	2,416	2,550	2,689	2,855	2,842	2,649
Federal	311	311	369	449	533	626	738	777	762	821	888	1,046	960
State	148	354	424	525	620	700	787	847	891	939	1,013	1,158	1,089
Total non-TANF collections	575	984	2,019	3,119	4,260	4,902	5,705	6,491	7,300	8,138	9,164	10,521	11,697
Total administrative expenditures	312	612	941	1,171	1,606	1,804	1,995	2,241	2,556	3,012	3,049	3,427	3,584
Federal	236	459	633	804	1,061	1,212	1,343	1,517	1,741	2,095	2,040	2,327	2,385
State	76	153	308	366	545	593	652	724	816	917	1,015	1,100	1,199
Federal incentive payments to States and localities	54	107	158	222	264	278	299	339	407	400	409	409	396
Average number of TANF cases in which a collection was made	458	597	582	621	701	755	836	879	926	976	940	865	790
Average number of non-TANF cases in which a collection was made	249	448	786	1,083	1,363	1,555	1,749	1,958	2,169	2,408	2,618	2,850	3,071
Average number of AFDC/TANF arrears only cases	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	308	343	404	493	651
Number of parents located	454	779	1,046	1,388	2,062	2,577	3,152	3,777	4,204	4,950	5,808	6,441	6,585
Number of paternities established	111	173	245	307	393	472	512	554	592	659	733	814	848
Number of support obligations established	315	462	731	871	1,022	[3] 821	879	1,026	1,025	1,051	1,093	1,156	1,148
Percent of TANF assistance payments recovered through child support collections	NA	6.8	8.6	9.8	10.3	10.7	11.4	12.0	12.5	13.6	15.5	22.0	20.0
Total child support collections per dollar of total administrative expenses	3.35	2.89	3.45	3.93	3.74	3.82	3.99	3.98	3.86	3.60	3.93	3.90	4.00

[1] Adjusted for inflation using fiscal Consumer Price Index.

[2] TANF collections are divided into State/Federal shares and incentives are taken from the Federal share thereby reducing the Federal amounts.

[3] Data beginning in 1991 exclude modifications of support orders.

NA—Not available.

Note.—Data is preliminary for fiscal year 1998. Paternities established do not include the paternities esablished through the In-Hospital Paternity Acknowledgement Program. In fiscal year 1994, 84,411 paternities were established in hospitals; 272,729 paternities were established in hospitals in fiscal year 1995; 324,595 paternities were established in hospitals in fiscal year 1996; 486,551 paternities were established in hospitals in fiscal year 1997; and 614,081 paternities were established in hospitals in fiscal year 1998.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The statute also requires the Assistant Secretary to provide technical assistance to States to help them establish effective systems for collecting support and establishing paternity. To fulfill this requirement, OCSE operates a National Child Support Enforcement Reference Center as a central location for the collection and dissemination of information about State and local programs. OCSE also provides, under a contract with the American Bar Association Child Support Project, training and information dissemination on legal issues to persons working in the field of child support enforcement. Special initiatives, such as assisting major urban areas in improving program performance, have also been undertaken by OCSE.

The Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 (Public Law 98–378) extended the research and demonstration authority in section 1115 of the Social Security Act to the Child Support Enforcement Program. This authority makes it possible for States to test innovative approaches to support enforcement so long as the modification does not disadvantage children in need of support nor result in an increase in Federal TANF costs. The 1984 amendments also authorize $15 million for each fiscal year after 1986 for special project grants to promote improvement in interstate enforcement. In fiscal year 1999, 38 States had section 1115 grants or waivers which directly impacted child support: 6 States had waivers to implement models of collaboration among the CSE agency, Head Start Programs, and child care programs; 4 States had waivers to test new ways of reviewing and modifying orders; 4 States had waivers designed to improve CSE for Native Americans; 3 States had waivers to test different approaches to handling CSE cases with a history of domestic violence; 3 States had waivers to measure and improve CSE Program performance; and other States had waivers related to access and visitation, child support assurance, fatherhood initiatives, job training, parenting, interviewing and client referral, paternity establishment, and staffing standards.

The Assistant Secretary for Children and Families has full responsibility for the evaluation of the CSE Program. Pursuant to Public Law 104–193, States must annually review and report to the DHHS Secretary information adequate to determine the State's compliance with Federal requirements for expedited procedures, timely case processing, and improvement on the performance indicators. To measure the quality of the data reported by States and to assess the adequacy of financial management of the State program, the Secretary must conduct an audit of every State at least once every 3 years and more often if a State fails to meet Federal requirements. Under the audit's penalty provision, a State's TANF Block Grant must be reduced by an amount equal to at least 1 but not more than 2 percent for the first failure to comply substantially with the standards and requirements, at least 2 but not more than 3 percent for the second failure, and at least 3 but not more than 5 percent for the third and subsequent failures.

The 1996 welfare reform law set aside 1 percent of the Federal share of retained child support collections for information dissemination and technical assistance to States (including technical assistance related to automated systems), training of State and Federal staff, staffing studies, and related activities needed to improve

the CSE Program, and research, demonstration, and special projects of regional or national significance relating to the operation of the CSE Program. An additional 2 percent of the Federal share of retained child support collections is set aside for the operation of the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS).

The statute creates several Federal mechanisms to assist States in performing their paternity and child support enforcement functions. These include use of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the Federal courts, and the FPLS. The Assistant Secretary must approve a State's application for permission to use the courts of the United States to enforce orders upon a finding that either another State has not enforced the court order of the originating State within a reasonable time or Federal courts are the only reasonable method of enforcing the order. Although Congress authorized the use of Federal courts to enforce interstate cases, this mechanism has gone unused, apparently because States view it as costly and complex.

Finally, the CSE statute requires the establishment of a FPLS to be used to find absent parents in order to secure and enforce child support obligations. The role of the FPLS was expanded by the 1996 welfare reform law. For purposes of establishing parentage; establishing, setting the amount of, modifying, or enforcing child support obligations; or enforcing child custody or visitation; the FPLS is to provide information to locate any individual: (1) who is under an obligation to pay child support or provide child custody or visitation rights; (2) against whom such an obligation is sought; or (3) to whom such an obligation is owed. Upon request, the Secretary of DHHS must provide to an authorized person the most recent address and place of employment of any noncustodial parent if the information is contained in the records of DHHS or can be obtained from any other department or agency of the United States or of any State. Public Law 105–33, which was enacted in 1997 and made numerous changes to the 1996 welfare reform law, allows FPLS information to be disclosed to noncustodial parents except in cases where there is evidence of domestic violence or child abuse and the local court determines that disclosure may result in harm to the custodial parent or child. The Secretary also must make available the services of the FPLS to any State that wishes to locate a missing parent or child for the purpose of enforcing any Federal or State law involving the unlawful taking or restraint of a child or the establishment or maintenance of a child custody or visitation order.

Historically, the Federal Government held the view that visitation (also referred to as child access) and child support should be legally separate issues, and that only child support should be under the purview of the CSE Program. Both Federal and State policymakers have maintained that denial of visitation rights should be treated separately and should not be considered a reason for stopping support payments. Nonetheless, Census Bureau data indicate that it was more likely for noncustodial parents to make payments of child support if they had either joint custody or visitation rights. Thus, in order to promote visitation and better relations between custodial and noncustodial parents, the 1996 welfare reform law provided $10 million per year for grants to States for access and

visitation programs, including mediation, counseling, education, and supervised visitation. In addition, as mentioned above, the 1996 law also expanded the scope of the FPLS to allow certain noncustodial parents to obtain information regarding the location of the custodial parent.

All States and territories applied for and received funding for access and visitation grants in fiscal year 1997. According to a preliminary report on the grant program (American Institutes, 1999), most participating individuals received parenting education, help in developing parenting plans, and mediation services. Based on data from 28 States and 2 territories, nearly 20,000 individuals were served by the grant program in its first year of operation.

THE STATE ROLE

The Social Security Act requires every State operating a TANF Program to conduct a Child Support Enforcement Program. Federal law requires applicants for, and recipients of, TANF to assign their support rights to the State in order to receive benefits. In addition, each applicant or recipient must cooperate with the State to establish the paternity of a child born outside marriage and to obtain child support payments.

TANF recipients or applicants may be excused from the requirement of cooperation if the CSE agency determines that good cause for noncooperation exists, taking into consideration the best interests of the child on whose behalf aid is claimed. If good cause is found not to exist and if the relative with whom a child is living still refuses to cooperate, then the State must reduce the family's TANF benefit by at least 25 percent and may remove the family from the TANF Program. (Federal law also stipulates that no TANF funds may be used for a family that includes a person who has not assigned child support rights to the State.) Before the 1996 welfare reform law, cooperation could have been found to be against the best interests of the child if cooperation could be anticipated to result in physical or emotional harm to the child or caretaker relative; if the child was conceived as a result of incest or rape; or if legal procedures were underway for the child's adoption.

Unlike previous law, the welfare reform law provides States rather than the Federal Government with the authority to define "good cause." The law now requires States to develop both "good cause" and "other exceptions" to the cooperation requirement. The only restriction is that both the "good cause" and "other exceptions" must be based on the "best interests of the child." In addition to defining good cause and other exceptions, States must establish the standard for proving a claim. States also will have to decide which State agency will inform TANF caretaker relatives about the cooperation exemptions, and which agency will make the decision about the validity of a given claim. These responsibilities can be delegated to the State TANF agency, the CSE agency, or the Medicaid agency.

Each State is required to designate a single and separate organizational unit of State government to administer its child support program. Earlier child support legislation, enacted in 1967, had required that the program be administered by the welfare agency. The 1975 act deleted this requirement in order to give each State

the opportunity to select the most effective administrative mechanism. Most States have placed the child support agency within a social or human services umbrella agency which also administers the TANF Program. However, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, and Massachusetts have placed the agency in the department of revenue and Guam, Hawaii, Texas, and the Virgin Islands have placed the agency in the office of the attorney general. The law allows the programs to be administered either at the State or local level. Ten programs are locally administered. A few programs are State administered in some counties and locally administered in others.

States must have plans, approved by the director of OCSE, which set forth the details of their child support program. States must also enter into cooperative arrangements with courts and law enforcement officials to assist the child support agency in administering the program. These agreements may include provision for reimbursing courts and law enforcement officials for their assistance. States also must operate a parent locator service to find absent parents, and they must maintain full records of collections and disbursements and otherwise maintain an adequate reporting system.

In order to facilitate the collection of support in interstate cases, a State must cooperate with other States in establishing paternity, locating absent parents, and securing compliance with an order issued by another State.

States are required to use several enforcement tools. They must use the IRS tax refund offset procedure for welfare and nonwelfare families, and they must also determine periodically whether any individuals receiving unemployment compensation owe child support. The State Employment Security Agency (part of the Federal-State Unemployment Insurance System), is required to withhold unemployment benefits, and to pay the child support agency any outstanding child support obligations established by an agreement with the individual or through legal processes.

Other enforcement techniques States must use include:

1. Imposing liens against real and personal property for amounts of overdue support;
2. Withholding State tax refunds payable to a parent who is delinquent in support payments;
3. Reporting the amount of overdue support to a consumer credit bureau upon request;
4. Requiring individuals who have demonstrated a pattern of delinquent payments to post a bond or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support;
5. Establishing expedited processes within the State judicial system or under administrative processes for obtaining and enforcing child support orders and determining paternity. These expedited procedures include giving States authority to secure assets to satisfy payment of past-due support by seizing or attaching unemployment compensation, workers' compensation, judgments, settlements, lotteries, asset held in financial institutions, and public and private retirement funds;
6. Withholding, suspending, or restricting the use of driver's licenses, professional and occupational licenses, and recreational and sporting licenses of noncustodial parents who owe past-due support;

7. Denying passports to persons owing more than $5,000 in past-due support;
8. Requiring unemployed noncustodial parents who owe child support to a child receiving TANF benefits to participate in appropriate work activities;
9. Performing quarterly data matches with financial institutions; and
10. Voiding of fraudulent transfers of assets to avoid payment of child support.

Each State's plan must provide that the child support agency will attempt to secure support for all TANF children. The State must also provide in its plan that it will undertake to establish the paternity of a TANF child born out of wedlock. These requirements apply to all cases except those in which the State finds, in accordance with standards established by the Secretary, the best interests of the child would be violated. For families whose TANF eligibility ends due to the receipt of or an increase in child support, States must continue to provide CSE services without imposing the application fee.

Foster care agencies are required to take steps, where appropriate, to secure an assignment to the State of any rights to support on behalf of a child receiving foster care maintenance payments under title IV–E of the Social Security Act.

State child support agencies are also required to petition to include medical support as part of any child support order whenever health care coverage is available to the noncustodial parent at a reasonable cost. And, if a family loses TANF eligibility as the result of increased collection of support payments, the State must continue to provide Medicaid benefits for 4 calendar months beginning with the month of ineligibility. In addition, States must provide services to families covered by Medicaid who are referred to the State IV–D agency from the State Medicaid agency.

With respect to non-TANF families, States must provide, once an application is filed with the State agency, the same child support collection and paternity determination services which are provided for TANF families. The State must charge non-TANF families an application fee of up to $25. States may charge the fee against the custodial parent, pay the fee out of State funds, or recover it from the noncustodial parent.

States also have the option of charging a late payment fee equal to between 3 and 6 percent of the amount of overdue support. Late payment fees may be charged to noncustodial parents and are to be collected only after the full amount of the support has been paid to the child. States may also recover costs in excess of the application fee from either the custodial or noncustodial parent. If a State chooses to make recovery from the custodial parent, it must have in effect a procedure whereby all persons in the State who have authority to order support are informed that such costs are to be collected from the custodial parent.

Child support enforcement services must include the enforcement of spousal support, but only if a support obligation has been established with respect to the spouse, the child and spouse are living in the same household, and child support is being collected along with spousal support.

Finally, each State must comply with any other requirements and standards that the Secretary determines to be necessary to the establishment of an effective child support program.

THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROCESS

The goal of the child support program is to combine these Federal and State responsibilities and activities into an efficient machine that provides seven basic products: locating absent parents, establishing paternity, establishing child support orders, reviewing and modifying orders, promoting medical support, collecting and distributing support, and enforcing child support across State lines. Each of these services deserves extensive discussion.

LOCATING ABSENT PARENTS

In pursuing cases, child support officials try to obtain a great deal of information and several documents from the custodial parent or other sources. These include the name and address of the noncustodial parent; the noncustodial parent's Social Security number (SSN); children's birth certificates; the child support order; the divorce decree or separation agreement; the name and address of the current or most recent employer of the noncustodial parent; the names of friends and relatives or organizations to which the noncustodial parent might belong; information about income and assets; and any other information about noncustodial parents that might help locate them. Once this information is provided, it is used in strictest confidence.

If the Child Support Enforcement Program cannot locate the noncustodial parent with the information provided by the custodial parent, it must try to locate the noncustodial parent through the State parent locator service. The State uses various information sources such as telephone directories, motor vehicle registries, tax files, and employment and unemployment records. The State also can ask the FPLS to locate the noncustodial parent. The FPLS can access data from the Social Security Administration, the IRS, the Selective Service System, the Department of Defense, the Veterans Administration, the National Personnel Records Center, and State Employment Security Agencies. The FPLS provides SSNs, addresses, and employer and wage information to State and local child support agencies to establish and enforce child support orders.

The FPLS obtains employer addresses and wage and unemployment compensation information from the State employment security agencies. This information is very useful in helping child support officials work cases in which the custodial parent and children live in one State and the noncustodial parent lives or works in another State. Employment data are updated quarterly by employers reporting to their State employment security agency; unemployment data are updated continually from State unemployment compensation payment records.

The FPLS conducts weekly or biweekly matches with most of the agencies listed above. Each agency runs the cases against its data base and the names and SSNs that match are returned to FPLS and through FPLS to the requesting State or local child support of-

fice. During fiscal year 1997, the FPLS processed approximately 4.9 million requests for information from State and local CSE agencies.

Since October 1984, OCSE has participated in Project 1099 which provides State child support agencies access to all of the earned and unearned income information reported to IRS by employers and financial institutions. Project 1099, named after the IRS form on which both earned and unearned income is reported, is a cooperative effort involving State child support agencies, the OCSE, and the IRS. Examples of reported earned and unearned incomes include: interest paid on savings accounts, stocks and bonds, and distribution of dividends and capital gains; rent or royalty payments; prizes, awards, or winnings; fees paid directors or subcontractors; and unemployment compensation. The Project 1099 information is used to locate noncustodial parents and to verify income and employment. Project 1099 also helps locate additional nonwage income and assets of noncustodial parents who are employees as well as income and asset sources of self-employed and nonwage earning obligors. In fiscal year 1995, OCSE submitted about 3.9 million cases to the IRS under Project 1099 and over 2.5 million cases were matched (65 percent).

The SSN is the key piece of information around which the child support information system is constructed. Most computer searches need the SSN in order to operate effectively. Thus, in the 1996 welfare reform law, Congress gave CSE agencies access to new sources for obtaining SSNs. Federal CSE law requires States to implement procedures requiring that the SSN of any applicant for a professional, driver's, occupational, recreational, or marriage license be recorded on the application (not on the face of the license itself). In addition, the 1996 law requires that the SSN of any individual subject to a divorce decree, support order, or paternity determination or acknowledgment be placed in the records relating to the matter and that the SSN of any individual who has died be placed in the death records and recorded on the death certificate.

To further improve CSE's ability to locate absent parents, the 1996 law also requires States to have automated registries of child support orders containing records of each case in which CSE services are being provided and each support order established or modified on or after October 1, 1998. Local registries could be linked to form the State registry. The State registry is to include a record of the support owed under the order, arrearages, interest or late penalty charges, amounts collected, amounts distributed, child's date of birth, and any liens imposed. The registry also will include standardized information on both parents, such as name, SSN, date of birth, and case identification number.

In one of the most important child support reforms in recent years, the 1996 law required States, by October 1, 1997, to establish an automated directory of new hires containing information from employers, including Federal, State, and local governments and labor organizations, for each newly hired employee. The directory must include the name, address and SSN of the employee and the employer's name, address, and tax identification number. This information is to be supplied by employers to the State new hires directory within 20 days after the employee is hired. Within 3 business days after receipt of new hire information, the State directory

of new hires is required to furnish the information to the national directory of new hires. The new law also requires the establishment of a Federal case registry of child support orders and a national directory of new hires. The Federal directories are to consist of abstracts of information from the State directories and are located in the FPLS. In fiscal year 1998, there were more than 1 million matches in which employment and address information was returned to States to assist in the location of noncustodial parents who owed child support. In fiscal year 1999, with the addition of the case registry to the matching system, there were 2.8 million matches.

The 1996 reforms allow all States to link up to an array of data bases and permits the FPLS to be used for the purpose of establishing parentage; establishing, setting the amount of, modifying, or enforcing child support obligations; or enforcing child custody or visitation orders. By May 1, 1998, a designated State agency must directly or by contract conduct automated comparisons of the SSNs reported by employers to the State directory of new hires and the SSNs of CSE cases that appear in the records of the State registry of child support orders. The Secretary of DHHS is required to conduct similar comparisons of the Federal directories. When a match occurs, the State directory of new hires is required to report to the State CSE agency the name, date of birth, and SSN of the employee, and the name, address, and identification number of the employer. The CSE agency must, within 2 business days, instruct appropriate employers to withhold child support obligations from the employee's paycheck, unless the employee's income is not subject to withholding.

There are two exceptions to the immediate income withholding rule: (1) if one of the parties demonstrates, and the court (or administrative process) finds, that there is good cause not to require immediate withholding; or (2) if both parties agree in writing to an alternative arrangement. Employers must remit to the State disbursement unit income withheld within 7 business days after the employee's payday. States also are required to operate a centralized collection and disbursement unit that sends child support payments to custodial parents within 2 business days.

ESTABLISHING PATERNITY

Paternity establishment is a prerequisite for obtaining a child support order. In 1998, 32.8 percent of children born in the United States were born to unmarried women. According to the OCSE, in fiscal year 1997 paternity was established for only 34 percent of the children who needed paternity established. However, in recent years the CSE Program has made great strides in establishing paternity. Between 1994 and 1998, for example, the new In-Hospital Paternity Acknowledgement Program grew from 84,411 to 614,081 paternities established, a jump of well over 600 percent.

But experts agree that the CSE Program must continue to improve paternity establishment. Without paternity established, children have no legal claim on their fathers' income. In addition to financial benefits, establishing paternity can provide social, psychological, and emotional benefits and in some cases the father's medical history may be needed to give a child proper care.

In the 1980s, legislation was enacted that contained provisions aimed at increasing the number of paternities established. Public Law 98–378, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984, required States to implement laws that permitted paternity to be established until a child's 18th birthday. Under the Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–485), States are required to initiate the establishment of paternity for all children under the age of 18, including those for whom an action to establish paternity was previously dismissed because of the existence of a statute of limitations of less than 18 years. The 1988 law encourages States to create simple civil procedures for establishing paternity in contested cases, requires States to have all parties in a contested paternity case take a genetic test upon the request of any party, requires the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the laboratory costs of these tests, and permits States to charge persons not receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) for the cost of establishing paternity. The 1988 law also sets paternity establishment standards for the States and stipulates that each State is required, in administering any law involving the issuance of birth certificates, to require both parents to furnish their SSN unless the State finds good cause for not doing so.

Congress took additional action to improve paternity establishment in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This law required States to have in effect, by October 1, 1993, the following:

1. A simple civil process for voluntarily acknowledging paternity under which the State must explain the rights and responsibilities of acknowledging paternity and afford due process safeguards. Procedures must include a hospital-based program for the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity during the period immediately preceding or following the birth of a child;
2. A law under which the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity creates a rebuttable, or at State option, conclusive presumption of paternity, and under which such voluntary acknowledgments are admissible as evidence of paternity;
3. A law under which the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity must be recognized as a basis for seeking a support order without requiring any further proceedings to establish paternity;
4. Procedures which provide that any objection to genetic testing results must be made in writing within a specified number of days prior to any hearing at which such results may be introduced in evidence; if no objection is made, the test results must be admissible as evidence of paternity without the need for foundation testimony or other proof of authenticity or accuracy;
5. A law which creates a rebuttable or, at the option of the State, conclusive presumption of paternity upon genetic testing results indicating a threshold probability of the alleged father being the father of the child;
6. Procedures which require default orders in paternity cases upon a showing that process has been served on the defendant and whatever additional showing may be required by State law; and
7. Expedited processes for paternity establishment in contested cases and full faith and credit to determinations of paternity made by other States.

The 1993 reforms also revised the mandatory paternity establishment requirements imposed on States by the Family Support Act of 1988. The most notable provision increased the mandatory paternity establishment percentage, which was backed up by financial penalties linked to a reduction of Federal matching funds for the State's AFDC (now TANF) Program (see Audits and Financial Penalties section). The welfare reform law of 1996 further strengthened the Nation's paternity establishment system. More specifically, the new law streamlines the paternity determination process; raises the paternity establishment requirement from 75 to 90 percent; implements a simple civil process for establishing paternity; requires a uniform affidavit to be completed by men voluntarily acknowledging paternity and entitles such affidavit to full faith and credit in any State; stipulates that a signed acknowledgment of paternity be considered a legal finding of paternity unless rescinded within 60 days and thereafter may be challenged in court only on the basis of fraud, duress, or material mistake of fact; and provides that no judicial or administrative action is needed to ratify an acknowledgment that is not challenged. The new law also requires States to publicize the availability and encourage the use of procedures for voluntary establishment of paternity and child support.

Paternity acknowledgments must be filed with the State birth records agency. However, before a mother or alleged father can sign a paternity acknowledgment, each must be given notice (both orally and in writing) of the alternatives to, legal consequences of, and rights and responsibilities arising from the signed acknowledgment. Moreover, in the case of unmarried parents, the father's name shall not appear on the birth certificate unless he has signed a voluntary acknowledgment or a court has issued an adjudication of paternity.

While employing these laws and procedures to establish paternity, States follow a predictable sequence of events. In cases for which paternity is not voluntarily acknowledged (which is still the majority of cases), the child support agency locates the alleged father and brings him to court or before an administrative agency where he can either acknowledge or dispute paternity. If he claims he is not the father, the court can require that he submit to parentage blood testing to establish the probability that he is the father. If the father denies paternity, a court usually decides the issue based on scientific and testimonial evidence. Through the use of testing techniques, a man may be excluded as a possible natural father, in which case no further action against him is warranted. Most States use one or more of several scientific methods for establishing paternity. These include: ABO blood typing system, human leukocyte antigen testing, red cell enzyme and serum protein electrophoresis, and deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) testing.

The State CSE agency has the power (without the need for permission from a court or administrative tribunal) to order genetic tests in appropriate CSE cases. These CSE agencies also must recognize and enforce the ability of other State CSE agencies to take such actions. Moreover, genetic test results must be admissible as evidence so long as they are of a type generally acknowledged as reliable by accreditation bodies recognized by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and performed by an entity

approved by such an accredited body. Finally, in any case in which the CSE agency ordered the tests, the State must pay the initial costs. The State is allowed to recoup the cost from the father if paternity is established. If the original test result is contested, further testing can be ordered by the CSE agency if the contestant pays the cost in advance.

There are two types of testing procedures for paternity cases: (1) probability of exclusion tests, and (2) probability of paternity tests. Most laboratories perform probability of exclusion tests. This type of testing can determine with 90–99 percent accuracy that a man is "not" the father of a given child. There is a very high probability the test will exonerate a falsely accused man (Office of Child Support Enforcement, 1990).

Since the question of paternity is essentially a scientific one, it is important that the verification process include available advanced scientific technology. Experts now agree that use of the highly reliableDNA test greatly increases the likelihood of correct identification of putative fathers. DNA tests can be used either to exclude unlikely fathers or to establish a high likelihood that a given man is the father (Office of Child Support, 1990, see pp. 59–74). One expert, speaking at a child support conference, summed up the effectiveness of DNA testing as follows:

> The DNA fingerprinting technique promises far superior reliability than current blood grouping or human leukocyte antigen analyses. The probability of an unrelated individual sharing the same patterns is practically zero. The "DNA fingerprinting" test, developed in England in 1985, refines the favorable statistics to an even greater degree, reducing the probability that two unrelated individuals will have the same DNA fingerprint to one in a quadrillion (Georgeson, 1989, p. 568).

If the putative father is not excluded on the basis of the scientific test results, authorities may still conclude on the basis of witnesses, resemblance, and other evidence that they do not have sufficient evidence to establish paternity and, therefore, will drop charges against him. Tests resulting in nonexclusion also may serve to convince the putative father that he is, in fact, the father. If this occurs, a voluntary admission often leads to a formal court order. When authorities believe there is enough evidence to support the mother's allegation, but the putative father continues to deny the charges, the case proceeds to a formal adjudication of paternity in a court of law (McKillop, 1981, pp. 22–23). Using the results of the blood test and other evidence, the court or the child support agency, often through an administrative process, may dismiss the case or enter an order of paternity, a prerequisite to obtaining a court order requiring a noncustodial parent to pay support (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1987).

In fiscal year 1998, 848,000 paternities were established, up from 245,000 in fiscal year 1986. While the number of paternities established through child support agencies reached a record high in 1998, huge disparities exist among States. For example, the percentage of children in the Child Support Enforcement Program for whom paternity was established averaged 64 percent nationally, but ranged from 16 percent in Iowa to 155 percent in Maryland (some paternities established are for children born in previous years). In addition to the 848,000 paternities established in fiscal

year 1998, 614,000 paternities were voluntarily acknowledged in the hospital (see table 8–1).

ESTABLISHING ORDERS

A child support order legally obligates noncustodial parents to provide financial support for their children and stipulates the amount of the obligation (current weekly obligation plus arrearages, if any) and how it is to be paid. Many States have statutes that provide that, in the absence of a child support award, the payment of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits to the child of a noncustodial parent creates a debt due from the parent or parents in the amount of the TANF benefit. Other States operate under the common law principle, which maintains that a father is obligated to reimburse any person who has provided his child with food, shelter, clothing, medical attention, or education. States can establish child support obligations either by judicial or administrative process.

Judicial and administrative systems

The courts have traditionally played a major role in the child support program. Judges establish orders, establish paternity, and provide authority for all enforcement activity. The child support literature generally concludes that the judicial process offers several advantages, especially by providing more adequate protection for the legal rights of the noncustodial parent and by offering a wide range of enforcement remedies, such as civil contempt and possible incarceration. A major problem of using courts, however, is that they are often cumbersome, expensive, and time consuming.

Thus, the advantages of an administrative process are very compelling. These include offering quicker service because documents do not have to be filed with the court clerk nor await the signature of the judge, eliminating time consuming problems in scheduling court appearances, providing a more uniform and consistent obligation amount, and saving money because of reduced court costs and attorney fees.

The 1984 child support amendments required States to limit the role of the courts significantly by implementing administrative or judicial expedited processes. States are required to have quasi-judicial or administrative systems to expedite the process for obtaining and enforcing a support order. Since 1993, States have been required to extend these expedited processes to paternity establishment.

Most child support officials view the growth of expedited administrative processes as an improvement in the child support program. An expedited judicial process is a legal process in effect under a State's judicial system that reduces the processing time of establishing and enforcing a support order. To expedite case processing, a "judge surrogate" is given authority to: take testimony and establish a record, evaluate and make initial decisions, enter default orders if the noncustodial parent does not respond to "notice" or other State "service of process" in a timely manner, accept voluntary acknowledgment of support liability and approve stipulated agreements to pay support. In addition, if the State establishes paternity using the expedited judicial process, the surrogate

can accept voluntary acknowledgement of paternity. Judge surrogates are sometimes referred to as court masters, referees, hearing officers, commissioners, or presiding officers.

The purpose of an expedited administrative process is to increase effectiveness and meet specified processing times in child support cases and paternity actions. Federal regulations specify that 90 percent of cases must be processed within 3 months, 98 percent within 6 months, and 100 percent within 12 months.

The Federal regulations also contain additional requirements related to the expedited process. Proceedings conducted pursuant to either the expedited judicial or expedited administrative process must be presided over by an individual who is not a judge of the court. Orders established by expedited process must have the same force and effect under State law as orders established by full judicial process, although either process may provide that a judge first ratify the order. Within these broad limitations, each State is free to design an expedited process that is best suited to its administrative needs and legal traditions.

Under the 1996 welfare reform law, the expedited procedure rules were broadened to cover modification of support orders. The new law also requires that State tribunals—whether quasi-judicial or administrative—must have statewide jurisdiction over the parties and permit intrastate case transfers from one tribunal to another without the need to refile the case or re-serve the respondent. In addition, once a support/paternity order is entered, the tribunal must require each party to file and periodically update certain information with both the tribunal and the State's child support case registry. This information includes the parent's SSN, residential and mailing addresses, telephone number, driver's license number, and employer's name, address and telephone number.

Moreover, the 1996 reforms require States to adopt laws that give the CSE agency authority to initiate a series of expedited procedures without the necessity of obtaining an order from any other administrative agency or judicial tribunal. These actions include: ordering genetic testing; issuing subpoenas; requiring public and private employers and other entities to provide information on employment, compensation, and benefits or be subject to penalties; obtaining access to vital statistics, State and local tax records, real and personal property records, records of occupational and professional licenses, business records, employment security and public assistance records, motor vehicle records, corrections records, customer records of utilities and cable television companies pursuant to an administrative subpoena, and records of financial institutions; directing the obligor to make payments to the child support agency in public assistance or income withholding cases; ordering income withholding; securing assets to satisfy judgments and settlements; and increasing the monthly support due to make payments on arrearages.

Determining the amount of support orders

Before October 1989, the decision of how much a parent should pay for child support was left primarily to the discretion of the court. Typically, judges examined financial statements from mothers and fathers and established awards based on children's needs.

The resulting awards varied greatly. Moreover, this case-by-case approach resulted in very low awards. As late as 1991, the average amount of child support received by custodial parents was $2,961, less than $250 per month.

In an attempt to increase the use of objective criteria, the 1984 child support amendments required each State to establish, by October 1987, guidelines for determining child support award amounts "by law or by judicial or administrative action" [1] and to make the guidelines available "to all judges and other officials who have the power to determine child support awards within the State." Federal regulations made the provision more specific: State child support guidelines must be based on specific descriptive and numeric criteria and result in a computation of the support obligation. The 1984 provision did not make the guidelines binding on judges and other officials who had the authority to establish child support obligations. However, the Family Support Act of 1988 required States to pass legislation making the State child support guidelines a "rebuttable presumption" in any judicial or administrative proceeding and establishing the amount of the order which results from the application of the State-established guidelines as the correct amount to be awarded.

States generally use one of three basic types of guidelines to determine award amounts: "Income shares," which is based on the combined income of both parents (31 States); "percentage of income," in which the number of eligible children is used to determine a percentage of the noncustodial parents' income to be paid in child support (15 States); and "Melson-Delaware," which provides a minimum self-support reserve for parents before the cost of rearing the children is prorated between the parents to determine the award amount (Delaware, Hawaii, West Virginia). Two jurisdictions (the District of Columbia and Massachusetts) use variants of one or more of these three approaches (Williams, 1994; see table 8–24 below).

The income shares approach is designed to ensure that the children of divorced parents suffer the lowest possible decline in standard of living. The approach is intended to ensure that the child receives the same proportion of parental income that he would have received if the parents lived together. The first step in the income shares approach is to determine the combined income of the two parents. A percentage of that combined income, which varies by income level, is used to calculate a "primary support obligation." The percentages decline as income rises, although the absolute amount of the primary support obligation increases with income. Many States add child care costs and extraordinary medical expenses to the primary support obligation. The resulting total child support obligation is apportioned between the parents on the basis of their incomes. The noncustodial parent's share is the child support award (Office of Child Support, 1987, pp. II 67–80).

---

[1] *Fitzgerald* v. *Fitzgerald*, No. 87–1259 (DC Ct. App. October 10, 1989): In October 1989, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals struck down child support guidelines adopted in October 1987 in response to the Federal requirement. The court held that the superior court committee that drafted the guidelines lacked authority to do so. It did not rule on the fairness of the guidelines, which awarded children a fixed fraction of the gross income of the noncustodial parent.

The percentage of income approach is based on the noncustodial parent's gross income and the number of children to be supported (the child support obligation is not adjusted for the income of the custodial parent). The percentages vary by State. In Wisconsin, child support is based on the following proportions of the noncustodial parent's gross income: one child—17 percent; two children—25 percent; three children—29 percent; four children—31 percent; and five or more children—34 percent. There is no self support reserve in this approach nor is there separate treatment for child care or extraordinary medical expenses. The States that use a percentage of income approach are Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The Melson-Delaware formula starts with net income.[2] After determining net income for each parent, a primary support allowance is subtracted from each parent's income. This reserve represents the minimum amount required for adults to meet their own subsistence requirements. The next step is to determine a primary support amount for each dependent child. Work-related child care expenses and extraordinary medical expenses are added to the child's primary support amount. The child's primary support needs are then apportioned between the parents. To ensure that children share in any additional income the parents might have, a percentage of the parents' remaining income is allocated among the children (the percentage is based on the number of dependent children). The States that use the Melson-Delaware approach are Delaware, Hawaii, and West Virginia.

Pirog, Klotz, and Buyers (1997) have examined the differences in child support guidelines across States. Their approach was to define five hypothetical cases of custodial mothers and noncustodial fathers that capture a range of differences in income, expenses, and other factors that influence the amount of child support payments computed under the guidelines adopted by the various States. State 1997 guidelines were then applied to each of the five cases to compute the amount of child support that would be due. In each of the five cases, the mother and father are divorced. The father lives alone while the mother lives with the couples' two children, ages 7 and 13. The father pays union dues of $30 per month and health insurance for the children of $25 per month. The mother incurs monthly employment-related child care expenses of $150. The income of the fathers and mothers are:

Case A: father—$530; mother—$300
Case B: father—$720; mother—$480
Case C: father—$2,500; mother—$1,000
Case D: father—$4,400; mother—$1,760
Case E: father—$6,300; mother—$4,200

Arguably, the most striking generalization that emerges from table 8–2 is the remarkable differences across States in the amount

[2] Net income equals income from employment and other sources plus business expense accounts if they provide the parent with an automobile, lunches, etc., minus income taxes based on maximum allowable exemptions, other deductions required by law, deductions required by an employer or union, legitimate business expenses, and benefits such as medical insurance maintained for dependents.

of the child support obligation established by the guidelines, particularly at the lower income levels.

TABLE 8–2.—AMOUNT OF CHILD SUPPORT AWARDED BY STATE GUIDELINES IN VARIOUS CASES

State	Case				
	A	B	C	D	E
Alabama	$216	$280	$433	$634	(1)
Alaska	38	38	312	546	$1,193
Arizona	(1)	75	482	628	1,061
Arkansas	(1)	150	305	475	1,025
California	236	278	478	770	1,457
Colorado	231	261	409	610	1,066
Connecticut	0	0	404	703	1,198
Delaware	91	91	467	626	1,157
District of Columbia	50	208	458	821	1,495
Florida	135	261	463	721	1,186
Georgia	210	210	383	673	1,607
Hawaii	100	100	470	610	1,260
Idaho	122	166	345	566	913
Illinois	102	136	294	485	1,020
Indiana	215	327	692	899	1,462
Iowa	50	189	358	566	1,047
Kansas	188	227	390	582	1,195
Kentucky	221	293	445	637	1,017
Louisiana	207	292	451	667	1,052
Maine	52	290	437	619	1,031
Maryland	249	295	449	655	1,060
Massachusetts	(1)	137	471	789	(1)
Michigan	128	141	468	657	1,078
Minnesota	62	84	376	606	1,228
Mississippi	92	124	251	427	908
Missouri	149	265	447	609	1,032
Montana	6	15	26	456	908
Nebraska	50	50	390	677	1,035
Nevada	200	180	375	660	1,575
New Hampshire	50	50	424	667	1,473
New Jersey	112	267	452	710	(1)
New Mexico	183	291	468	588	1,095
New York	25	50	436	699	1,548
North Carolina	50	57	463	600	1,012
North Dakota	68	126	356	582	1,231
Ohio	150	278	465	609	1,045
Oklahoma	171	171	295	415	801
Oregon	73	159	343	587	1,027
Pennsylvania	(1)	257	415	554	(1)
Rhode Island	252	315	480	677	1,170
South Carolina	58	183	463	574	1,000
South Dakota	275	275	486	652	1,032
Tennessee	153	200	393	665	1,422
Texas	109	147	298	517	1,114
Utah	83	131	447	616	(1)

TABLE 8–2.—AMOUNT OF CHILD SUPPORT AWARDED BY STATE GUIDELINES IN VARIOUS CASES—Continued

State	Case				
	A	B	C	D	E
Vermont	(1)	(1)	428	642	1,025
Virginia	231	289	446	641	1,042
Washington	50	50	412	641	1,054
West Virginia	50	117	364	539	1,742
Wisconsin	133	180	375	660	1,575
Wyoming	105	200	348	519	882

[1] In these cases, courts have the discretion to set the amount that seems appropriate to the court.

Note.—See text for explanation of cases A, B, C, D, and E.

Source: Pirog, Klotz, & Buyers, 1997.

Award rates

In 1995, of the 11.6 million custodial mothers of children under the age of 21 whose father was not living in the household, only 7.1 million or 61 percent had a child support award and were owed child support. About one-third of the 4.5 million custodial mothers without awards chose not to pursue a child support award. In other cases, custodial parents were unable to locate the noncustodial parent, had a nonlegal agreement with the noncustodial parent, or the noncustodial parent was unable to pay. Never-married custodial parents were the group least likely to have a child support award. Only 44 percent of never-married custodial mothers had support awards compared with 76 percent of divorced custodial mothers. Moreover, black custodial mothers and custodial mothers of Hispanic origin were much less likely than their white counterparts to have child support awards. About 72 percent of whites had child support awards, compared with 45 percent of blacks and 47 percent of Hispanics (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999).

Unresolved issues

As noted by Garfinkel, Melli, and Robertson (1994), there are a host of controversial issues associated with child support awards. These include whether child care costs, extraordinary medical expenses, and college costs are taken into account in determining the support order; how the income of the noncustodial parent is allocated between first and subsequent families;[3] how the income of stepparents is treated; whether a minimum child support award level regardless of age or circumstance of the noncustodial parent should be imposed; whether income earned as a result of a custodial parent's participation in an AFDC work, education, and training program is taken into account; and the duration of the support order (i.e., does the support obligation end when the child reaches age 18; what happens to arrearages).

[3] Traditionally, the courts have taken the position that the father's prior child support obligations take absolute precedence over the needs of the new family. They have disregarded the father's plea that his new responsibilities are a "change in circumstance" justifying a reduction in a prior child support award or at least averting an increase.

REVIEWING AND MODIFYING ORDERS

Without periodic modifications, child support obligations can become inadequate and inequitable. Historically, the only way to modify a child support order was to require a party to petition the court for a modification based on a "change in circumstances." What constituted a change in circumstances sufficient to modify the order depended on the State and the court. The person requesting modification was responsible for filing the motion, serving notice, hiring a lawyer, and proving a change in circumstances of sufficient magnitude to satisfy statutory standards. The modification proceeding was a two step process. First the court determined whether a modification was appropriate. Next, the amount of the new obligation was determined.

Because this approach to updating orders was so cumbersome, the Family Support Act of 1988 required States both to use guidelines as a rebuttable presumption in all proceedings for the award of child support and to review and adjust child support orders in accordance with the guidelines. These provisions reflected congressional intent to simplify the updating of support orders by requiring a process in which the standard for modification was the State child support guidelines. They also reflect a recognition that the traditional burden of proof for changing the amount of the support order was a barrier to updating. Finally, the 1988 law signaled a need for States to at least expand, if not replace, the traditional "change in circumstances" test as the legal prerequisite for updating support orders by making State guidelines the presumptively correct amount of support to be paid (*Federal Register*, 1992, p. 61560).

The Family Support Act also required States to review guidelines at least once every 4 years and have procedures for review and adjustment of orders, consistent with a plan indicating how and when child support orders are to be reviewed and adjusted. Review may take place at the request of either parent subject to the order or at the request of a State child support agency. Any adjustment to the award must be consistent with the State's guidelines, which must be used as a rebuttable presumption in establishing or adjusting the support order. The Family Support Act also required States to review all orders being enforced under the child support program within 36 months after establishment or after the most recent review of the order and to adjust the order in accord with the State's guidelines.

Review is required in child support cases in which support rights are assigned to the State, unless the State has determined that review would not be in the best interests of the child and neither parent has requested a review. This provision applies to child support orders in cases in which benefits under the TANF, foster care, or Medicaid Programs are currently being provided, but does not include orders for former TANF, foster care, or Medicaid cases, even if the State retains an assignment of support rights for arrearages that accumulated during the time the family was on welfare. In child support cases in which there is no current assignment of support rights to the State, review is required at least once every 36 months only if a parent requests it. If the review indicates that ad-

justment of the support amount is appropriate, the State must proceed to adjust the award accordingly.

The Family Support Act also required States to notify parents in cases being enforced by the State of their right to request a review, of their right to be informed of the forthcoming review at least 30 days before the review begins, and of any proposed adjustment or determination that there should be no change in the award amount. In the latter case, the parent must be given at least 30 days after notification to initiate proceedings to challenge the proposed adjustment or determination.

The 1996 welfare reform law somewhat revised the review and modification requirements. The mandatory 3-year review of child support orders is slightly modified to permit States some flexibility in determining which reviews of welfare cases should be pursued and in choosing methods of review. States must review orders every 3 years (or more often at State option) if either parent or the State requests a review in welfare cases or if either parent requests a review in nonwelfare cases. States must notify parents of their review and adjustment rights at least once every 3 years. States can use one of three different methods for adjusting orders: (1) the child support guidelines (i.e., current law); (2) an inflation adjustment in accordance with a formula developed by the State; or (3) an automated method to identify orders eligible for review followed by an appropriate adjustment to the order, not to exceed any threshold amount determined by the State. If either an inflation adjustment or an automated method is used, the State must allow either parent to contest the adjustment.

Especially during the early 1980s, a major issue in the modification of awards was the practice of retroactive modifications. The vast majority of such retroactive modifications had the effect of reducing the amount of child support ordered. Thus, for example, an order for $200 a month for child support, which was unpaid for 36 months, should accumulate an arrearage of $7,200. Yet, if the obligor was brought to court, having made no prior attempt to modify the order, the order might be reduced to $100 a month retroactive to 36 months prior to the date of modification. This retroactive modification would reduce the arrearage from $7,200 to $3,600. Cases such as this, which had serious impacts on custodial parents and their children, convinced Congress to take action.

Thus, in 1986 Congress enacted section 9103 of Public Law 99–509 (section 466(a)(9) of the Social Security Act) to change State practices involving modification of child support arrears. The provision required States to change their laws so that any payment of child support, on and after the date due, is a "judgment" (the official decision or finding of a court on the respective rights and claims of the parties to an action) by operation of law. The provision also requires that the judgment be entitled to full faith and credit in the originating State and in any other State. Full faith and credit is a constitutional principle that the various States must recognize the judgments of other States within the United States and accord them the force and effect they would have in their home State.

The 1986 provision also greatly restricts retroactive modification to make it more difficult for courts and administrative entities to

forgive or reduce arrearages. More specifically, orders can be retroactively modified only for a period during which there is pending a petition for modification and only from the date that notice of the petition has been given to the custodial or noncustodial parent.

PROMOTING MEDICAL SUPPORT

Section 16 of Public Law 98–378, enacted in 1984, requires the Secretary of DHHS to issue regulations to require that State child support agencies petition for the inclusion of medical support as part of any child support order whenever health care coverage is available to the noncustodial parent at reasonable cost. According to Federal regulations, any employment-related or other group coverage is considered reasonable, under the assumption that health insurance is inexpensive to the employee/noncustodial parent. A 1993 study by Cooper and Johnson that analyzed 1987 data from the Center for Health Expenditures and Insurance Studies indicated that for workers with income below the poverty line and employer-provided family health insurance coverage, 77 percent of the premium was paid for by the employer.

On October 16, 1985, the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) published regulations amending previous regulations and implementing section 16 of Public Law 98–378. The regulations require State child support agencies to obtain basic medical support information and provide this information to the State Medicaid agency. The purpose of medical support enforcement is to expand the number of children for whom private health insurance coverage is obtained by increasing the availability of third party resources to pay for medical care and thereby reduce Medicaid costs for both the States and the Federal Government. If the custodial parent does not have satisfactory health insurance coverage, the child support agency must petition the court or administrative authority to include medical support in new or modified support orders and inform the State Medicaid agency of any new or modified support orders that include a medical support obligation. The regulations also require child support agencies to enforce medical support that has been ordered by a court or administrative process. States receive child support matching funds at the 66-percent rate for required medical support activities. Before these regulations were issued, medical support activities were pursued by child support agencies only under optional cooperative agreements with Medicaid agencies.

Some of the functions that the child support agency may perform under a cooperative agreement with the Medicaid agency include: receiving referrals from the Medicaid agency, locating noncustodial parents, establishing paternity, determining whether the noncustodial parent has a health insurance policy or plan that covers the child, obtaining sufficient information about the health insurance policy or plan to permit the filing of a claim with the insurer, filing a claim with the insurer or transmitting the necessary information to the Medicaid agency, securing health insurance coverage through court or administrative order, and recovering amounts necessary to reimburse medical assistance payments.

On September 16, 1988, OCSE issued regulations expanding the medical support enforcement provisions. These regulations require

the child support agency to develop criteria to identify existing child support cases that have a high potential for obtaining medical support, and to petition the court or administrative authority to modify support orders to include medical support for these cases even if no other modification is anticipated. The child support agency also is required to provide the custodial parent with information regarding the health insurance coverage obtained by the noncustodial parent for the child. Moreover, the regulation deletes the condition that child support agencies may secure health insurance coverage under a cooperative agreement only when it will not reduce the noncustodial parent's ability to pay child support.

Before late 1993, employees covered under their employer's health care plans generally could provide coverage to children only if the children lived with the employee. However, as a result of divorce proceedings, employees often lost custody of their children but were nonetheless required to provide their health care coverage. While the employee would be obliged to follow the court's directive, the employer that sponsored the employee's health care plan was under no similar obligation. Even if the court ordered the employer to continue health care coverage for the nonresident child of their employee, the employer would be under no legal obligation to do so (Shulman, 1994, pp. 1–2). Aware of this situation, Congress took the following legislative action in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993:

1. Insurers were prohibited from denying enrollment of a child under the health insurance coverage of the child's parent on the grounds that the child was born out of wedlock, is not claimed as a dependent on the parent's Federal income tax return, or does not reside with the parent or in the insurer's service area;
2. Insurers and employers were required, in any case in which a parent is required by court order to provide health coverage for a child and the child is otherwise eligible for family health coverage through the insurer: (a) to permit the parent, without regard to any enrollment season restrictions, to enroll the child under such family coverage; (b) if the parent fails to provide health insurance coverage for a child, to enroll the child upon application by the child's other parent or the State child support or Medicaid agency; and (c) with respect to employers, not to disenroll the child unless there is satisfactory written evidence that the order is no longer in effect or the child is or will be enrolled in comparable health coverage through another insurer that will take effect not later than the effective date of the disenrollment;
3. Employers doing business in the State, if they offer health insurance and if a court order is in effect, were required to withhold from the employee's compensation the employee's share of premiums for health insurance and to pay that share to the insurer. The Secretary of DHHS may provide by regulation for such exceptions to this requirement (and other requirements described above that apply to employers) as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with an order, or with the limits on withholding that are specified in section 303(b) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act;

4. Insurers were prohibited from imposing requirements on a State agency acting as an agent or assignee of an individual eligible for medical assistance that are different from requirements applicable to an agent or assignee of any other individual;
5. Insurers were required, in the case of a child who has coverage through the insurer of a noncustodial parent to: (a) provide the custodial parent with the information necessary for the child to obtain benefits; (b) permit the custodial parent (or provider, with the custodial parent's approval) to submit claims for covered services without the approval of the noncustodial parent; and (c) make payment on claims directly to the custodial parent, the provider, or the State agency; and
6. The State Medicaid agency was permitted to garnish the wages, salary, or other employment income of, and to withhold State tax refunds to, any person who: (a) is required by court or administrative order to provide health insurance coverage to an individual eligible for Medicaid; (b) has received payment from a third party for the costs of medical services to that individual; and (c) has not reimbursed either the individual or the provider. The amount subject to garnishment or withholding is the amount required to reimburse the State agency for expenditures for costs of medical services provided under the Medicaid Program. Claims for current or past due child support take priority over any claims for the costs of medical services.

These provisions appear to be having an impact on the number of children in single-parent families with medical coverage. According to OCSE data, 61 percent of support orders established in fiscal year 1997 included health insurance, up from 46 percent in fiscal year 1991 but down somewhat from 67 percent in fiscal year 1996. Nevertheless, only 39 percent of support orders enforced or modified in fiscal year 1997 included health insurance, up only slightly from 35 percent in 1991. These figures indicate that many children still lack coverage. One way to increase medical support may be to require withholding of health insurance premiums in all cases with medical support orders (Gordon, 1994).

Under the 1996 welfare reform legislation, the definition of "medical child support order" in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) was expanded to clarify that any judgment, decree, or order that is issued by a court or by an administrative process has the force and effect of law. In addition, the new law stipulates that all orders enforced by the State CSE agency must include a provision for health care coverage. If the noncustodial parent changes jobs and the new employer provides health coverage, the State must send notice of coverage to the new employer; the notice must serve to enroll the child in the health plan of the new employer.

Public Law 105–200, enacted in 1998, provides for a uniform manner for States to inform employers about their need to enroll the children of noncustodial parents in employer-sponsored health plans. It requires the CSE agency to use a standardized national medical support notice (developed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Department of Labor) to communicate to employers the issuance of a medical support

order. Employers are required to accept the form as a "qualified medical support order" under ERISA.

COLLECTING CHILD SUPPORT

Local courts and child support enforcement agencies attempt to collect child support when the noncustodial parent does not pay. The most important collection method is wage withholding. Other techniques for enforcing payments include regular billings; delinquency notices; liens on property; offset of unemployment compensation payments; seizure and sale of property; reporting arrearages to credit agencies; garnishment of wages; seizure of State and Federal income tax refunds; revocation of various types of licenses (drivers', business, occupational, recreational) to persons who are delinquent in their child support payments; attachment of lottery winnings and insurance settlements of debtor parents; and Federal imprisonment, fines or both.

In addition to approaches authorized by the Federal Government through the child support program, States use a variety of other collection techniques. In fact, States have been at the forefront in implementing innovative approaches. Some States hire private collection agencies to collect child support payments. Some States bring charges of criminal nonsupport or civil or criminal contempt of court against noncustodial parents who fail to pay child support. These court proceedings are usually lengthy because of court backlogs, delays, and continuances. Once a court decides the case, noncustodial parents are often given probation or suspended sentences, and occasionally they are even awarded lower support payments and partial payment of arrearages. To combat problems associated with court delays, the child support statute requires States to implement expedited processes under the State judicial system or State administrative processes for obtaining and enforcing support orders.

Given the pivotal role of collections in the child support process, this section now turns to detailed discussion of the most effective collections procedures. Summary data on the effectiveness of four top collection methods are presented in table 8–3.

Wage withholding

The Family Support Act of 1988 greatly expanded wage withholding by requiring immediate withholding to begin in November 1990 for all new or modified orders being enforced by States. Equally important, States were required, with some exceptions, to implement immediate wage withholding in all support orders initially issued on or after January 1, 1994, regardless of whether a parent has applied for child support services.

TABLE 8–3.—CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS MADE BY VARIOUS ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUES, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1989–98

[In millions of dollars]

Enforcement technique	Child support collections						Percent of total collections					
	1989	1991	1995	1996	1997	1998	1989	1991	1995	1996	1997	1998
Wage withholding	$2,144	$3,266	$6,111	$6,731	$7,472	$8,003	40.9	47.4	56.9	56.0	55.9	55.8
Federal income tax offset	411	476	734	906	1,015	1,026	7.9	6.9	6.8	7.5	7.6	7.2
State income tax offset	62	72	97	112	120	136	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Unemployment compensation intercept	54	143	187	211	207	204	1.0	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.4
Other [1]	2,570	2,929	3,624	4,059	4,549	4,978	49.0	42.6	33.7	33.8	34.0	34.7
Total collections	5,241	6,886	10,753	12,019	13,363	14,347	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] The Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) does not designate the source of most of these collections. According to the OCSE, the majority of collections in the ''other'' category came from noncustodial parents who were complying with their support orders by sending their payments to the child support agency. OCSE officials maintain that reliability of collection data lessen when specified by techniques of collection.

Note.—Data is preliminary for fiscal year 1998.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The child support amendments of 1984 also required that States have in effect two distinct procedures for withholding wages of noncustodial parents. First, for existing cases enforced through the child support agency, States were required to impose wage withholding whenever an arrearage accrued that was equal to the amount of support payable for 1 month. Second, for all child support cases, all new or modified orders were required to include a provision for wage withholding when an arrearage occurs. The intent of the second procedure was to ensure that orders not enforced through the child support agency contain the authority necessary to permit wage withholding to be initiated by someone other than the child support agency if and when an arrearage occurs.

According to the Federal statute, State due process requirements govern the scope of notice that must be provided to an obligor (i.e., noncustodial parent) when withholding is triggered. As a general rule, the noncustodial parent is entitled to advance notice of the withholding procedure. This notice, where required, must inform the noncustodial parent of the following: the amount that will be withheld; the application of withholding to any current or subsequent period of employment; the procedures available for contesting the withholding and the sole basis for objection (i.e., mistake of fact); the period allotted to contest the withholding and the result of failure to contact the State within this timeframe (i.e., issuance of notification to the employer to begin withholding); and the steps the State will take if the noncustodial parent contests the withholding, including the procedure to resolve such contests.

If the noncustodial parent contests the withholding notice, the State must conduct a hearing, determine if the withholding is valid, notify the noncustodial parent of the decision, and notify the employer to commence the deductions if withholding is upheld. All of this must occur within 45 days of the initial notice of withholding. Whether a State uses a judicial or an administrative process, the only basis for a hearing is a factual mistake about the amount owed (current, arrearage or both) or the identity of the noncustodial parent.

When withholding is uncontested or when a contested case is resolved in favor of withholding, the administering agency must serve a withholding notice on the employer. The employer is required to withhold as much of the noncustodial parent's wages as is necessary to comply with the order, including the current support amount plus an amount to be applied toward liquidation of any arrearage. In addition, the employer may retain a fee to offset the administrative cost of implementing withholding. Employer fees per wage withholding transaction range from nothing to $3 per pay period to $5 per attachment to $10 per month (Office of Child Support, 1986, p. 7).

The Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act limits garnishment to 50 percent of disposable earnings for a noncustodial parent who is the head of a household, and 60 percent for a noncustodial parent who is not supporting a second family. These percentages increase by 5 percentage points, to 55 and 65 percent respectively, when the arrearages represent support that was due more than 12 weeks before the current pay period.

Upon receiving a withholding notice, the employer must begin withholding the appropriate amount of the obligor's wages no later than the first pay period that occurs after 14 days following the date the notice was mailed. The 1984 amendments regulate the language in State statutes on the other rights and liabilities of the employer. For instance, the employer is subject to a fine for discharging a noncustodial parent or taking other forms of retaliation as a result of a withholding order. In addition, the employer is held liable for amounts not withheld as directed.

In addition to being able to charge the noncustodial parent a fee for the administrative costs associated with wage withholding, the employer can combine all support payments required to be withheld for multiple obligors into a single payment and forward it to the child support agency or court with a list of the cases to which the payments apply. The employer need not vary from the normal pay and disbursement cycle to comply with withholding orders; however, support payments must be forwarded to the State or other designated agency within 10 days of the date on which the noncustodial parent is paid.

When the noncustodial parent changes jobs, the previous employer must notify the court or agency that entered the withholding order. The State must then notify the new employer or income source to begin withholding from the obligor's wages. In addition, States must develop procedures to terminate income withholding orders when all of the children are emancipated and no arrearage exists.

Federal law provides three exceptions to the income withholding rule: (1) if one of the parents demonstrates, and the court (or administrative process) finds, that there is good cause not to require immediate income withholding, (2) if both parents agree in writing to an alternative payment arrangement, or (3) at the DHHS Secretary's discretion, if a State can demonstrate that the rule will not increase the effectiveness or efficiency of the State's CSE Program. For income withholding purposes, "income" means any periodic form of payment due an individual, regardless of source, including wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, workers' compensation, disability, payments from a pension or retirement program, and interest.

As shown in table 8–3, the congressional emphasis on wage withholding has paid off handsomely. Although the total amount of support collected through wage withholding increased each year, reaching $8.0 billion in 1998, the percentage of total collections achieved through wage withholding appears to have leveled off at about 56 percent.

Federal income tax refund offset

Under this program, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), operating on request from a State filed through the Secretary of DHHS, simply intercepts tax returns and deducts the amount of certified child support arrearages. The money is then sent to the State for distribution. The availability of the IRS collection mechanism for child support was strengthened by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97–35). IRS can now withhold past due support from Federal tax refunds upon a simple showing by

the State that an individual owes at least $150 in past due support which has been assigned to the State as a condition of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) eligibility. The withheld amount is sent to the State agency, together with notice of the taxpayer's current address.

The 1984 amendments created a similar IRS Offset Program for non-AFDC families owed child support. States must submit to the IRS for withholding the names of absent parents who have arrearages of at least $500 and who, on the basis of current payment patterns and the enforcement efforts that have been made, are unlikely to pay the arrearage before the IRS offset can occur. The law establishes specific notice requirements and mandates that the noncustodial parent and his spouse (if any) be informed of the impending use of the tax offset procedure. The purpose of this notice is to protect the unobligated spouse's portion of the tax refund. The 1988 provision applied to refunds payable after December 31, 1985, and before January 1, 1991. Public Law 101–508, enacted in 1990, makes permanent the IRS Offset Program for non-AFDC families.

In tax year 1998, according to DHHS, more than 1.4 million cases were offset. The total amount intercepted was about $1.3 billion, up by a factor of well over four since 1986 ($308 million). In tax year 1998, the average collection for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) families was $923; the average collection for non-TANF families was $952.

State income tax refund offset

The child support amendments of 1984 mandate that States increase the effectiveness of the child support program by, among other things, enacting several collection procedures. Among the required procedures is the interception of State income tax refunds payable to noncustodial parents up to the amount of overdue support. As in the case of liens and bonds, this procedure need not be used in cases found inappropriate under State guidelines.

In order for the State tax refund offset to work effectively, cooperation between the State's department of revenue and the child support agency is crucial. The names and Social Security numbers (SSNs) of delinquent noncustodial parents are submitted to the department of revenue for matching with tax return forms. If a match occurs and a refund is due, the refund or a portion of it is transferred from the State department of revenue to the child support agency and then credited to the appropriate noncustodial parent to offset his support debt. The child support agency must give advance notice of the impending offset to the noncustodial parent and must also inform him of the process for contesting and resolving the proposed action. If the custodial parent does not respond to the notice, the money is intercepted and forwarded to the child support agency for distribution.

In fiscal year 1998, the State Tax Intercept Program collected $136 million (table 8–3). Unlike the Federal program, which requires that States certify a specified amount before the offset can be applied ($150 for TANF families and $500 for non-TANF families), States choose their own level for certification. In many States, the amount is the same for both TANF and non-TANF families. Al-

though the amounts vary greatly from State to State, the amount in the typical State is about $100.

Unemployment compensation intercept

Public Law 97–35, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, requires State child support agencies to determine on a periodic basis whether individuals receiving unemployment compensation owe support obligations that are not being met. The act also requires child support agencies to enforce support obligations in accord with State-developed guidelines for obtaining an agreement with the individual to have a specified amount of support withheld from unemployment compensation or, in the absence of an agreement, for bringing legal proceedings to require the withholding. The child support agency must reimburse the State employment security agency for the administrative costs attributable to withholding unemployment compensation.

The unemployment compensation intercept collected $204 million in fiscal year 1998 (table 8–3). A number of States, especially those with high levels of unemployment, are finding that the unemployment offset procedure can raise collections significantly.

Property liens

A lien is a legal claim on someone's property as security against a just debt. The use of liens for child support enforcement was characterized during congressional debate on the child support amendments of 1984 as "simple to execute and cost effective and a catalyst for an absent parent to pay past due support in order to clear title to the property in question" (U.S. House, 1983). The House report also stated that liens would complement the income withholding provisions of the 1984 law and be particularly helpful in enforcing support payments owed by noncustodial parents with substantial assets or income but who are not salaried employees.

The 1984 legislation required States to enact laws and implement "procedures under which liens are imposed against real property for amount of overdue support owed by an absent parent who resides or owns property in the State." Liens can apply to property such as land, vehicles, houses, antique furniture, and livestock. The law provides, however, that States need not use liens in cases in which, on the basis of guidelines that generally are available to the public, they determine that lien procedures would be inappropriate. This provision implicitly requires States to develop guidelines about use of liens.

Generally, a lien for delinquent child support is a statutorily created mechanism by which an obligee obtains a nonpossessory interest in property belonging to the noncustodial parent. The interest of the custodial parent is a slumbering interest that allows the noncustodial parent to retain possession of the property, but affects the noncustodial parent's ability to sell the property or transfer ownership to anyone else. A child support lien converts the custodial parent from an unsecured to a secured creditor. As such, it gives the custodial parent priority over unsecured creditors and subsequent secured creditors. In some States a lien is established automatically upon entry of a support order and the first incidence of noncompliance by the obligor. Frequently, the mere imposition

of a lien will motivate the delinquent parent to pay past-due support to remove the lien. When this is not the case, it may become necessary to enforce the lien. Liens are not self-executory. If a lien exists, a debtor must satisfy the judgment before the property may be sold or transferred. However, it is not necessary for the obligee to wait until the obligor tries to transfer the property before taking action. The obligee may enforce her judgment by execution and levy against the property if she believes the amount of equity in the property justifies execution.

A procedure developed by the IRS, known as Project 1099 (that is, the number of the IRS form used), has helped several States increase their use of liens by identifying individuals who possess appropriate assets. Initiated in 1984 to assist in location efforts, since the fall of 1988 Project 1099 has routinely provided wage and employer information as well as location and asset information on noncustodial parents.

The welfare reform legislation passed in 1996 (Public Law 104–193) requires States to have procedures under which liens arise by operation of law against property for the amount of the past-due support. States must grant full faith and credit to liens of other States if the originating State agency or party has complied with procedural rules relating to the recording or serving of lien.

Bonds, securities, and other guarantees

The 1984 child support amendments require States to have in effect and use procedures under which noncustodial parents must post security, bond, or some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue child support. This technique is useful where significant assets exist although the noncustodial parent's income is sporadic, seasonal, or derived from self-employment. As in the case of liens, this procedure need not be used in cases found inappropriate under State guidelines. The State guidelines should define and target assets that can appropriately be sought to secure or guarantee payment without hindering the noncustodial parent from effectively pursuing his livelihood.

IRS full collection process

Since 1975, Congress has authorized the IRS to collect certain child support arrearages as if they were delinquent Federal taxes. This method is known as the IRS full collection process. It works as follows. The Secretary of DHHS must, upon the request of a State, certify to the Secretary of Treasury any amounts identified by the State as delinquent child support. The Secretary of DHHS may certify only the amounts delinquent under a court or administrative order, and only upon a showing by the State that it has made diligent and reasonable efforts to collect amounts due using its own collection mechanisms. States must reimburse the Federal Government for any costs involved in making the collections. This full collection process is used only when there is a good chance that the IRS can make a collection and only for cases in which a child support obligation is delinquent and the amount owed has been certified to be at least $750. Use by the States of this regular IRS collection mechanism, which may include seizure of property, freezing of accounts, and use of other aggressive procedures, has been

relatively infrequent. In fiscal year 1995, collections were made in 463 cases nationwide, for a total collection of $1,153,473.

Withholding of passports and various types of licenses

The 1996 welfare reform law required States to implement procedures under which the State would have authority to withhold, suspend, or restrict use of driver's licenses, professional and occupational licenses, and recreational and sporting licenses of persons who owe past-due support or who fail to comply with subpoenas or warrants relating to paternity or child support proceedings. The law also authorized the Secretary of State to deny, revoke, or restrict passports of debtor parents whose child support arrearages exceed $5,000. According to DHHS, the passport denial program has collected more than $2.25 million in lump sum child support payments and is currently denying 30 to 40 passports daily to delinquent noncustodial parents.

Credit bureau reporting

The 1984 Federal child support legislation required States to develop procedures for providing child support debt information to credit reporting agencies (sometimes referred to as credit bureaus). The primary purposes for reporting delinquent child support payers to credit reporting agencies are to discourage noncustodial parents from not making their child support payments, to prevent the undeserved extension of credit, and to maintain the noncustodial parent's ability to pay his child support obligation. Other benefits include access by child support agencies to address, employment, and asset information.

The 1984 amendments require States to report overdue child support obligations exceeding $1,000 to consumer reporting agencies if such information is requested by the credit bureau. States have the option of reporting in cases in which the noncustodial parent is less than $1,000 in arrears. States must provide noncustodial parents with advance notice of intent to release information on their child support arrearage and an opportunity for them to contest the accuracy of the information. The child support agency may charge the credit bureau a fee for the information.

Public Law 102–537, the Ted Weiss Child Support Enforcement Act of 1992, amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require consumer credit reporting agencies to include in any consumer report information on child support delinquencies. The information is provided by or verified by State or local child support agencies. Public Law 103–432, enacted in October 1994, includes a provision that requires States to periodically report to consumer reporting agencies the name of parents owing at least 2 months of overdue child support, and the amount of the child support overdue.

In order to facilitate the access of child support officials to credit information, the 1996 welfare reform legislation states that in response to a request by the head of a State or local CSE agency or other authorized official; consumer credit agencies must release information if the person making the request makes all of the following certifications: that the consumer report is needed to establish and individual's capacity to make child support payments or determine the level of payments; that paternity has been established or

acknowledged; that the consumer has been given at least 10 days notice by certified or registered mail that the report is being requested; and that the consumer report will be kept confidential, will be used solely for child support purposes, and will not be used in connection with any other civil, administrative, or criminal proceeding or for any other purpose. Consumer reporting agencies also must give reports to a CSE agency for use in setting an initial or modified award. These provisions amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

The 1996 law also requires States to periodically report to consumer reporting agencies the name of any noncustodial parent who is delinquent in the payment of support and the amount of past-due support owed by the parent. Before such a report can be sent, the obligor must have been afforded all due process rights, including notice and reasonable opportunity to contest the claim of child support delinquency.

Enforcement against Federal employees

The 1975 child support legislation included a provision allowing garnishment of wages and other payments by the Federal Government for enforcement of child support and alimony obligations. The law also provided that moneys payable by the United States to any individual for employment are subject to legal proceedings brought for the enforcement of child support or alimony. The law sets forth in detail the procedures that must be followed for service of legal process and specifies that the term "based upon remuneration for employment" includes wages, periodic benefits for the payment of pensions, retirement pay including Social Security, and other kinds of Federal payments.

The 1996 welfare reform law substantially revised child support enforcement for Federal employees, including retirees and military personnel. As under prior law, Federal employees are subject to income withholding and other actions taken against them by State CSE agencies. However, every Federal agency is responsible for responding to a State CSE Program as if the Federal agency were a private business. The head of each Federal agency must designate an agent, whose name and address must be published annually in the Federal Register, to be responsible for handling child support cases. The agency must respond to withholding notices and other matters brought to its attention by CSE officials. Child support claims are given priority in the allocation of Federal employee income.

Enforcement against military personnel

Child support enforcement workers face unique difficulties when working on cases in which the absent parent is an active duty member of the military service. Learning to work through military channels can prove both challenging and frustrating, especially if the child support agency is not near a military base. As a result, military cases are often ignored or not given sufficient attention (Office of Child Support, 1991).

Public Law 97–248, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, requires allotments from the pay and allowances of any active duty member of the uniformed service who fails to make child

or spousal support payments. This requirement arises when the service member fails to make support payments in an amount at least equal to the value of 2 months' worth of support. Provisions of the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act apply, limiting the percentage of the member's pay that is subject to allotment. The amount of the allotment is the amount of the support payment, as established under a legally enforceable administrative or judicial order.

Since October 1, 1995, the Department of Defense has consolidated its garnishment operations at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service in Cleveland, Ohio. Support orders received by the Service are processed immediately and notices are sent to the appropriate military pay center to start payments in the first pay cycle (Office of Child Support, 1995c).

As a result of the 1996 welfare reform law, the Secretary of Defense must establish a central personnel locator service, which must be updated on a regular basis, that permits location of every member of the Armed Services. The Secretary of each branch of the military service must grant leave to facilitate attendance at child support hearings and other child support proceedings. The Secretary of each branch also must withhold support from retirement pay and forward it to State disbursement units.

Small business loans

The 103d Congress passed legislation, the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–403), which included the requirement that recipients of financial assistance from the Small Business Administration, including direct loans and loan guarantees, must certify that the recipient is not more than 60 days delinquent in the payment of child support.

Other provisions

On February 27, 1995, President Clinton signed an Executive order establishing the executive branch of the Federal Government, including its civilian employees and the uniformed services members, as a model employer in promoting and facilitating the establishment and enforcement of child support. The Executive order states that the Federal Government is the Nation's largest single employer and as such should set an example of leadership and encouragement in ensuring that all children are properly supported. Among other measures, the order requires the Federal agencies and the uniformed services to cooperate fully in efforts to establish paternity and child support orders and to enforce the collection of child and medical support. The order also requires Federal agencies to provide information to their personnel concerning the services that are available to them and to ensure that their children are provided the support to which they are legally entitled (Office of Child Support, 1995b).

The 1996 welfare reform law requires States to implement expedited procedures that allow them to secure assets to satisfy arrearages by intercepting or seizing periodic or lump sum payments (such as unemployment and workers' compensation), lottery winnings, awards, judgments, or settlements. States must also

have expedited procedures that allow them to seize assets of the debtor parent held by public or private retirement funds and financial institutions.

INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT

The most difficult child support orders to enforce are interstate cases. States are required to cooperate in interstate child support enforcement, but problems arise from the autonomy of local courts. Family law has traditionally been under the jurisdiction of State and local governments, and citizens fall under the jurisdiction of the courts where they live.

During the 1930s and 1940s, such laws were used to establish and enforce support obligations when the noncustodial parent, custodial parent, and child lived in the same State. But when noncustodial parents lived out of State, enforcing child support was cumbersome and ineffective. Often the only option in these cases was to extradite the noncustodial parent and, when successful, to jail the person for nonsupport. This procedure, rarely used, generally punished the irresponsible parent, but left the abandoned family without financial support.

A University of Michigan study (Hill, 1988) of separated parents found that 12 percent lived in different States 1 year after divorce or separation. That proportion increased to 25 percent after 3 years, and to 40 percent after 8 years. Estimates based on the Federal income tax refund offset and other sources suggest that approximately 30 percent of all child support cases involve interstate residency of the custodial and noncustodial parents (Weaver & Williams, 1989, p. 510). According to U.S. Census Bureau (1991) data, 20 percent of noncustodial parents lived in a different State than their children, 3 percent lived overseas, and the residence of 11 percent of the noncustodial parents was unknown.

Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESA)

Starting in 1950, interstate cooperation was promoted through the adoption by the States of URESA. This act, which was first proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1950, has been enacted in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The act was amended in 1952 and 1958 and revised in 1968. Thus, even though every State has passed some provisions of URESA, many provisions vary from State to State. URESA, in short, is uniform in name only.

The purpose of URESA was to provide a system for the interstate enforcement of support orders without requiring the person seeking support to go (or have her legal representative go) to the State in which the noncustodial parent resided. Where the URESA provisions between the two States are compatible, the law can be used to establish paternity, locate an absent parent, and establish, modify, or enforce a support order across State lines. However, some observers note that the use of URESA procedures often resulted in lower orders for both current support and arrearages. They also contend that few child support agencies attempted to use URESA procedures to establish paternity or to obtain a modification in a support order.

Long arm statutes

Unlike URESA, interstate cases established or enforced by long arm statutes use the court system in the State of the custodial parent rather than that of the noncustodial parent. When a person commits certain acts in a State of which he is not a resident, that person may be subjecting himself to the jurisdiction of that State. The long arm of the law of the State where the event occurs may reach out to grab the out-of-State person so that issues relating to the event may be resolved where it happened. Under the long arm procedure, the State must authorize by statute that the acts allegedly committed by the defendant are those that subject the defendant to the State's jurisdiction. An example is a paternity statute stating that if conception takes place in the State and the child lives in the State, the State may exercise jurisdiction over the alleged father even if he lives in another State. Long arm statute language usually extends the State's jurisdiction over an out-of-State defendant to the maximum extent permitted by the U.S. Constitution under the 14th amendment's due process clause. Long arm statutes may be used to establish paternity, establish support awards, and enforce support orders.

Federal courts

The 1975 child support law mandated that the State plan for child support require States to cooperate with other States in establishing paternity, locating absent parents, and securing compliance with court orders. Further, it authorized the use of Federal courts as a last resort to enforce an existing order in another State if that State were uncooperative.

Section 460 of the Social Security Act provides that the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to any amount in controversy, to hear and determine any civil action certified by the Secretary of DHHS under section 452(a)(8) of the act. A civil action under section 460 may be brought in any judicial district in which the claim arose, the plaintiff resides, or the defendant resides. Section 452(a)(8) states that the Secretary of DHHS shall receive applications from States for permission to use the courts of the United States to enforce court orders for support against noncustodial parents. The Secretary must approve applications if she finds both that a given State has not enforced a court order of another State within a reasonable time and that using the Federal courts is the only reasonable method of enforcing the order.

As a condition of obtaining certification from the Secretary, the child support agency of the initiating State must give the child support agency of the responding State at least 60 days to enforce the order as well as a 30-day warning of its intent to seek enforcement in Federal court. If the initiating State receives no response within the 30-day limit, or if the response is unsatisfactory, the initiating State may apply to the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) Regional Office for certification. The application must attest that all the requirements outlined above have been satisfied. Upon certification of the case, a civil action may be filed in the U.S. district court. Although this interstate enforcement procedure has been available since enactment of the child support program in 1975, there has only been one reported case of its use by a State

(the initiating State was California; the responding State was Texas).

Interstate income withholding

Interstate income withholding is a process by which the State of the custodial parent seeks the help of the State in which the noncustodial parent's income is earned to enforce a support order using the income withholding mechanism. Pursuant to the child support amendments of 1984, income withholding was authorized for all valid instate or out-of-State orders issued or modified after October 1, 1985, and for all orders being enforced by the IV–D program, regardless of the date the order was issued. Although Federal law requires a State to enforce another State's valid orders through interstate withholding, there is no Federal mandate that interstate income withholding procedures be uniform. Approaches vary from the Model Interstate Income Withholding Act to URESA registration. The preferred way to handle an interstate income withholding request is to use the interstate action transmittal form from one child support agency to another. In child support enforcement cases, Federal regulations required that by August 22, 1988, all interstate income withholding requests be sent to the enforcing State's central registry for referral to the appropriate State or local official. The actual wage withholding procedure used by the State in which the noncustodial parent lives is the same as that used in intrastate cases. In a 1992 report (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992a, p. 4 & pp. 21–28), GAO indicated that the main reason for the failure of interstate income withholding was the lack of uniformity in its implementation.

The 1996 welfare law required the DHHS Secretary, in consultation with State CSE directors, to issue forms by October 1, 1996 that States must use for income withholding, for imposing liens, and for issuing administrative subpoenas in interstate cases. States were required to begin using the forms by March 1, 1997.

Full faith and credit

One of the most significant barriers to improved interstate collections is that, because a child support order is not considered a final judgment, the full faith and credit clause of the U.S. Constitution does not preclude modification. Thus, the order is subject to modification upon a showing of changed circumstances by the issuing court or by another court with jurisdiction. Congress could prohibit inter- or intrastate modifications of child support orders, but many students of child support hold that a complete ban on modifications would be unrealistic and unfair. A more likely approach would be one under which States were required to give full faith and credit to each other's child support orders under most circumstances.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, Public Law 99–509, took a step in this direction by requiring States to treat past due support obligations as final judgments entitled to full faith and credit in every State. Thus, a person who has a support order in one State does not have to obtain a second order in another State to obtain the money due should the debtor parent move from the issuing court's jurisdiction. The second State can modify the order prospectively if it finds that circumstances exist to justify a change,

but the second State may not retroactively modify a child support order.

Public Law 103–383, the Full Faith and Credit for Child Support Orders Act of 1994, restricts a State court's ability to modify a child support order issued by another State unless the child and the custodial parent have moved to the State where the modification is sought or have agreed to the modification.

The full faith and credit rules of the 1996 welfare reform law clarify the definition of a child's home State, make several revisions to ensure that the rules can be applied consistently with the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), and clarify the rules regarding which child support order States must honor when there is more than one order.

Federal criminal penalties

The Child Support Recovery Act of 1992 imposed a Federal criminal penalty for the willful failure to pay a past due child support obligation to a child who resides in another State and that has remained unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than $5,000. For the first conviction, the penalty is a fine of up to $5,000, imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both; for a second conviction, the penalty is a fine of not more than $250,000, imprisonment for up to 2 years, or both.

In response to concerns of law enforcement officials and prosecutors that the 1992 law did not adequately address more serious instances of nonpayment of child support obligations, Congress passed the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–187). The law establishes two new categories of felony offenses, subject to a 2-year maximum prison term. The offenses are: (1) traveling in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation if the obligation has remained unpaid for more than 1 year or is greater than $5,000; and (2) willfully failing to pay a child support obligation regarding a child residing in another State if the obligation has remained unpaid for more than 2 years or is greater than $10,000. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the administration's criminal child support enforcement initiative, "Project Save Our Children," has investigated 800 cases resulting in 275 arrests, 210 convictions, and the payment of $5.3 million in past-due child support payments. The initiative is conducted by officials from the DHHS Office of Inspector General, the OCSE, the Department of Justice, State CSE agencies, and local law enforcement organizations working together to pursue chronic delinquent parents who owe large sums of child support.

Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA)

UIFSA was drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and approved by the Commissioners in August 1992. It is designed to deal with desertion and nonsupport by instituting uniform laws in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. The core of UIFSA is limiting control of a child support case to a single State, thereby ensuring that only one child support order from one court or child support agency is in effect at any given time. It follows that the controlling State will be able to effec-

tively pursue interstate cases, primarily through the use of long arm statutes, because its jurisdiction is undisputed. Many, perhaps most, child support officials believe UIFSA will help eliminate jurisdictional disputes between States and lead to substantial increases in interstate collections.

UIFSA allows: (1) direct income withholding by the controlling State without second State involvement; (2) administrative enforcement without registration; and (3) registered enforcement based on the substantive laws of the controlling State and the procedural laws of the registering State. The order cannot be adjusted if only enforcement is requested, and enforcement may begin upon registration (before notice and hearing) if the receiving State's due process rules allow such enforcement. The controlling State may adjust the support order under its own standards. In addition, UIFSA includes some uniform evidentiary rules to make interstate case handling easier, such as using telephonic hearings, easing admissibility of evidence requirements, and admitting petitions into evidence without the need for live or corroborative testimony to make a prima facie case.

The 1996 welfare reform law required all States to enact UIFSA, including all amendments, before January 1, 1998. States are not required to use UIFSA in all cases if they determine that using other interstate procedures would be more effective. As of February 1998, all States and jurisdictions had adopted UIFSA, except Guam, Kentucky, New Jersey, and the Virgin Islands.

Other procedures that aid interstate enforcement

In 1948, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the American Bar Association approved the Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act (UEFJA), which simplifies the collection of child support arrearages in interstate cases. Revised in 1964 and adopted in only 30 States, UEFJA provides that upon the filing of an authenticated foreign (i.e., out-of-State) judgment and notice to the obligor, the judgment is to be treated in the same manner as a local one. A judgment is the official decision or finding of a court on the respective rights of the involved parties. UEFJA applies only to final judgments. As a general rule, child support arrearages that have been reduced to judgment are considered final judgments and thus can be filed under UEFJA. An advantage of UEFJA is that it does not require reciprocity (i.e., it need only be in effect in the initiating State). A disadvantage is that UEFJA is limited to collection of arrearages; it cannot be used to establish an initial order or to enforce current orders.

In fiscal year 1997, there were 2.4 million interstate cases in which collections were sent to or received from other States. This represents a 60 percent increase over the 1.5 million interstate cases that yielded a payment in fiscal year 1990. Similarly, in fiscal year 1997, $1.824 billion was collected for interstate cases, up from $825 million (21 percent) in fiscal year 1990.

Expedited procedures and the financial institution data match program

Regardless of whether a State uses judicial processes, administrative processes, or a combination, the 1996 welfare reform law re-

quired States to adopt a series of procedures to expedite both the establishment of paternity and the establishment, enforcement, and modification of child support. These procedures must give the State CSE agency the authority to take several enforcement actions, subject to due process safeguards, without the necessity of obtaining an order from any other judicial or administrative tribunal. For example, States must have expedited procedures to secure assets to satisfy an arrearage by intercepting or seizing periodic or lump sum payments (such as unemployment and workers' compensation), lottery winnings, awards, judgments, or settlements, and assets of the debtor parent held by public or private retirement funds and financial institutions.

The 1996 law also required States to enter into agreements with financial institutions conducting business within their State for the purpose of conducting a quarterly data match. The data match is intended to identify financial accounts (in banks, credit unions, money-market mutual funds, etc.) belonging to parents who are delinquent in the payment of their child support obligation. When a match is identified, State CSE agencies may issue liens or levies on the account(s) of the delinquent parent to collect the past-due child support. In 1998, Congress made it easier for multistate financial institutions to match records by permitting the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS) to help them coordinate their information. According to DHHS, 662,000 financial accounts with a value of about $1 billion have been matched since August 1999. States are using their expedited procedures to seize the accounts and thereby force debtor noncustodial parents to meet their child support obligations.

Summary information on collection methods

Table 8–3 shows that 65 percent of the $14.3 billion in child support payments collected in fiscal year 1998 was obtained through four enforcement techniques: wage withholding, Federal income tax refund offset, State income tax refund offset, and unemployment compensation intercept. The remaining 35 percent is listed as collected by "other" means. The "other" category includes collections from parents who have informal agreements, collections from noncustodial parents who voluntarily sent money for their children even though a support order had never been established (about 4 percent of all collections), and enforcement techniques such as liens against property, license and passport revocation, seizure of assets from financial institutions, posting of bonds or securities, and use of the full IRS collection procedure. Table 8–3 indicates that by fiscal year 1991 wage withholding had become the primary enforcement method, producing nearly 47 percent of all child support collections. By 1998, the percentage had increased even further, reaching 56 percent.

PRIVATE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

According to the OCSE, the Child Support Enforcement Program handles about 50 percent of all child support cases. The rest are handled by private attorneys, private collection agencies, locally-funded public child support enforcement agencies, or through mutual agreements between the parents.

Nonfederal CSE activities.—Some localities have taken it upon themselves to operate a child support program using local funding sources and fees levied against noncustodial parents. A major complaint of these localities is that the enforcement tools (e.g., Federal and State tax refund intercepts, license sanctions, passport sanctions, data matches with financial institutions, reporting of delinquencies to credit bureaus) that are now available only to the Federal/State CSE Program should be extended to the entities working outside the Federal/State system and to private contractors as well. However, State child support agencies, advocates representing both noncustodial and custodial parents, and privacy rights organizations have voiced concerns about such an approach, particularly as it relates to private agencies.

CSE privatization.—While doing business with public and private sector entities outside the CSE Program for such things as laboratory testing for paternity establishment, service of process, and automated systems development is not new in the CSE Program, contracting out all of the program's functions is new. This approach is usually referred to as privatization.

According to a December 1996 U.S. General Accounting Office report, 15 States had turned to full-service privatization of selected local CSE offices as a way to improve performance that had been hampered by growing caseloads, resource constraints, and increased Federal requirements. For some localities, privatization is also a response to State restrictions on hiring additional public employees.

In many more States, the State or locality had a contract with a private entity to perform one or several services to supplement the efforts of the State or local program. Most commonly, States contract with the private sector for the collection of past-due support, especially support considered hard to collect. Under the terms of most collection contracts, States pay contractors only if collections are made and payments to contractors are often a fixed percentage of the recovered arrearage payments.

STATE COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF SUPPORT PAYMENTS

One of the major child support provisions of the 1996 welfare reform legislation was the requirement that by October 1, 1998, State CSE agencies must operate a centralized, automated unit for collection and disbursement of payments on two categories of child support orders: those enforced by the CSE agency and those issued or modified after December 31, 1993 which are not enforced by the State CSE agency but for which the noncustodial parent's income is subject to withholding.

The State disbursement unit must be operated directly by the State CSE agency, by two or more State CSE agencies under a regional cooperative agreement, or by a contractor responsible directly to the State CSE agency. The State disbursement unit may be established by linking local disbursement units through an automated information network if the DHHS Secretary agrees that the system will not cost more, take more time to establish, nor take more time to operate than a single State system. All States, includ-

ing those that operate a linked system, must give employers one and only one location for submitting withheld income.

The disbursement unit must be used to collect and disburse support payments, to generate orders and notices of withholding to employers, to keep an accurate identification of payments, to promptly distribute money to custodial parents or other States, and to furnish parents with a record of the current status of support payments made after August 22, 1996. The disbursement unit must use automated procedures, electronic processes, and computer-driven technology to the maximum extent feasible, efficient, and economical.

The disbursement unit must distribute all amounts payable within 2 business days after receiving the money and identifying information from the employer or other source of periodic income if sufficient information identifying the payee is provided. The unit may retain arrearages in the case of appeals until they are resolved.

States must use their automated system to facilitate collection and disbursement including at least: (1) transmission of orders and notices to employers within 2 days after receipt of the withholding notice; (2) monitoring to identify missed payments of support; and (3) automatic use of enforcement procedures when payments are missed.

The collection and disbursement unit provisions went into effect on October 1, 1998. States that process child support payments through local courts were allowed to continue court payments until September 30, 1999.

Following enactment of this provision in August 1996, there was widespread misunderstanding about its breadth of application. Thus, it is useful to emphasize here that not all child support orders must be a part of the State disbursement unit. First, orders issued before 1994 that are not being enforced by the State Child Support Enforcement Agency are exempt. Second, parents can avoid both wage withholding and involvement in the child support enforcement system if at the time the original order is issued, the judge determines that private payment directly between parents is acceptable.

Because of the total loss of CSE funding plus possible loss of TANF Block Grant funding for States that are not in compliance with the State plan requirement related to State disbursement units, in November 1999, Congress passed legislation (Public Law 106–113) that imposes a lesser alternative penalty for these States. To qualify, States must have submitted a corrective compliance plan by April l, 2000, that describes how, by when, and at what cost the State would achieve compliance with the State disbursement unit requirement. The DHHS Secretary is required to reduce the amount the State would otherwise have received in Federal child support payments by the penalty amount for the fiscal year. The penalty amount percentage is 4 percent in the case of the first fiscal year of noncompliance; 8 percent in the second year; 16 percent in the third year; 25 percent in the fourth year; and 30 percent in the fifth and subsequent years. If a State that is subject to a penalty achieves compliance on or before April l, 2000, the DHHS Secretary is required to waive the first year penalty. If a State achieves compliance on or after April 1, 2000, and on or before Sep-

tember 30, 2000, the penalty percentage will be 1. In addition, Public Law 106–113 provides that States that fail to implement both the CSE automated data processing requirement and the State disbursement unit requirement are subject to only one alternative penalty process.

BANKRUPTCY AND CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Giving debtors a fresh start is the goal of this country's bankruptcy system. Depending on the type of bankruptcy, a debtor may be able to discharge a debt completely, pay a percentage of the debt, or pay the full amount of the debt over a longer period of time. However, several types of debts are not dischargeable, including debts for child support and alimony (U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support, 1992, p. 209).

The 1975 child support legislation included a provision stating that an assigned child support obligation was not dischargeable in bankruptcy. In 1978 this provision was incorporated into the uniform law on bankruptcy. The bankruptcy law also listed exceptions to discharge including alimony and maintenance or support due a spouse, former spouse, or child. In 1981, a provision stating that a child support obligation assigned to the State as a condition of eligibility for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is not dischargeable in bankruptcy was reinstated. In 1984, the provision was expanded so that child support obligations assigned to the State as part of the child support program may not be discharged in bankruptcy, regardless of whether the payments are to be made on behalf of a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or a non-TANF family and regardless of whether the debtor was married to the child's other parent.

Some noncustodial parents seek relief from their financial obligations in the U.S. bankruptcy courts. Although child support payments may not be discharged via a filing of bankruptcy, the filing may cause long delays in securing child support payments. Pursuant to Public Law 103–394, enacted in 1994, a filing of bankruptcy will not stay a paternity, child support, or alimony proceeding. In addition, child support and alimony payments are priority claims and custodial parents are able to appear in bankruptcy court to protect their interests without having to pay a fee or meet any local rules for attorney appearances.

The 1996 welfare reform legislation amends the U.S. Bankruptcy Code to ensure that any child support debt that is owed to a State and that is enforceable under the CSE Program cannot be discharged in bankruptcy proceedings.

AUTOMATED SYSTEMS

In 1980, Congress authorized 90 percent Federal matching funds on an open-ended basis for States to design and implement automated data systems. Funds go to States that establish an automated data processing and information retrieval system designed to assist in administration of the State child support plan, and to control, account for, and monitor all factors in the enforcement, collection, and paternity determination processes. Funds may be used to plan, design, develop, and install or enhance the system. The

Secretary of DHHS must approve the State system as meeting specified conditions before matching is available.

In 1984, Congress made the 90-percent rate available to pay for the acquisition of computer hardware and necessary software. The 1984 legislation also specified that if a State met the Federal requirement for 90 percent matching, it could use its funds to pay for the development and improvement of income withholding and other procedures required by the 1984 law. In May 1986, OCSE established a transfer policy requiring States seeking the 90 percent Federal matching rate to transfer existing automated systems from other States rather than to develop new ones, unless there were a compelling reason not to use the systems developed by other States.

In 1988, Congress required States without comprehensive statewide automated systems to submit an advance planning document to the OCSE by October 1, 1991, for the development of such a system. Congress required that all States have a fully operating system by October 1, 1995, at which time the 90 percent matching rate was to end. The 1988 law allowed many requirements for automated systems to be waived under certain circumstances. For instance, the DHHS Secretary could waive a requirement if a State demonstrated that it had an alternative system enabling it to substantially comply with program requirements.

As of September 30, 1995, OCSE had approved the automated data systems of only six States—Delaware, Georgia, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. Most observers agree that States were delayed primarily by the lateness of Federal regulations specifying the requirements for the data systems and by the complexity of getting their final systems into operation. Thus, on October 12, 1995, Congress enacted Public Law 104–35 which extended for 2 years, from October 1, 1995 to October 1, 1997, the deadline by which States were required to have statewide automated systems for their child support programs. On October 1, 1995, however, the 90 percent matching rate was ended; the Federal matching rate for State spending on data systems reverted back to the basic administrative rate of 66 percent.

The purpose of requiring States to operate statewide automated and computerized systems is to ensure that child support functions are carried out effectively and efficiently. These requirements include case initiation, case management, financial management, enforcement, security, privacy, and reporting. Implementing these requirements can facilitate locating noncustodial parents and monitoring child support cases. For example, by linking automated child support systems to other State databases, information can be obtained quickly and cheaply about a noncustodial parent's current address, assets, and employment status. Systems can also be connected to the court system to access information on child support orders (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992b).

Under the 1996 welfare reform legislation, States are required to have a statewide automated data processing and information retrieval system which has the capacity to perform a wide variety of functions with a specified frequency. The State data system must be used to perform functions the DHHS Secretary specifies, including controlling and accounting for the use of Federal, State, and

local funds and maintaining the data necessary to meet Federal reporting requirements. The automated system must maintain the requisite data for Federal reporting, calculate the State's performance for purposes of the incentive and penalty provisions, and have in place systems controls to ensure the completeness, reliability, and accuracy of the data. Final regulations were issued by the Secretary in August 1998.

The 1996 welfare reform law stipulated that, first, all automatic data processing requirements enacted on or before the date of enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988 (i.e., October 13, 1988) are to be met by October 1, 1997. Second, requirements enacted on or before August 22, 1996 must be met by October 1, 2000. The Federal Government continued the 90 percent matching rate in 1996 and 1997 for provisions outlined in advanced planning documents submitted before September 30, 1995.

The Secretary must create procedures to cap payments to the States to meet the new requirements at $400 million for fiscal years 1996–2001. The Federal matching rate for the new requirements will be 80 percent. Funds are to be distributed among States by a formula set in regulations which takes into account the relative size of State caseloads and the level of automation needed to meet applicable automatic data processing requirements.

The Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–200), gives the DHHS Secretary an alternative to assessing a 100 percent penalty (i.e., loss of all CSE funding) on States that failed to comply with the October 1, 1997 statewide automated system requirements. The alternative penalty is available to States that the Secretary determines have made and are continuing to make good faith efforts to comply with the automated system requirements (and have submitted a "corrective action plan" that describes how, by when, and at what cost the State will achieve compliance with the automated system requirements). The alternative percentage penalty is equal to 4, 8, 16, 25, and 30 percent respectively for the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth or subsequent years of failing to comply with the data processing requirements. The percentage penalty is to be applied to the amount payable to the State in the previous year as Federal administrative reimbursement under the child support program (i.e., the 66 percent Federal matching funds). A State that fails to comply with the 1996 automated system requirements may nonetheless have its annual penalty reduced by 20 percent for each performance measure under the new incentive system for which it achieves a maximum score. Thus, for example, a State being penalized would have its penalty for a given year reduced by 60 percent if it achieved maximum performance on three of the five proposed performance measures. Further, the Secretary is to reduce the annual penalty amount by 90 percent in the year in which a State achieves compliance with the automated system requirements. These alternative penalties apply to all CSE automated system requirements (i.e., those required by both Public Law 100–485 and Public Law 104–193). However, Public Law 105–200 only allows the Secretary to impose one penalty in any given year. This means that if a State is not in compliance in fiscal year 2000 with either the 1988 automated system requirements or the 1996 requirements, it can only

be penalized once. The 1998 law also stipulates that because States are subject to the alternative penalty procedures for violations of the CSE automated system requirements, they are exempt from the TANF penalty procedure for such violations.

As of January 6, 2000, 11 jurisdictions had not been certified as meeting the October 1, 1997 CSE automated systems requirements; 7 States had not yet scheduled a certification review (California, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, South Carolina, and the Virgin Islands), and 4 States had reports pending (District of Columbia, Indiana, Kansas, and North Dakota).

AUDITS AND FINANCIAL PENALTIES

Audits are required at least every 3 years to determine whether the standards and requirements prescribed by law and regulations have been met by the child support program of every State. If a State fails the audit, Federal TANF funds must be reduced by an amount equal to at least 1 but not more than 2 percent for the first failure to comply, at least 2 but not more than 3 percent for the second failure, and at least 3 but not more than 5 percent for the third and subsequent failures.

If a penalty is imposed after a followup review, a State may appeal the audit penalty to the DHHS Departmental Appeals Board. Payment of the penalty is delayed while the appeal is pending. The appeals board reviews the written records which may be supplemented by informal conferences and evidentiary hearings.

The penalty may be suspended for up to 1 year to allow a State time to implement corrective actions to remedy the program deficiency. At the end of the corrective action period, a followup audit is conducted in the areas of deficiency. If the followup audit shows that the deficiency has been corrected, the penalty is rescinded. However, if the State remains out of compliance with Federal requirements, a graduated penalty, as provided by law, is assessed against the State. The actual amount of the penalty—between 1 and 5 percent of the State's TANF matching funds (see above)—depends on the severity and the duration of the deficiency. If a State is under penalty, a comprehensive audit is conducted annually until the cited deficiencies are corrected (Office of Child Support, 1994, pp. 17–19).

The welfare reform law of 1996 requires States to annually review and report to the DHHS Secretary, using data from their automatic data processing system, both information adequate to determine the State's compliance with Federal requirements for expedited procedures and case processing as well as the information necessary to calculate their levels of accomplishment and rates of improvement on the performance indicators.

The Secretary is required to determine the amount (if any) of incentives or penalties. She also must review State reports on compliance with Federal requirements and provide States with recommendations for corrective action. The purpose of the audits is to assess the completeness, reliability, and security of data reported for use in calculating the performance indicators and to assess the adequacy of financial management of the State program.

In addition to the 1–5 percent penalty for States that the DHHS Secretary has found, via an audit, to have failed to substantially

comply with CSE State plan requirements, there is the possibility of complete elimination of CSE funding in cases in which a State's program has been disapproved. The Secretary must disapprove the plans of States which fail to implement the CSE State plan requirements under section 454 of the Social Security Act. Disapproval of a State's plan will result in the cessation of all Federal child support funding for the State. In addition, because operating an approved Child Support Enforcement Program is a prerequisite to a State's receiving funds under the TANF Program, a State's TANF funds also would be terminated. (See above sections on Automated Systems and State Collection and Disbursement of Support Payments for more details.)

As mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, there are two exceptions to this rule. First, CSE law establishes an alternative penalty for a State's failure to meet the automated data systems requirements. Second, CSE law (Public Law 106–113) establishes an alternative penalty for a State's failure to meet the automated centralized disbursement unit requirements.

ASSIGNMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS

Two parties have claims on child support collections made by the State. The children and custodial parent on behalf of whom the payments are made, of course, have a claim on payments by the noncustodial parent. However, in the case of families that have received public aid, taxpayers who paid to support the destitute family by providing a host of welfare benefits also have a legitimate claim on the money.

Since the child support program's inception, the rules determining the distribution of arrearage payments have been complex, but not nearly as complicated as they are currently. It is helpful to think of the rules in two categories. First, there are rules in both Federal and State law that stipulate who has a legal claim on the payments owed by the noncustodial parent. These are called assignment rules. Second, there are rules that determine the order in which child support collections are paid in accord with the assignment rules. These are called distribution rules.

DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS WHILE THE FAMILY RECEIVES PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

When a family applies for TANF, the custodial parent must assign to the State the right to collect both current child support payments and past-due child support obligations which accrue while the family is on the TANF rolls. Arrearages that accrued to the family before it went on public assistance are called "preassistance" arrearages; those that accrue while the family is on public assistance are called "permanently-assigned arrearages." While the family receives TANF benefits, the State is permitted to retain any current support and any arrearages it collects up to the cumulative amount of TANF benefits which has been paid to the family. Before the 1996 reforms, States were required by Federal law to pay (or "pass through") the first $50 of collections to the family. This provision was repealed by the 1996 legislation and States were given the

right to decide for themselves how much, if any, of their collections would be passed through to the family, although they must pay the Federal share of collections. Thus, amounts passed through come entirely out of the State share of collections. States also have the right to decide whether they treat any child support passed through to the family as income, in which case they may reduce or even eliminate TANF payments.

DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS AFTER THE FAMILY LEAVES PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Distribution rules after the family leaves public assistance are far more complicated. Most of the problems stem from the requirements that preassistance arrears be assigned to the State, and that certain arrearages otherwise owed to the former welfare family are deemed to be owed to the State when the collection is made by Federal tax refund intercept.

When a family leaves welfare, States are required to keep track of six categories of arrearages: (1) permanently assigned; (2) temporarily assigned; (3) conditionally assigned; (4) never assigned; (5) unassigned during assistance; and (6) unassigned preassistance. On the computer, these different categories are called "buckets." The money shifts among the buckets according to the source of the collection, the family's status on or off assistance when the arrearage accrued, the amount of the unreimbursed public assistance balance, and the date of the assignment of support rights as well as the date the TANF case closed (because of phased-in implementation dates). Moreover, the distribution rules differ depending on whether the family went on welfare before or after October 1, 1997.

Families that assigned their rights to preassistance arrearages to the State before October 1, 1997, have "permanently-assigned arrearages," which are owed to the State. Families that assign their rights to preassistance arrearages to the State on or after October 1, 1997, have "temporarily-assigned arrearages." Temporarily-assigned arrearages and permanently-assigned arrearages are treated differently after a family leaves public assistance. Temporarily-assigned arrearages become "conditionally-assigned arrearages" when the family leaves welfare or on October 1, 2000, whichever is later. These are called conditionally-assigned arrearages because, as will be seen below, if they are collected by Federal tax refund intercept, they will be paid to the State, not the family.

There are also categories for "never-assigned arrearages," which accrue after the family's most recent period of assistance ends. These can become temporarily-assigned arrearages if the family goes back on public assistance. In addition, there are "unassigned during assistance arrearages" and "unassigned preassistance arrearages." These are previously assigned arrearages which exceed the cumulative amount of unreimbursed assistance when the family leaves public assistance, and which accrued either during (unassigned during assistance arrearages) or prior to (unassigned preassistance arrearages) receipt of assistance.

When the family leaves public assistance, the order of distribution of any collection depends not only on when the arrearages accrued—preassistance, during-assistance, or postassistance—and when they were assigned, but also on when and how the past-due

support was collected. If the collection was made by any means other than the Federal tax refund intercept, the collection is first paid to the family up to the amount of the monthly child support obligation. Any remaining collection is distributed to certain categories of arrearages owed to the family (conditionally assigned, never assigned and unassigned preassistance), and then to arrearages owed to the State (permanently assigned), with the remainder to the family (unassigned during assistance).

Once current support is paid, collections on past-due support made between October 1, 1997, and September 30, 2000, or earlier at State option, are paid to the family to satisfy any arrearages that accrued to the family after leaving public assistance (never-assigned arrearages). Once never-assigned arrearages are satisfied, the collection is to be applied either to other arrearages owed to the family or to the State (permanently-assigned arrearages). A family that leaves welfare before October 1, 2000, maintains its permanently-assigned arrearages, that is, those which accrued before the family went on welfare and while the family received public assistance. These arrearages are always owed to the State and, unlike temporarily-assigned arrearages, never revert to the family.

On October 1, 2000, the rules change again (although States can opt to implement these changes sooner). As noted above, the temporarily-assigned arrearages for a former welfare family that leaves public assistance on or after October 1, 2000, or when the case closes, whichever is later, become "conditionally-assigned arrearages." The distribution of these conditionally-assigned arrearages is "conditioned" upon whether the money is collected by Federal tax refund intercept or by some other method, such as levy of a bank account, a workers' compensation lump sum payment, or a payment agreement to avoid a driver's license revocation. If the collection is from a tax refund intercept, it will be paid to the State rather than to the family, up to the cumulative amount of unreimbursed assistance. The distribution from any other method of collection is first made to the family, with current support being paid first and any balance allocated to any arrearages.

FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS

The child support program conducted by States is financed by three major streams of money. The first and largest is the Federal Government's commitment to reimburse States for 66 percent of all allowable expenditures on child support activities. Allowable expenditures include outlays for locating parents, establishing paternity (with an exception noted below), establishing orders, and collecting payments.

There are two mechanisms through which Federal financial control of State expenditures is exercised. First, States must submit plans to the Secretary of DHHS outlining the specific child support activities they intend to pursue. The State plan provides the Secretary with the opportunity to review and approve or disapprove child support activities that will receive the 66 percent Federal reimbursement. Second, as discussed previously, DHHS conducts a financial audit of State expenditures.

In addition to the general matching rate of 66 percent, the Federal Government provides 90 percent matching for two especially

important child support activities. First, the Federal Government pays 80–90 percent of approved State expenditures on developing and improving management information systems. Congress decided to pay this enhanced match rate because data management, the construction of large data bases containing information on location, income, and assets of child support obligors, and computer access to and manipulation of such large data bases were seen as the keys to a cost effective child support system. In spending the additional Federal dollars on these data systems, Congress hoped to provide an incentive for States to adopt and aggressively employ efficient data management technology.

Second, Congress also provides 90 percent funding for laboratory costs of blood testing. As in the case of data management systems, Congress justified enhanced funding of blood tests because paternity establishment is an activity vital to successful child support enforcement. Historically, establishing paternity in cases of births outside marriage has proven to be surprisingly difficult. Especially since the 1960s, more and more children have been born outside marriage; today nearly a third of all children are born to unwed mothers, and nearly 50 percent of these babies wind up on welfare. Thus, establishing paternity has become more and more important because a growing fraction of the welfare caseload is children whose paternity has not been established. Congress hopes to stimulate the use of blood tests as a way of improving State performance in establishing paternity, especially given that recent experience in the States shows that many men voluntarily acknowledge paternity once blood tests reveal a high probability of their paternity.

In addition to the Federal administrative matching payments, the second stream of financing for State programs is child support collections. As we have seen, when mothers apply for welfare, they assign the child's claim rights against the father to the State. As long as the family receives TANF payments, the State can retain all child support payments. As explained in detail above in the section on distribution of child support payments, States retain the right to pursue repayment for TANF benefits from the parent who owes child support even after the family leaves welfare.

Recovered payments are split between the State and the Federal Government in accord with the percentage of Federal reimbursement of Medicaid benefits. In the Medicaid Program, the Federal Government pays States a percentage of their expenditures that varies inversely with State per capita income—poor States have a high Federal reimbursement percentage, wealthy States have a lower Federal reimbursement percentage. Mississippi, for example, one of the poorest States, receives a reimbursement of about 77 percent for its Medicaid expenditures. By contrast, States like California and New York that have high per capita income receive the minimum Federal reimbursement of 50 percent.

Though TANF is not a matching grant program, the Federal Government and the States still share the costs of providing help to needy families with children. TANF includes a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement that requires States to expend 75 percent (80 percent if they fail to meet TANF work requirements) of what they spent under prior law programs in fiscal year 1994 on families with children that meet TANF eligibility requirements. The fact

that the Federal Government and the States split the costs of TANF explains why States are required to split child support collections from TANF cases with the Federal Government. The rate at which States reimburse the Federal Government is the Federal Medicaid matching rate. The details of this cost-recovery procedure means that poorer States are rewarded less for their CSE efforts than wealthier States.

The third stream of child support financing is Federal incentive payments. The current incentive system is designed to encourage States to collect child support from both TANF and non-TANF cases.

Public Law 105–200, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998 (enacted July 16, 1998), replaced the old incentive payment system with a new cost-neutral system of incentive payments that provides: (1) incentive payments based on a percentage of the State's collections (with no cap on non-TANF collections); (2) incorporation of five performance measures related to establishment of paternity and child support orders, collections of current and past-due support payments, and cost-effectiveness; (3) mandatory reinvestment of incentive payments into the CSE Program; and (4) an incentive payment formula weighted in favor of TANF and former TANF families.

The new incentive system is scheduled to be gradually phased in between fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2002. The system caps the Federal incentive pool, thereby forcing States for the first time to compete against each other for incentive dollars. Under the new incentive system, a State may be eligible to receive an incentive payment for good performance. The total amount of the incentive payment received by a State depends on four factors: (1) the total amount of money available in a given fiscal year from which to make incentive payments; (2) the State's success in making collections on behalf of its caseload; (3) the State's performance in five areas (mentioned earlier); and (4) the relative success or failure of other States in making collections and meeting these performance criteria.

In fiscal year 1998, the incentive payment, which comes out of the gross Federal share of child support collected on behalf of TANF families, was $395 million. Federal law (Public Law 105–200) stipulates that the incentive payment pool cannot exceed $422 million for fiscal year 2000; $429 million for fiscal year 2001; $450 million for fiscal year 2002; $461 million for fiscal year 2003; $454 million for fiscal year 2004; $446 million for fiscal year 2005; $458 million for fiscal year 2006; $471 million for fiscal year 2007; and $483 million for fiscal year 2008. For years after fiscal year 2008, the incentive pool is increased to reflect changes in inflation in the previous year as measured by the Consumer Price Index.

Given this overview of the three streams of money that support State CSE Programs, we can now examine the basic financial operations of the child support system. Table 8–4 summarizes both child support income and expenditures for every State. The first three columns show State income from each of three funding streams just described; the fourth column shows State spending on child support. As demonstrated in the fifth column, the sum of the three streams of income exceeds expenditures in some 25 States.

In other words, most States make a profit on their child support program. States are free to spend the State share of collections in any manner the State sees fit, but States must spend Federal incentive payments solely on the CSE Program or on activities approved by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Secretary which contribute to the effectiveness or efficiency of the CSE Program.

TABLE 8–4.—FINANCING OF THE FEDERAL/STATE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1998

[In thousands of dollars]

State	State income			State administrative expenditures (costs)	State net	Collections-to-costs ratio
	Federal administrative payments	State share of collections	Federal incentive payments			
Alabama	$33,866	$4,102	$2,576	50,747	(10,203)	3.40
Alaska	12,059	8,322	2,733	18,245	4,869	3.52
Arizona	35,982	6,918	3,595	54,189	(7,693)	2.66
Arkansas	22,858	3,392	2,554	34,541	(5,737)	2.88
California	341,359	288,800	83,629	515,391	198,398	2.66
Colorado	29,878	13,830	5,023	45,084	3,646	3.11
Connecticut	32,031	23,836	7,409	47,853	15,423	3.23
Delaware	10,933	2,939	1,008	16,490	(1,611)	2.55
District of Columbia	11,125	2,270	878	16,545	(2,272)	1.98
Florida	110,491	26,584	12,150	166,882	(17,656)	3.04
Georgia	56,402	16,082	8,732	85,109	(3,893)	3.53
Guam	2,790	252	231	4,214	(941)	1.72
Hawaii	15,829	5,743	1,678	23,960	(710)	2.60
Idaho	9,641	2,935	1,563	14,562	(422)	3.69
Illinois	79,325	37,947	11,846	119,900	9,219	2.50
Indiana	26,978	14,024	5,579	41,695	4,886	5.45
Iowa	25,830	15,210	6,215	38,646	8,608	4.79
Kansas	26,568	9,975	3,724	40,066	201	3.05
Kentucky	31,589	11,304	5,390	47,619	664	3.90
Louisiana	28,255	6,351	3,077	42,329	(4,646)	4.03
Maine	11,490	8,258	5,052	17,363	7,438	4.25
Maryland	54,827	16,897	4,121	82,899	(7,054)	4.31
Massachusetts	39,897	29,043	7,706	59,950	16,696	4.58
Michigan	105,950	77,609	19,689	160,376	42,871	7.18
Minnesota	69,974	28,649	7,906	102,462	4,068	3.85
Mississippi	20,339	3,411	2,646	30,377	(3,981)	3.69
Missouri	56,044	20,512	8,353	85,274	(365)	3.36
Montana	7,753	2,113	1,261	11,706	(579)	3.15
Nebraska	16,675	5,530	1,882	25,109	(1,021)	4.66
Nevada	15,789	3,603	2,314	23,866	(2,160)	2.90
New Hampshire	8,973	4,379	1,383	13,561	1,174	4.50
New Jersey	83,306	38,638	10,970	125,290	7,624	4.64
New Mexico	15,464	2,570	1,367	23,406	(4,005)	1.59

TABLE 8–4.—FINANCING OF THE FEDERAL/STATE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	State income			State administrative expenditures (costs)	State net	Collections-to-costs ratio
	Federal administrative payments	State share of collections	Federal incentive payments			
New York	132,900	96,815	26,667	200,762	55,620	4.16
North Carolina	73,071	17,358	7,489	108,863	(10,945)	2.86
North Dakota	5,169	1,399	827	7,594	(199)	4.75
Ohio	140,004	44,084	14,384	202,888	(4,416)	5.67
Oklahoma	18,673	6,629	3,515	27,934	882	3.10
Oregon	26,111	9,980	4,859	39,516	1,434	5.29
Pennsylvania	98,316	52,426	15,829	147,723	18,847	7.06
Puerto Rico ..	17,820	471	350	26,994	(8,353)	5.38
Rhode Island	6,625	8,826	3,487	10,017	8,922	4.18
South Carolina	21,594	3,729	2,947	32,650	(4,381)	4.71
South Dakota	3,807	1,696	966	5,629	840	6.13
Tennessee	34,872	5,427	4,607	52,613	(7,706)	3.58
Texas	120,677	40,135	18,474	181,979	(2,692)	3.76
Utah	21,357	6,441	3,248	32,058	(1,012)	3.03
Vermont	5,009	2,715	1,202	7,557	1,369	4.20
Virginia	40,628	19,827	7,006	61,083	6,377	2.67
Virgin Islands	1,521	136	87	2,294	(550)	4.53
Washington ..	83,997	48,575	15,205	126,830	20,947	3.74
West Virginia	16,249	3,420	1,874	24,470	(2,927)	4.47
Wisconsin	60,145	27,990	7,230	90,924	4,442	5.49
Wyoming	6,198	1,047	468	8,891	(1,178)	3.72
Total	2,385,011	1,141,151	384,963	3,584,972	326,153	4.00

Note.—The ''State net'' column in this table is not the same as the comparable figure presented in annual reports of the Office of Child Support Enforcement (see for example, 1996, p. 78 and tables 8–5 and 8–23 below) because estimated Federal incentive payments are used in the annual reports while final Federal incentive payments were used in this table.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The method of financing child support enforcement has received considerable attention in recent years. One of the most important issues is that States have little incentive to control their administrative spending. The last column of table 8–4 presents a measure of State program efficiency obtained by dividing total collections by total administrative expenses. The table shows the dramatic differences among States in how much child support is collected for each dollar of administrative expenditure—a crude measure of efficiency—ranging from only $1.59 in New Mexico to $7.06 in Pennsylvania. And yet, about half of the States, including those that spend up to three or four times as much per dollar of collections as more efficient States, still make a profit on the program.

Table 8–5 shows one consequence of child support's financing system. The first two columns of the table show the net impact of

program financing on the Federal and State governments respectively. The Federal Government has lost money on child support every year since 1979, and the losses have grown almost every year since then. Overall, losses jumped sharply from $43 million in 1979 to $1.427 billion in 1998.

TABLE 8–5.—FEDERAL AND STATE SHARE OF CHILD SUPPORT ''SAVINGS,'' FISCAL YEARS 1979–98

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Federal share of child support savings [1]	State share of child support savings	Net public savings [1]
1979	−$43	$244	$201
1980	−103	230	127
1981	−128	261	133
1982	−148	307	159
1983	−138	312	174
1984	−105	366	260
1985	−231	317	86
1986	−264	274	9
1987	−359	363	4
1988	−363	388	25
1989	−454	377	−77
1990	−523	333	−190
1991	−599	398	−201
1992	−645	475	−170
1993	−765	494	−271
1994	−947	450	−497
1995	−1,262	410	−852
1996	−1,171	433	−738
1997	−1,283	470	−813
1998	−1,427	[2] 340	−1,087

[1] Negative ''savings'' are costs.
[2] Includes $14 million in Federal hold-harmless payments.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, Annual Reports to Congress; Congressional Research Service, based on data from Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Congressional Research Service analysis slightly changed numbers for years 1987–96 published in previous editions.

State governments by contrast have made a profit on the program every year. In 1979, the first year for which data are available, States in the aggregate cleared $244 million. In 1998, States cleared $340 million (the peak year was 1993, when States cleared $494 million).

The last column in table 8–5 portrays an unfortunate historical progression in child support financing. Beginning in the very first year of the child support program and for nearly a decade thereafter, the net impact of Federal losses and State profits was a net savings for taxpayers. Thus, in 1979, although the Federal Government lost money, State savings more than made up for the losses. As a result, from a public finance perspective, taxpayers were

ahead by $201 million (see last column). Total Federal and State child support expenditures, in other words, were more than offset by collections from parents whose children had been supported by AFDC payments. These AFDC collections were retained and used to reimburse the Federal and State governments for previous AFDC expenditures. The savings produced in this manner exceeded overall expenditures.

Unfortunately, net public savings declined over the years. A major explanation for the negative public savings was that beginning in 1985, as explained above, new Federal legislation required States to give the first $50 per month of collections in welfare cases to the custodial parent. This $50 passthrough had an immediate impact; in its first year, combined Federal-State savings fell to $86 million from $260 million the previous year. By 1989 the overall "savings" in the combined program went negative. For the first time that year, Federal losses exceeded State gains—by $77 million. The net losses have increased almost every year, reaching $852 million in 1995 before declining somewhat to $738 million in 1996. By 1998, the net loss was $1.087 billion.

Reflecting on these numbers, two perspectives should be considered. One perspective, the finance perspective, attends simply to the measurable costs and benefits of the child support program. But a second, broader perspective includes more diffuse social benefits of child support that are difficult to measure.

From the finance perspective, perhaps the most important question about child support financing is why the Federal Government, which loses money on the program every year, should provide such a high reimbursement level for State expenditures when nearly all States make a profit on their child support program. In the past, this issue has prompted Congress to reduce the basic administrative reimbursement rate on several occasions. As a result, the rate has declined from its original level of 75 percent to 66 percent. But some Members of Congress have suggested that, because most States are still making a profit while the Federal Government is losing money, Congress should reduce the Federal administrative reimbursement rate below 66 percent. Defenders of child support financing respond by pointing out that allowing States to profit from the program makes it very popular with State policymakers who control funding of the State share of expenditures. Without financing arrangements favorable to State interests, according to this view, the child support program would not have posted the impressive gains that have characterized the program since its inception in 1975. Moreover, many defenders of the current financing structure view retained collections as reimbursement for a portion of a State's welfare expenditures, rather than "income" to the State. In fiscal year 1998 the State's share of retained collections accounted for just 10 percent of all States' expenditures on TANF.

The 66 percent Federal reimbursement of State administrative expenditures raises a second issue of program financing: Why is such a large percentage of State expenditures financed without regard to performance? Even if States spend a great deal of money on activities of dubious value in collecting child support, they can nonetheless count on 66 percent reimbursement from the Federal Government. The flat 66 percent reimbursement rate may provide

States with an incentive to spend money inefficiently. A potential solution would be for the Federal Government to provide States with less money based on gross spending and relatively more money based on performance.

However, some critics of child support financing question whether incentives should be provided for non-TANF collections. With regard to program financing, there is a striking difference between the TANF and non-TANF Programs; namely, government retains part of TANF collections but non-TANF collections are given entirely to the family. When Congress enacted the Child Support Enforcement Program in 1975, the floor debate shows that members of the House and Senate supported the program primarily because retaining welfare collections would help offset welfare expenditures.

But program trends since 1975 show that the non-TANF Program is actually much bigger than the TANF Program and grows faster each year than the TANF Program. As shown in table 8–1 above, welfare collections increased from about $0.5 billion in 1978 to a high point of $2.9 billion in 1996, a growth factor of five. Between 1996 and 1998, welfare collections actually declined somewhat. But non-TANF collections have grown steadily from about $0.6 billion to $11.7 billion over the same period, for a growth factor of nearly 20.

The point here is that non-TANF collections are growing much faster than TANF collections and probably will continue to do so in light of the 1996 welfare reforms. And since the State and Federal Governments receive virtually no direct reimbursement for non-TANF expenditures, the child support program loses more and more money every year. Why, then, critics ask, should the Federal Government encourage greater expenditures by providing incentives for non-TANF collections. Ignoring for the moment possible social benefits from the non-TANF Program and based entirely on a finance perspective, some critics argue that non-TANF incentives encourage inefficiency.

Another issue regarding program financing is whether government should pay such a high percentage of costs in the non-TANF Program. States must charge an application fee that can be no more than $25 for the non-TANF Program, but this amount doesn't even pay the full cost of opening a case file. In 1998, more than 3 million non-TANF families received services resulting in child support collections that averaged around $3,800 per case. By collecting this money, government is providing a useful service to millions of families, many of which are not poor. Rather than have taxpayers pick up the cost of this service, some critics argue that families receiving the services should pay more of the costs. Federal law allows States to charge additional fees, but few do so. States argue that, because many of the non-TANF families are poor or low-income, charging them for child support services would decrease their already tenuous financial stability. States also argue that setting up an administrative system to establish and collect the fees would cost more money than the fees actually collected.

The account of child support from the finance perspective given above relies on measurable spending and collections. However, defenders of the current child support program argue that it may

produce social benefits that are not captured by mere spending and collections data. These program defenders claim that a strong child support program produces "cost avoidance" by demonstrating to noncustodial parents who would try to avoid child support that the system will eventually catch up with them.

Although currently there is only modest evidence that would allow an estimate of the cost avoidance effect (Wheaton & Sorensen, 1998), there is nonetheless good reason to believe that at least some noncustodial parents make child support payments in part because they fear detection and prosecution. Even more to the point, a strong child support program may change the way society thinks about child support. As in the cases of civil rights and smoking, a persistent effort over a period of years may convince millions of Americans, both those who owe child support and those concerned with the condition of single-parent families, that making payments is a moral and civic duty. Those who avoid it would then be subject to something even more potent than legal prosecution—social ostracism.

To the extent that this reasoning is correct, the public and policymakers may come to regard child support enforcement as a long-term investment similar in many respects to education, job training, and other policies that help families support their children. In each of these cases, there is expectation that society will be better off in the long run because the government invests in helping individuals and families. But the expectation that investments will lead to immediate payoffs, or even that we can devise evaluation methods that adequately capture the long-term payoffs, is a much lower criterion of success than the expectation of immediate and measurable payoffs that characterizes the kind of public finance reasoning outlined above. Of course, even if the public is willing to continue paying for child support enforcement as a social investment, Congress and child support administrators may nonetheless find it desirable to intensify their efforts to make the program as efficient as possible.

HOW EFFECTIVE IS CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT?

Since the inception of the Federal-State child support program in 1975, there appears to have been growing public awareness of the problem of nonpayment of child support and increased willingness by taxpayers to spend money trying to improve child support enforcement. As measured either by expenditures or total collections, the Federal-State program has grown rapidly since 1978. To the extent that private arrangements fail to ensure child support payments, our laws and, increasingly, our practices bring child support cases into the public domain. In view of these quite remarkable changes in law and practice, it seems useful to provide a broad assessment of the performance of the Nation's child support system in general and of the IV–D program in particular.

IMPACT ON TAXPAYERS

One useful measure of the Federal-State program is the impact of collections on TANF costs. As outlined above, States retain and split with the Federal Government collections from parents whose

children are on TANF. In addition, States can often retain part of collections from parents whose children were on TANF in the past as repayment for taxpayer-provided TANF benefits.

As shown in table 8–1 above, after a long period of steady growth TANF collections have started declining, from a high of nearly $2.9 billion in 1996 to $2.6 billion in 1998. Nonetheless, the child support agencies collected a level of payments on behalf of TANF parents that equalled 20 percent of all TANF benefits in 1998, up from only 7 percent in 1982. Despite this improvement, the overall impact of the child support program on taxpayers is negative. As shown in table 8–5, taxpayers lost over $0.9 billion on the program in 1998.

IMPACT ON POVERTY

In 1995, about 30 percent of the 13.7 million women and men rearing children alone had incomes below the poverty level. By comparison, only 22 percent of the custodial parents who received child support payments had incomes below the poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999, p. 5). Thus, child support appears to be associated with a modest reduction in poverty. If the child support program could collect support for a substantial fraction of the additional 9 million single parents who did not receive payments in 1995, the antipoverty impact of the program could be substantially improved.

Despite the modest impact of child support on poverty, many families on welfare have received enough of a financial boost from child support payments that they were able to leave the rolls. In 1997, 356,000 families with child support collections, representing about 10 percent of the welfare caseload, became ineligible for TANF. Similarly, about 3 percent of families in the non-TANF child support program were lifted out of poverty by child support payments. This 3 percent figure is more impressive than it appears at first because a substantial fraction of the non-TANF caseload had incomes above the poverty level before receiving any child support payments. For most of these nonpoor families, incomes and standards of living were improved by child support payments. Presumably, even poor families that received child support but remained in poverty had their standard of living improved by the child support payments.

IMPACT ON NATIONAL CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Perhaps the most important measure of the Federal-State program is its impact on overall national rates of paying child support. Although the original intent of Congress in creating the child support program was primarily to offset welfare payments, both Congress and the American public have come to see the program as a means of improving the Nation's system of ensuring that all parents who no longer live with their children continue to provide for their financial support.

The U.S. Census Bureau periodically collects national survey information on child support. By interviewing a random sample of single-parent families, the Census Bureau is able to generate a host of numbers that can be used to assess the performance of non-

TABLE 8–6.—CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS AWARDED AND RECEIVED BY WOMEN WITH CHILDREN PRESENT, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, 1997 [1]

Characteristics of women	Total (thousands)	Percent awarded child support payments [2]	Supposed to receive child support in 1997			
			Total (thousands)	Received support in 1997		
				Percent	Mean child support	Mean income
ALL WOMEN						
Current marital status:						
Married	2,607	65.3	1,559	75.3	$3,977	$21,087
Divorced	3,673	70.4	2,357	73.7	4,326	29,752
Separated	1,565	56.2	765	66.3	3,547	20,510
Widowed [3]	230	54.3	104	59.6	(5)	(5)
Never married	3,831	46.7	1,547	55.3	1,966	13,769
Race and Hispanic origin:						
White	8,264	64.2	4,752	73.1	3,886	24,098
Black	3321	48.4	1,434	53.3	2,600	18,612
Hispanic origin [4]	1,710	46.7	688	62.9	3,012	17,023
Years of school completed:						
Less than high school graduate	2,385	47.5	976	54.9	2,127	10,131
High school graduate or GED	4,399	59.3	2,336	64.8	3,398	19,413
Some college, no degree	2,624	62.0	1,476	70.5	3,615	21,520
Associate degree	1,043	69.8	653	78.9	3,737	25,607
Bachelors degree or more	1,454	67.9	891	81.9	5,312	41,656
Total	11,905	59.5	6,331	68.5	3,655	23,249
WOMEN BELOW POVERTY						
Current marital status:						
Married	238	50.4	109	59.6	(5)	(5)
Divorced	977	60.6	513	62.4	2,839	8,224
Separated	657	53.9	310	57.4	2,960	7,383
Widowed [3]	60	68.3	30	36.7	(5)	(5)
Never married	1,884	48.5	761	49.0	1,577	6,890
Race:						
White	2,292	57.6	1,122	59.4	2,428	7,386
Black	1,407	46.2	565	47.4	1,963	7,187
Hispanic origin [4]	820	44.0	286	52.4	2,759	8,485
Total	3,816	53.0	1,723	55.0	2,290	7,306

[1] Preliminary data.
[2] Award status as of spring 1998.
[3] Widowed women whose previous marriage ended in divorce.
[4] Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.
[5] Sample too small to produce reliable estimate.

Note.—Women with own children under 21 years of age present from an absent father as of spring 1998.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, in press. (Advance copy of preliminary data furnished to the Congressional Research Service.)

custodial parents in paying child support. Table 8–6 provides detailed information for 1997, the most recent year for which national data are available, on child support payments by fathers to families headed by mothers. Although the 1997 survey, like the 1995, 1993,

and 1991 surveys, included custodial fathers, the following discussion is focused solely on custodial mothers. Several points bear emphasis, the most important of which is that many female-headed families do not receive child support. As shown in the bottom row of the upper panel in table 8–6, of the 11.9 million female-headed families eligible for support, only 60 percent even had a support award. Most observers would say that a major failure of the Nation's child support system is that entirely too many mothers do not have a child support award.

Of the 6.3 million mothers who had an award and who were supposed to receive payments in 1997, 68.5 percent actually received at least one payment (table 8–6). However, as shown in table 8–7, only about 36 percent of the total of 11.9 million women who did not live with their children's father in 1997 actually received at least one payment and only 22 percent received everything due. So in addition to its failure to get orders for about 40 percent of eligible mothers, critics assert that a second failure of the child support system is that a large proportion of the money owed is not paid.

Table 8–6, which also summarizes child support information by ethnic group, by years of schooling, and by poverty level, suggests a number of interesting and important features of child support payments. White mothers are more likely to have a support order than black or Hispanic mothers (64 percent versus 49 percent for blacks and 47 percent for Hispanics). Similarly, mothers with a college degree have a 68 percent chance of having an order as compared with 48 percent for high school dropouts and 59 percent for high school graduates. As for payments, white mothers receive about $3,900 per year on average as compared with $2,600 for black mothers and $3,000 for Hispanic mothers. College graduates receive $5,300 per year in support as compared with $2,100 and $3,400 for high school dropouts and graduates respectively.

Clearly, mothers who are already financially worse off get less from child support than mothers who are financially better off. This generalization is made especially clear by two further pieces of information depicted in the table. First, never-married mothers, one of the poorest demographic groups in the Nation, are less likely to have an award than divorced mothers (47 percent versus 70 percent); even never-married mothers who actually receive support get considerably less than divorced mothers ($2,000 versus $4,300). Second, as shown by the data at the bottom of the table, poor mothers are less likely to have orders and receive less money than nonpoor mothers. Table 8–8 shows similar data for the award of health insurance. While demonstrating that 58 percent of all mothers have health insurance included in their award, the table also shows that the probability of health insurance coverage is greatly reduced for never-married women, black and Hispanic women, and women with less schooling.

Table 8–7, which summarizes several child support measures for selected years from 1978 to 1997, complements and puts into context the conclusions drawn from the 1997 data.[4] More specifically,

[4] The Census Bureau changed its interview procedures before obtaining the 1991 data. Specifically, Census asked whether adults had any children under age 21 in their household who had a parent living elsewhere. This question may have excluded some mothers who would have an-

Continued

the pattern of poor women being less likely to have an order and receive support is nothing new; but the years since 1978 show a narrowing of the difference. The percentage of poor women who had an order was up 39 percent over the 19-year period, compared with a decline of 7 percent for all women. Similarly, the percentage of poor women who received child support payments increased 39 percent from 1978 to 1997, compared to a decrease of nearly 2 percent for all women. The percentage of all women with an award is only slightly higher than in 1978, the percentage that actually receive any payment is only slightly higher, and the aggregate payments have grown less rapidly than the number of demographically eligible mothers. Equally discouraging, while a slightly higher percentage of women were awarded child support (59.5 percent in 1997 versus 59.1 percent in 1978), a smaller percentage of women received full payment (22 percent in 1997 versus 24 percent in 1978).

In summary, it appears that the performance of the Nation's child support system is modest and that only a few of the measures of national performance have improved in nearly two decades. By contrast, as shown at the beginning of this chapter (see table 8–1), the Federal-State child support program has shown improved performance on a number of important measures virtually every year since 1978. To promote comparison of performance changes in the IV–D program with overall national trends in child support performance, table 8–9 summarizes several measures from both the IV–D program as revealed in reports from the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) and the national system of child support as revealed in U.S. Census Bureau Surveys. The data are surprising and, at first, confusing. As shown in the top panel, the Federal-State program is showing impressive improvement on every measure. Total collections, parents located, paternities established, and awards established are all up by over 250 percent since 1978, and the average increase in these four measures is over 670 percent.

By contrast, the measures of overall national trends show little improvement. In fact, the likelihood of having an award, being legally entitled to a payment, and receiving at least one payment have been nearly stagnant. Moreover, the percentage of mothers who received the full amount due has decreased from 49 to 42 percent. On the other hand, total collections increased by 42 percent. This increase, however, is dwarfed by the 415 percent increase in IV–D collections. The increase must also be interpreted in view of the fact that the number of single mothers demographically eligible for child support increased by 64 percent over the same period.

Clearly, although the IV–D program has been growing steadily since 1978, and although its performance on many measures of child support has been improving significantly, the improvement appears to have had only modest impact on the national picture. How can these two trends be reconciled?

---

swered the child support questions in previous surveys. In the interviews for the years 1978 through 1989, all never-married mothers were asked the child support questions. Because of this and other differences in procedure, the Census Bureau recommends "extreme caution" (U.S. Census Bureau, 1995, p. 40) in comparing data from the 1992 interview with data from previous interviews. We present the data from all the surveys and recommend that readers draw their own conclusions.

TABLE 8–7.—CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS FOR ALL WOMEN, WOMEN ABOVE THE POVERTY LEVEL, AND WOMEN BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL, SELECTED YEARS 1978–97

Category of women	1978	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1991 [3]	1993 [4]	1995	1997 [5]
All women:										
Total (in thousands)	7,094	8,387	8,690	8,808	9,415	9,955	9,918	11,505	11,634	11,905
Percent awarded [1]	59.1	59.2	57.7	61.3	59.0	57.7	55.9	59.8	61.2	59.5
Percent actually received payment	34.6	34.6	34.9	36.8	39.0	37.4	37.6	36.4	37.4	36.4
Percent received full payment	23.6	22.5	23.2	24.0	26.3	25.6	25.7	17.8	21.3	22.3
Women above poverty level:										
Total (in thousands)	5,121	5,821	5,792	6,011	6,224	6,749	6,405	7,271	7,763	8,089
Percent awarded [1]	67.3	67.9	65.3	71.0	66.5	64.6	65.2	64.4	66.3	62.5
Percent actually received payment	41.1	41.4	42.6	44.1	44.8	43.1	45.0	41.6	42.9	41.9
Women below poverty level:										
Total (in thousands)	1,973	2,566	2,898	2,797	3,191	3,206	3,513	4,234	3,871	3,816
Percent awarded [1]	38.1	39.7	42.5	40.4	44.3	43.3	38.9	51.9	51.1	53.0
Percent actually received payment	17.8	19.3	19.6	21.3	27.7	25.4	24.1	27.5	26.5	24.8
Aggregate payment (in billions of dollars): [2]										
Child support due	16.3	17.7	16.2	16.3	20.6	21.1	19.4	23.7	27.1	26.4
Child support received	10.5	10.9	11.5	10.7	14.1	14.4	13.2	15.0	17.3	15.8
Aggregate child support deficit	5.8	6.8	4.8	5.6	6.5	6.7	6.2	8.7	9.8	10.6

[1] Award status as of spring 1979, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1998.
[2] In 1997 dollars based on Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers.
[3] Data for 1991 are not directly compatible with data from prior years because of refinements to the survey universe.
[4] Data for 1993 are not directly compatible with data from prior years because of changes to survey questions.
[5] Preliminary data.

Note.—Payments for women with own children under age 21.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (1981, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2000).

TABLE 8–8.—CHILD SUPPORT AWARD STATUS AND INCLUSION OF HEALTH INSURANCE IN AWARD, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN, 1997 [1]

Characteristic	Total (thousands)	Supposed to receive child support payments in 1997		
		Total (thousands)	Health insurance included in child support award	
			Number (thousands)	Percent of total awarded
Current marital status: [2]				
Married	2,607	1,559	1134	66.6
Divorced	3,673	2,357	1,702	65.8
Separated	1,565	765	474	53.9
Never married	3,831	1,547	726	40.6
Race and Hispanic origin:				
White	8,264	4,752	3,367	63.4
Black	3,321	1,434	652	40.6
Hispanic [3]	1,710	688	381	47.7
Age:				
15–17 years	103	37	17	43.6
18–29 years	3,204	1,561	885	49.8
30–39 years	4,714	2,653	1,749	60.2
40 years and over	3,883	2,080	1,461	62.0
Years of school completed:				
Less than high school graduate	2,385	976	455	40.2
High school graduate or GED	4,399	2,336	1,509	57.9
Some college, no degree	2,624	1,476	1,053	64.8
Associate degree	1,043	653	459	63.0
Bachelors degree or more	1,454	891	635	64.3
Number of own children present from an absent father:				
One child	6,602	3,181	2,179	60.4
Two children	3,450	2,031	1,276	57.4
Three children	1,335	818	491	54.0
Four children or more	578	301	166	49.0
Total	11,905	6,331	4,112	58.1

[1] Preliminary data.
[2] Excludes a small number of currently widowed women whose previous marriage ended in divorce.
[3] Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

Note.—Women 15 years and older with own children under 21 years of age present from absent fathers as of spring 1998.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000.

The last panel of table 8–9 suggests an answer. This panel shows collections by the Federal-State program as a percentage of overall national child support payments. In 1978, less than one-fourth of child support payments were collected through the IV–D program. By 1997, fully 85 percent of all child support payments were made through the IV–D program. The implication of this trend is that the IV–D program may be recruiting more and more cases from the private sector, bringing them into the public sector, providing them with subsidized services (or substituting Federal spending for State and local spending), but not greatly improving overall collections. Whatever the explanation, it seems that improved effectiveness of

TABLE 8–9.—COMPARISON OF MEASURES OF IV–D EFFECTIVENESS WITH CENSUS CHILD SUPPORT DATA, 1978–95

Measure	Year									Percent change, 1978–97
	1978	1983	1985	1987	1989	1991 [1]	1993 [1]	1995	1997	
Federal-State IV–D program										
Total IV–D collections (1997 dollars, in billions) [2]	2.6	3.3	3.8	5.5	6.8	8.1	9.9	11.4	13.4	415
Parents located (thousands)	454	831	878	1,145	1,624	2,577	3,777	4,950	6,585	1,350
Paternities established (thousands)	111	208	232	269	339	472	554	659	848	664
Awards established (thousands)	315	496	669	812	936	[3] 821	1,026	1,051	1,156	267
National trends										
Total collections (1997 dollars, in billions) [2]	11.1	11.4	10.2	14.1	14.5	14.0	14.7	18.7	15.8	42
Of demographically eligible:										
Percent with awards	59	58	61	59	58	56	60	61	60	2
Percent supposed to receive payment	48	46	50	51	50	49	51	54	53	10
Percent who received some payment	35	35	37	39	37	38	37	37	36	3
Of mothers supposed to receive payment, percent who received full amount	49	50	48	51	51	52	35	40	42	14
IV–D collections as a percentage of national collections										
IV–D collections as a percent of total collections	23	28	37	40	47	58	64	61	85	270

[1] The Census Bureau collected data on custodial fathers for the first time for 1991; only the data on custodial mothers is included here.
[2] Constant fiscal year 1993 dollars using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers.
[3] The definition of support orders established changed in 1991.

Note.—Demographically eligible means women with own children under 21 years of age living with them from an absent father.

Sources: Office of Child Support Enforcement, Annual Reports to Congress, 1994 and various years; U.S. Census Bureau (1981, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1995, and 1997).

the IV–D program has not led to significant improvement of the Nation's child support performance.

The data in table 8–9 suffer from a potentially important flaw. Given that Congress passed major child support legislation in 1996, as part of the 1996 welfare reform legislation, the impacts of these reforms have not yet had time to become fully manifest. Thus, collections may now be improving rapidly, as State level data for 1998 seem to suggest, but national data through 1997 may not yet reflect the improvement.

Two additional statistics must be considered in any general assessment of national child support payments. First, according to Sorensen (1997), noncustodial parents owe over $30 billion in overdue child support. Some perspective on the magnitude of this figure is provided by recalling that the entire Federal outlay on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) welfare program in 1999 was about $16.5 billion.

But many critics of the child support system contend that this figure on arrearages, which is based on child support orders currently in place, is actually an underestimate of the shortcomings of the Nation's child support system. These critics hold that too few noncustodial parents have orders, that the amount of orders is too low, and that not enough of the amount owed is actually paid. Considerations of this sort have led to several studies of what might be called "child support collections potential"—the amount that could be collected by a perfectly efficient child support system.

The most recent of these studies, conducted by researchers at the Urban Institute (Sorensen, 1997), produced the estimate that $51 billion could be collected in child support each year. The assumptions underlying this estimate are that all custodial parents had an order, that payments were made in accordance with the Wisconsin guidelines (17 percent for one child, 25 percent for two children, 29 percent for three children, 31 percent for four children, and 34 percent for five or more children), and that the full amount of every order was actually paid. Of course, no one expects any program to be perfectly efficient. Even so, comparing the $51 billion that could be generated by a perfect system with the actual payments of around $16 billion in 1997 provides a useful index of how far we need to go as a Nation if we are to provide custodial parents and children with the measure of financial security that is the major goal of our child support system.

Finally, there does appear to be one area in which the Federal-State program is having some success. As discussed in detail in appendix N, nonmarital births have exploded since the 1960s. These cases are the most difficult ones in which to establish a child support order and make collections. Because there are more and more of these difficult cases each year, improved performance with other types of cases is being masked to some degree. Despite the difficulty of those cases, the Federal-State program has increased the probability of collections for never-married mothers from 4 percent in 1976 to 18 percent in 1997 (Sorensen and Halpern, 1999). Even so, the huge increase in these cases in recent decades has served to reduce the overall effectiveness of the Federal-State program.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Note: For legislative history before 1996, see previous editions of the *Green Book*.

1996

Title III of the 1996 welfare reform bill (Public Law 104–193) was devoted to major reforms of the Child Support Enforcement Program. A section-by-section summary of these reforms follows:

Sec. 301.—Imposes a State obligation to provide child support enforcement services for each child receiving assistance under IV–A (TANF), IV–E (foster care and adoption), and title XIX (Medicaid). Services must also be provided for others who apply, including families ceasing to receive assistance (no application is permitted for this group).

Sec. 302.—Changes distribution priorities to provide that families leaving welfare receive priority in payment of arrears. Changes are effective October 1, 1997 for postassistance arrears and October 1, 2000 for preassistance arrears. Exception is made for collections from the Federal Tax Refund Offset Program. Provides a hold harmless provision so that States are protected if the amount they lose because of changes in distribution exceeds what they gain from the elimination of the $50 passthrough (eliminated October 1, 1996).

Sec. 303.—Protects privacy rights with respect to confidential information.

Sec. 304.—Requires States to have procedures for providing notices of proceedings and copies of orders to recipients of program services or parties to cases being served under title IV–D.

Sec. 311.—Specifies requirements for the central State registry, including maintaining and updating a payment record and extracting data for matching with other databases. Allows automated linkages of local registries.

Sec. 312.—Specifies requirements for the centralized collection and disbursement of support payments, including the monitoring of payments, generating wage withholding notices, and automatic use of administrative enforcement remedies. Under some circumstances, permits linkages of local disbursement units to form centralized State disbursement unit for collection and disbursement of child support payments. Requires distribution within 2 business days of receipt of collection; requires transmission of withholding orders to employers within 2 business days of notice of income source subject to withholding.

Sec. 313.—Requires employers and labor organizations to report name, address, Social Security number (SSN), and employer identification number of new hires to State directory of new hires within 20 days of hire (in the case of an employer transmitting reports magnetically or electronically, reports may be made by two monthly transmissions); requires the report to be the W–4 or equivalent at option of the employer with penalties assessed for failure to report. State directory must perform database matching using SSNs and report findings to any State; directory must also report information to the National directory within 3 business days, and issue

withholding notices within 2 business days of match, among other requirements.

Sec. 314.—Strengthens and expands income withholding from wages to pay child support by reducing the time for employers to remit withheld wages to 7 business days and adding a State law requirement that allows issuance of electronic withholding orders by State agency and without notice to obligor.

Sec. 315.—Includes requirements for access by State child support agency to locator information from State motor vehicle and law enforcement systems.

Sec. 316.—Expands the authority of FPLS to obtain information and locate individuals. Permits access to the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS) for the enforcement of child custody and visitation orders but specifies that requests must come through courts or child support agencies. Requires establishment of a Federal case registry of child support orders, and details guidelines for the National directory of new hires. Allows disclosure of certain information, including Federal tax offset amounts, to child support enforcement agents.

Sec. 317.—Requires use of SSNs on applications for professional licenses, commercial driver's licenses, occupational license or marriage licenses, and in records for divorce decrees, support orders, paternity determinations or acknowledgments and death certificates.

Sec. 321.—Mandates adoption by all States of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act.

Sec. 322.—Clarifies priorities for recognition of orders.

Sec. 323.—Requires States to respond within 5 business days to a request from another State to enforce a support order; electronic means are allowed for transmitting requests.

Sec. 324.—Calls for the promulgation of forms, developed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), to be used in interstate income withholding cases, the imposition of liens, and administrative subpoenas across State lines.

Sec. 325.—Grants authority to State IV–D programs to order genetic testing for paternity establishment, issue a subpoena for financial or other information, and require all entities to respond to requests for information "without the necessity of obtaining an order from any other judicial or administrative tribunal, but subject to due process safeguards as appropriate." Grants States access to public records such as vital statistics of marriage, birth and divorce, State and local tax records, real and titled personal property, license records, employment security records, public assistance programs, motor vehicle records, and corrections records. Also grants access to certain private records such as public utility and cable television records and financial institution data, among other administrative measures.

Sec. 331.—Streamlines the legal processes for establishment of paternity, allows establishment of paternity anytime before a child turns 18, and provides for mandatory genetic testing in contested cases, among other provisions.

Sec. 332.—Mandates that State programs publicize the availability and encourage the use of procedures for voluntary establishment of paternity and child support.

Sec. 333.—Requires States to determine whether recipients of aid under the TANF Program or Medicaid are cooperating with the State in conducting child support activities against the noncustodial parent.

Sec. 341.—Requires the Secretary of DHHS to develop a new cost-neutral incentive system by March 1, 1997 which provides additional payments to any State based on such State's performance. Increases the mandatory IV–D paternity establishment percentage in graduated phases from 75 to 90 percent.

Sec. 342.—Changes the audit process to be based on performance measures and requires the Secretary to ensure that State data meets high standards of accuracy and completeness.

Sec. 343.—Requires States to collect and report program data in a uniform manner as a State plan requirement.

Sec. 344.—Creates additional requirements for the State automated data processing systems, and sets a deadline of October 1, 2000 for implementation. Contains a new implementation timetable that extends to October 1, 1997 the deadline by which a State must have an automated case tracking and monitoring system meeting all Federal IV–D requirements up through the enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988. Caps aggregate spending on the new automated system at $400,000 and requires the Secretary to devise a formula for distributing these funds among the States. The Federal Government will pay 80 percent of State costs of meeting the new requirements.

Sec. 345.—Sets aside 1 percent of the Federal share of reimbursed public assistance for information, training, and related technical assistance concerning State automated systems and research, demonstration, and special projects of regional or national significance. An additional 2 percent is set aside for the operation of the FPLS.

Sec. 346.—Clarifies data collection requirements and eliminates requirements for unnecessary or duplicate information. Several new data reports are to be included in the annual report to Congress, including information about State compliance.

Sec. 351.—Requires processes for periodic modification of all child support orders, with review occurring every 3 years, upon request.

Sec. 352.—Expands access and use of consumer reports by child support agencies for establishing and modifying child support.

Sec. 353.—Specifies that depository institutions are not liable for disclosing financial information to the Child Support Enforcement Agency; the Child Support Enforcement Agency is prohibited from disclosing information obtained except for child support purposes.

Sec. 361.—Makes technical corrections to the Social Security Act section on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) collection of arrearages.

Sec. 362.—Eliminates separate withholding rules for all Federal employees. Establishes procedures by which Federal agencies must aggressively pursue child support collections from Federal employees.

Sec. 363.—Establishes procedures by which all branches of the armed forces must aggressively pursue child support collections from Federal employees.

Sec. 364.—Requires States to have laws that prevent obligor from transferring income or property to avoid paying child support.

Sec. 365.—Requires State child support officials to have the authority to seek a judicial or administrative order that requires any individual owing past-due support to pay such support in accordance with a plan approved by the court or participate in work activities.

Sec. 366.—Provides a definition of a support order.

Sec. 367.—Requires all child support delinquencies and their amounts to be reported to credit bureaus.

Sec. 368.—Requires liens on real and personal property and the extension of full faith and credit to liens arising in another State in cases of past-due child support.

Sec. 369.—Requires States to have laws providing for the suspension of driver's, professional, occupational, and recreational licenses.

Sec. 370.—Establishes a process by which the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services can submit the names of delinquent obligors who are at least $5,000 in arrears to the State Department for the denial of their passports.

Sec. 371.—Authorizes Federal officials to declare any foreign country to be a foreign reciprocating country for purposes of establishment and collection of child support obligations.

Sec. 372.—Requires States to enter agreements with financial institutions doing business in the State to develop a data match system by which records on individuals having accounts with the financial institution are matched against the list of child support obligors who have overdue payments.

Sec. 373.—Adds a State option that a child support order of a child of minor parents, if the mother is receiving cash assistance, may be enforceable against parents of the noncustodial parent of the child.

Sec. 374.—Clarifies that child support assigned to a State in assistance cases is not dischargeable in bankruptcy.

Sec. 375.—Allows States to enter cooperative agreements with Indian tribes; allows the Secretary to make direct Federal funding to Indian tribes meeting certain criteria.

Sec. 381.—Requires the application of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) to support orders that are judgments, decrees or orders issued by any court of competent jurisdiction or through a State administrative process.

Sec. 382.—Adds a new State law requirement providing that the State IV–D agency have procedures for notifying a new employer of an absent parent, when the absent parent was providing health care coverage of the child in the previous job, of the medical support obligation.

Sec. 391.—Provides $10 million per year to the Secretary to award grants to States for the purpose of establishing programs to facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation of their children.

1997

Public Law 105–33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, made 28 technical changes to the 1996 welfare reform law (Public Law 104–193).

1998

Public Law 105–187, the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998, established two new categories of felony offenses, subject to a 2-year maximum prison term: (1) traveling in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation if the obligation has remained unpaid for more than 1 year or is greater than $5,000; and (2) willfully failing to pay a child support obligation regarding a child residing in another State if the obligation has remained unpaid for more than 2 years or is greater than $10,000.

Public Law 105–200, the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998, established a new cost/budget-neutral incentive system based on five performance measures that create strong incentives for States to operate efficient and effective programs. The law also imposes less severe financial penalties on States that failed to meet the October 1997 deadline for implementing a statewide CSE automated data processing and information retrieval system. It also includes provisions related to medical support and privacy protections, and makes other minor changes.

Public Law 105–306, the Noncitizen Benefit Clarification and Other Technical Amendments Act of 1998, includes a correction to Public Law 105–200 that allows a State that failed to comply with the 1996 child support data processing requirements to have its annual penalty reduced by 20 percent for each of the five performance measures under the child support incentive system for which it achieves a maximum score. In addition, the provision would clarify the date by which States must pass laws implementing medical child support provisions to allow time for State legislatures that meet biennially to pass laws after final Federal regulations are issued in year 2000.

1999

Public Law 106–113, the Fiscal Year 2000 Consolidated Appropriations Bill, provides an alternative penalty for States that are not in compliance with the centralized State disbursement unit requirement, but which have submitted a corrective compliance plan by April l, 2000, that describes how, by when, and at what cost the State would achieve compliance with the State disbursement unit requirement. The DHHS Secretary is required to reduce the amount the State would otherwise have received in Federal child support payments by the penalty amount for the fiscal year. The penalty amount percentage is 4 percent in the case of the first fiscal year of noncompliance; 8 percent in the second year; 16 percent in the third year; 25 percent in the fourth year; or 30 percent in the fifth or any subsequent year. In addition, the law provides for coordination of the alternative disbursement unit penalty with the automated systems penalty so that States that fail to implement both the automated data processing requirement and the State dis-

bursement unit requirement are subject to only one alternative penalty.

Public Law 106–169, the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, limits the hold harmless requirement of current law by stipulating that States would only be entitled to hold harmless funds if the State's share of child support collections are less than they were in fiscal year 1995 and the State has distributed and disregarded to welfare families at least 80 percent of child support collected on their behalf in the preceding fiscal year or the State has distributed to former welfare recipients the State share of child support payments collected via the Federal Income Tax Offset Program. If these conditions are met, the State's share of child support collections would be increased by 50 percent of the difference between what the State would have received in fiscal year 1995 and its share of child support collections in the pertinent fiscal year. Public Law 106–169 repeals the hold harmless provision effective October 1, 2001.

TABLE 8–10.—STATE PROFILE OF COLLECTIONS AND EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1998 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

State	Total collections	AFDC collections	Non-AFDC collections	Total expenditures	Child support collections per dollar of administrative expenditures			Incentive payments (estimate)
					Total	AFDC total	Non-AFDC total	
Alabama	$172.4	$15.5	$156.9	$50.7	$3.40	$0.31	$3.09	$2.6
Alaska	64.3	17.7	46.6	18.2	3.52	0.97	2.55	2.7
Arizona	144.3	20.6	123.7	54.2	2.66	0.38	2.28	3.6
Arkansas	99.4	14.8	84.6	34.5	2.88	0.43	2.45	2.6
California	1,372.4	611.0	761.3	515.4	2.66	1.19	1.48	83.6
Colorado	140.3	30.0	110.4	45.1	3.11	0.66	2.45	5.0
Connecticut	154.4	56.9	97.5	47.9	3.23	1.19	2.04	7.4
Delaware	42.0	7.6	34.4	16.5	2.55	0.46	2.09	1.0
District of Columbia	32.7	4.7	28.0	16.5	1.98	0.28	1.69	0.9
Florida	507.1	61.6	445.5	166.9	3.04	0.37	2.67	12.2
Georgia	300.8	58.4	242.4	85.1	3.53	0.69	2.85	8.7
Guam	7.3	1.5	5.8	4.2	1.72	0.35	1.37	0.2
Hawaii	62.3	11.6	50.7	24.0	2.60	0.48	2.12	1.7
Idaho	53.8	7.9	45.9	14.6	3.69	0.54	3.15	1.6
Illinois	300.2	80.6	219.7	119.9	2.50	0.67	1.83	11.8
Indiana	227.2	38.1	189.1	41.7	5.45	0.91	4.54	5.6
Iowa	185.1	42.4	142.7	38.6	4.79	1.10	3.69	6.2
Kansas	122.2	24.8	97.5	40.1	3.05	0.62	2.43	3.7
Kentucky	185.5	37.8	147.8	47.6	3.90	0.79	3.10	5.4
Louisiana	170.6	21.6	149.0	42.3	4.03	0.51	3.52	3.1
Maine	73.8	30.4	43.4	17.4	4.25	1.75	2.50	5.1

TABLE 8–10.—STATE PROFILE OF COLLECTIONS AND EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1998 [1]—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

State	Total collections	AFDC collections	Non-AFDC collections	Total expenditures	Child support collections per dollar of administrative expenditures			Incentive payments (estimate)
					Total	AFDC total	Non-AFDC total	
Maryland	357.1	31.5	325.6	82.9	4.31	0.38	3.93	4.1
Massachusetts	274.7	58.2	216.4	59.9	4.58	0.97	3.61	7.7
Michigan	1,151.8	150.4	1,001.5	160.4	7.18	0.94	6.24	20.0
Minnesota	394.7	56.2	338.5	102.5	3.85	0.55	3.30	7.9
Mississippi	112.2	16.9	95.3	30.4	3.69	0.56	3.14	2.6
Missouri	286.7	58.1	228.6	85.3	3.36	0.68	2.68	8.4
Montana	36.9	7.2	30.0	11.7	3.15	0.62	2.54	1.3
Nebraska	117.1	12.9	104.2	25.1	4.66	0.51	4.15	1.9
Nevada	69.1	7.5	61.6	23.9	2.90	0.31	2.58	2.3
New Hampshire	61.0	9.0	52.0	13.6	4.50	0.66	3.83	1.4
New Jersey	581.9	77.5	504.4	125.3	4.64	0.62	4.03	11.0
New Mexico	37.3	9.4	27.9	23.4	1.59	0.40	1.19	1.4
New York	834.5	187.6	646.9	200.8	4.16	0.93	3.22	26.7
North Carolina	311.7	51.2	260.5	108.9	2.86	0.47	2.39	7.5
North Dakota	36.1	4.7	31.3	7.6	4.75	0.62	4.12	0.8
Ohio	1,151.2	102.3	1,048.9	202.9	5.67	0.50	5.17	14.4
Oklahoma	86.7	22.5	64.2	27.9	3.10	0.80	2.30	3.5
Oregon	209.2	25.0	184.2	39.5	5.29	0.63	4.66	4.9
Pennsylvania	1,043.0	117.7	925.3	147.7	7.06	0.80	6.26	15.9
Puerto Rico	145.1	2.3	142.8	27.0	5.38	0.09	5.29	0.3
Rhode Island	41.9	19.1	22.8	10.0	4.18	1.91	2.27	3.5
South Carolina	153.9	20.1	133.8	32.6	4.71	0.61	4.10	2.9
South Dakota	34.5	5.3	29.2	5.6	6.13	0.94	5.19	1.0

Tennessee	188.4	34.2	154.2	52.6	3.58	0.65	2.93	4.6
Texas	685.0	122.0	563.0	182.0	3.76	0.67	3.09	18.5
Utah	97.0	21.3	75.8	32.1	3.03	0.66	2.36	3.2
Vermont	31.7	8.6	23.2	7.6	4.20	1.13	3.06	1.2
Virginia	276.9	43.3	233.5	61.1	4.53	0.71	3.82	7.0
Virgin Islands	6.1	0.6	5.5	2.3	2.67	0.25	2.42	0.1
Washington	474.4	102.5	371.9	126.8	3.74	0.81	2.93	15.2
West Virginia	109.4	13.2	96.2	24.5	4.47	0.54	3.93	1.9
Wisconsin	499.3	53.6	445.7	90.9	5.49	0.59	4.90	7.2
Wyoming	33.1	2.8	30.3	8.9	3.72	0.32	3.41	0.5
Total	14,347.7	2,649.9	11,697.8	3,585.0	4.00	0.74	3.26	385.0

[1] Totals may not add due of rounding.

Note.—Data is preliminary for fiscal year 1996. AFDC = Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–11.—TOTAL CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979–98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1979	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	$6,854	$66,174	$80,952	$98,141	$113,273	$127,908	$141,212	$157,887	$170,581	172,407
Alaska	3,844	26,788	30,721	35,613	39,148	45,851	51,734	57,708	64,919	64,262
Arizona	6,411	27,837	33,277	46,447	66,580	77,419	93,812	113,481	132,049	144,348
Arkansas	3,921	26,010	32,783	42,065	49,147	55,215	63,875	79,432	91,457	99,373
California	199,945	522,646	591,243	653,681	736,855	811,493	857,282	1,034,409	1,174,214	1,372,354
Colorado	4,020	39,601	46,997	58,030	67,723	80,288	91,870	108,259	123,565	140,311
Connecticut	23,033	66,724	75,778	84,190	93,454	98,448	117,723	125,234	141,543	154,374
Delaware	5,814	20,161	22,692	25,926	26,663	29,663	31,551	35,395	38,616	42,006
District of Columbia	1,086	13,598	16,578	19,733	21,798	24,079	26,040	27,791	29,906	32,716
Florida	10,524	176,603	214,153	252,473	289,976	327,296	374,015	411,799	484,630	507,113
Georgia	5,554	113,095	143,014	174,467	205,566	229,822	244,367	268,599	278,060	300,772
Guam	160	1,440	3,162	4,697	5,003	7,079	6,037	6,736	6,682	7,251
Hawaii	5,150	27,638	30,096	34,404	37,327	45,107	48,751	52,182	55,016	62,314
Idaho	2,501	22,909	23,442	27,846	32,127	36,942	40,747	44,003	48,025	53,779
Illinois	10,740	136,019	150,134	183,308	183,889	202,191	219,340	249,834	267,360	300,240
Indiana	9,073	96,145	110,117	124,614	141,164	151,626	174,450	196,935	208,444	227,203
Iowa	13,017	70,982	80,693	96,046	109,278	122,705	136,138	151,907	166,155	185,099
Kansas	3,975	44,958	54,832	66,053	59,601	86,744	97,571	107,579	114,979	122,230
Kentucky	4,881	59,998	73,928	93,902	103,587	121,427	130,640	144,901	164,357	185,550
Louisiana	12,678	60,527	67,988	84,373	103,054	118,008	129,609	143,644	154,821	170,555
Maine	4,574	35,741	36,554	38,005	44,963	51,184	57,361	62,585	68,615	73,783
Maryland	20,856	151,352	163,626	194,009	219,085	244,645	265,344	287,923	322.363	357.095
Massachusetts	36,338	176,915	169,545	185,086	195,374	203,986	223,560	247,948	258,584	274,662
Michigan	248,414	644,734	697,634	782,804	874,483	898,372	859,629	948,558	1,092,176	1,151,824
Minnesota	21,370	139,345	160,363	189,495	214,480	246,252	283,538	318,773	355,372	394,671
Mississippi	1,662	30,532	40,277	48,289	53,505	62,379	68,205	84,551	97,018	112,224
Missouri	5,829	129,851	141,372	166,339	189,161	214,362	238,700	279,225	318,310	286,735
Montana	1,213	8,822	12,968	17,436	20,150	21,363	25,532	29,356	33,401	36,922
Nebraska	2,468	52,378	57,055	66,177	71,708	81,082	90,055	95,373	108,624	117,127
Nevada	3,487	16,210	23,346	32,080	37,641	43,722	50,066	56,620	60,063	69,133

New Hampshire	2,089	20,604	22,659	27,360	31,497	36,538	42,570	48,242	54,469	60,976
New Jersey	94,005	281,923	326,879	372,506	407,849	439,748	480,327	500,157	553,713	581,902
New Mexico	1,680	14,416	16,792	19,088	27,117	30,082	26,938	30,114	34,417	37,310
New York	136,361	373,718	437,371	487,738	536,374	569,682	619,489	701,885	803,826	834,477
North Carolina	9,168	120,344	140,222	167,894	197,254	226,632	233,145	261,672	298,908	311,684
North Dakota	1,723	10,414	12,309	15,599	18,693	21,878	25,522	28,470	32,209	36,065
Ohio	22,832	489,515	552,649	665,999	714,132	789,319	886,843	981,342	1,083,543	1,151,229
Oklahoma	1,826	32,169	39,922	46,540	52,170	57,578	63,908	73,455	79,782	86,665
Oregon	88,502	78,374	91,252	107,435	124,929	142,227	156,829	178,428	197,911	209,182
Pennsylvania	186,718	614,222	699,676	775,782	814,480	861,653	895,720	958,281	1,006,860	1,042,987
Puerto Rico	1,916	74,535	77,252	84,329	97,357	98,628	107,397	126,711	142,555	145,132
Rhode Island	3,575	20,044	21,609	24,880	26,671	29,900	32,634	35,524	38,825	41,902
South Carolina	3,545	52,320	58,857	68,798	79,280	90,628	102,912	118,147	135,657	153,916
South Dakota	1,407	11,024	13,119	15,881	18,112	21,357	24,838	28,018	30,888	34,489
Tennessee	8,976	71,502	77,032	84,818	116,152	141,388	156,904	159,804	172,823	188,406
Texas	8,207	132,318	192,797	251,157	309,502	367,171	448,463	538,253	618,066	685,028
Utah	6,624	38,071	43,895	52,610	56,199	61,135	63,426	77,600	84,542	97,014
Vermont	1,449	9,353	11,023	13,518	15,831	17,950	21,234	25,370	27,878	31,712
Virginia	9,197	110,560	129,919	145,114	151,919	182,787	226,682	257,180	292,830	276,876
Virgin Islands	260	3,131	3,338	4,049	4,992	5,562	5,399	5,438	5,921	6,123
Washington	27,018	175,750	222,409	267,455	307,251	340,488	375,257	407,002	451,730	474,433
West Virginia	1,592	21,658	23,527	35,561	49,016	54,402	72,796	84,233	98,148	109,384
Wisconsin	34,267	241,272	276,712	293,460	332,814	380,584	427,487	440,239	459,882	499,272
Wyoming	520	7,155	9,079	11,220	13,810	16,184	17,350	25,021	28,683	33,110
Total	1,332,847	6,010,125	6,885,619	7,964,522	8,909,166	9,850,159	10,752,824	12,018,767	13,363,972	14,347,707

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–12.—TOTAL AFDC COLLECTIONS BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979–98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1979	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	$6,830	$19,484	$22,788	$23,001	$22,539	$21,148	$21,115	$23,464	$23,361	$15,486
Alaska	334	8,160	9,940	11,145	11,722	13,645	16,138	18,464	20,637	17,691
Arizona	642	6,102	7,401	12,693	18,616	21,175	24,217	23,764	26,031	20,632
Arkansas	2,428	11,799	13,800	15,766	16,249	15,662	16,831	19,746	19,876	14,760
California	117,532	248,440	286,261	314,232	335,235	374,548	401,573	496,185	544,639	611,023
Colorado	3,525	16,765	19,281	23,287	26,197	29,415	31,192	35,572	36,950	29,958
Connecticut	11,416	27,405	33,816	37,744	41,292	41,465	54,100	54,323	60,342	56,904
Delaware	1,386	5,826	6,661	7,306	7,798	7,855	8,029	8,315	7,962	7,595
District of Columbia	907	4,118	4,407	4,927	5,197	5,614	5,923	6,032	5,631	4,689
Florida	8,598	48,364	57,071	69,765	78,081	80,368	85,244	80,685	100,231	61,625
Georgia	4,772	45,937	57,765	74,546	84,627	84,820	84,932	102,399	77,173	58,405
Guam	159	520	1,635	2,524	2,344	1,948	1,723	2,003	1,320	1,465
Hawaii	2,544	8,343	7,699	8,161	9,058	9,951	11,367	12,241	11,510	11,578
Idaho	2,047	6,952	7,482	8,543	8,746	10,086	10,912	11,109	10,225	7,874
Illinois	9,916	44,149	48,968	58,842	55,749	61,112	65,091	72,391	77,683	80,566
Indiana	8,116	38,124	45,030	49,247	52,040	51,945	50,962	44,994	39,853	38,070
Iowa	10,654	28,552	30,585	35,401	36,775	40,105	41,007	40,100	40,773	42,358
Kansas	3,454	15,209	17,454	20,869	22,402	24,732	27,567	28,779	27,072	24,764
Kentucky	4,615	22,286	27,502	34,702	36,565	37,979	39,299	39,445	39,449	37,786
Louisiana	5,244	20,861	23,089	25,975	26,827	26,714	28,133	31,228	27,123	21,553
Maine	4,133	21,089	21,063	21,477	25,683	27,783	28,435	29,542	31,810	30,409
Maryland	10,929	42,318	37,162	46,348	51,313	48,031	47,419	46,709	38,008	31,480
Massachusetts	29,145	68,968	66,969	71,784	77,292	76,899	77,085	71,421	67,382	58,242
Michigan	76,375	145,251	153,690	168,317	169,581	176,100	167,673	170,955	161,658	150,357
Minnesota	14,510	43,950	47,802	53,305	55,961	61,418	64,406	64,872	64,572	56,177
Mississippi	1,556	14,530	19,494	21,523	21,641	22,962	22,067	24,450	21,857	16,927

Missouri	4,165	38,056	37,021	49,653	51,153	55,959	57,788	66,610	51,858	58,140
Montana	685	4,394	5,251	6,413	6,464	6,118	7,452	8,170	8,328	7,213
Nebraska	2,083	6,990	7,431	9,195	9,797	10,158	11,337	12,437	12,675	12,893
Nevada	517	3,311	4,465	6,807	7,021	7,271	7,643	8,441	8,433	7,508
New Hampshire	2,089	3,606	4,385	6,337	7,638	9,446	10,776	10,532	9,845	8,995
New Jersey	28,622	61,473	76,644	83,509	84,020	86,357	88,932	90,644	88,149	77,520
New Mexico	1,160	5,573	6,421	7,850	12,922	13,389	9,257	6,253	9,498	9,381
New York	56,588	134,040	157,582	174,587	184,583	183,707	187,205	205,855	224,751	187,613
North Carolina	7,714	46,176	54,712	64,004	70,304	76,808	75,209	75,017	74,283	51,171
North Dakota	1,379	5,103	5,600	6,016	6,098	6,148	6,334	6,108	5,967	4,744
Ohio	21,974	76,888	84,304	100,833	105,719	113,425	120,127	124,814	123,515	102,348
Oklahoma	1,260	11,875	14,894	17,682	18,784	20,817	22,287	24,345	23,980	22,483
Oregon	12,977	18,877	21,989	25,637	28,357	30,119	30,586	31,152	29,283	25,003
Pennsylvania	33,190	96,328	113,735	123,784	124,490	26,932	134,995	138,685	123,350	117,670
Puerto Rico	439	1,707	1,600	1,428	1,344	1,445	2,418	2,821	2,814	2,323
Rhode Island	3,438	10,168	10,550	13,486	14,954	16,539	17,704	18,351	18,869	19,131
South Carolina	3,065	15,933	17,779	21,066	24,588	27,063	27,933	29,614	24,935	20,072
South Dakota	1,137	3,717	4,213	4,888	5,056	5,645	6,129	6,617	6,163	5,294
Tennessee	3,871	22,926	27,865	22,777	33,422	34,852	47,576	34,740	31,556	34,187
Texas	6,370	39,659	47,255	59,165	66,199	75,830	88,507	102,752	108,101	121,982
Utah	5,442	14,999	16,261	18,939	19,488	20,691	20,948	21,555	21,001	21,262
Vermont	1,201	5,578	6,380	6,649	7,638	7,424	8,312	8,912	8,379	8,555
Virginia	9,081	27,770	33,910	38,281	39,610	37,579	48,109	46,351	46,883	43,326
Virgin Islands	143	210	233	282	343	357	352	484	628	573
Washington	18,319	65,291	77,402	91,083	100,337	104,063	109,763	112,819	112,561	102,533
West Virginia	1,430	4,085	6,859	9,500	16,867	12,377	13,846	15,307	15,919	13,213
Wisconsin	26,044	59,303	61,179	63,813	65,439	81,437	94,558	80,986	63,592	53,597
Wyoming	379	2,584	3,226	3,749	4,345	4,288	4,665	4,945	4,233	2,827
Total	596,532	1,750,125	1,983,962	2,258,844	2,416,511	2,549,723	2,693,186	2,854,502	2,842,681	2,649,930

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–13.—TOTAL NON-AFDC COLLECTIONS BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979–98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1979	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	$16	$46,691	$58,165	$75,140	$90,733	$106,760	$120,098	$134,423	$147,221	$156,921
Alaska	3,510	18,628	20,781	24,468	27,426	32,207	35,596	39,245	44,283	46,572
Arizona	5,769	21,735	25,875	33,754	47,963	56,243	69,594	89,273	106,018	123,716
Arkansas	1,494	14,211	18,984	26,299	32,899	39,553	47,045	59,686	71,581	84,614
California	82,412	274,205	304,982	339,449	401,620	436,945	455,708	538,224	629,575	761,331
Colorado	496	22,836	27,715	34,743	41,527	50,873	60,678	72,688	86,614	110,353
Connecticut	11,617	39,319	41,960	46,445	52,161	56,983	63,623	70,911	81,201	97,470
Delaware	4,428	14,335	16,032	18,620	18,865	21,809	23,522	27,080	30,654	34,411
District of Columbia	179	9,481	12,171	14,806	16,601	18,465	20,117	21,759	24,275	28,026
Florida	1,926	128,239	157,081	182,707	211,896	246,928	288,770	331,114	384,399	445,488
Georgia	783	67,158	85,249	99,921	120,939	145,002	159,435	166,200	200,887	242,368
Guam	(1)	920	1,527	2,172	2,659	5,131	4,314	4,733	5,361	5,786
Hawaii	2,606	19,295	22,397	26,243	28,269	35,156	37,384	39,941	43,505	50,737
Idaho	454	15,957	15,960	19,302	23,381	26,856	29,835	32,894	37,800	45,905
Illinois	823	91,870	101,167	124,467	128,140	141,079	154,249	177,443	189,677	219,674
Indiana	957	58,021	65,087	75,368	89,125	99,680	123,488	151,941	168,591	189,133
Iowa	2,363	42,430	50,109	60,645	72,503	82,599	95,131	111,807	125,383	142,741
Kansas	520	29,749	37,379	45,183	37,199	62,012	70,003	78,799	87,907	97,466
Kentucky	266	37,711	46,426	59,200	67,022	83,448	91,341	105,457	124,908	147,764
Louisiana	7,434	39,665	44,898	58,398	76,227	91,293	101,476	112,416	127,699	149,003
Maine	441	14,652	15,490	16,528	19,280	23,402	28,927	33,043	36,806	43,374
Maryland	9,927	109,034	126,464	147,660	167,771	196,614	217,925	241,214	284,355	325,615
Massachusetts	7,193	107,948	102,576	113,302	118,082	127,087	146,475	176,527	191,202	216,421
Michigan	172,039	499,483	543,944	614,488	704,903	722,273	691,956	777,603	930,518	1,001,467
Minnesota	6,861	95,395	112,561	136,190	158,519	184,834	219,131	253,900	290,799	338,494
Mississippi	106	16,002	20,783	26,766	31,864	39,417	46,139	60,101	75,161	95,298

Missouri	1,664	91,795	104,351	116,686	138,008	158,403	180,912	212,614	266,452	228,595
Montana	528	4,427	7,718	11,024	13,686	15,245	18,080	21,187	25,073	29,709
Nebraska	385	45,387	49,624	56,983	61,911	70,925	78,718	82,936	95,949	104,234
Nevada	2,970	12,899	18,881	25,273	30,620	36,451	42,423	48,179	51,630	61,625
New Hampshire	0	16,999	18,274	21,023	23,859	27,092	31,793	37,710	44,624	51,981
New Jersey	65,383	220,450	250,235	288,997	323,829	353,390	391,395	409,513	465,564	504,382
New Mexico	520	8,843	10,371	11,239	14,195	16,693	17,681	23,860	24,919	27,929
New York	79,773	239,678	279,289	313,151	351,791	385,974	432,284	496,030	579,075	646,864
North Carolina	1,454	74,167	85,510	103,890	126,951	149,824	157,936	186,655	224,625	260,513
North Dakota	344	5,312	6,708	9,583	12,595	15,730	19,188	22,361	26,242	31,321
Ohio	858	412,627	468,346	565,166	608,413	675,895	766,715	856,529	960,029	1,048,880
Oklahoma	566	20,293	25,028	28,858	33,386	36,760	41,621	49,109	55,802	64,182
Oregon	75,525	59,497	69,263	81,798	96,572	112,108	126,244	147,276	168,627	184,179
Pennsylvania	153,528	517,893	517,893	651,998	689,990	734,721	760,725	819,596	883,510	925,317
Puerto Rico	1,477	72,828	75,652	82,901	96,014	97,184	104,979	123,890	139,741	142,808
Rhode Island	137	9,876	11,059	11,394	11,717	13,361	14,931	17,173	19,955	22,771
South Carolina	480	36,387	41,078	47,732	54,692	63,565	74,978	88,533	110,722	133,844
South Dakota	270	7,307	8,906	10,993	13,056	15,711	18,709	21,401	24,724	29,195
Tennessee	5,105	48,575	49,167	62,041	82,730	106,536	109,328	125,064	141,267	154,220
Texas	1,837	92,659	145,543	191,993	243,303	291,341	359,956	435,501	509,964	563,046
Utah	1,183	23,073	27,634	33,671	36,712	40,445	42,478	56,045	63,541	75,752
Vermont	249	3,775	4,643	6,869	8,193	10,526	12,922	16,458	19,498	23,157
Virginia	116	82,789	96,008	106,833	112,309	145,207	178,572	210,828	245,946	233,549
Virgin Islands	116	2,920	3,105	3,767	4,649	5,205	5,047	4,955	5,293	5,549
Washington	8,699	110,459	145,006	176,372	206,914	236,425	265,495	294,184	339,169	371,900
West Virginia	162	17,574	16,668	26,061	32,149	42,025	58,951	68,926	82,229	96,171
Wisconsin	8,224	181,969	215,533	229,647	267,374	299,147	332,929	359,253	396,290	445,675
Wyoming	141	4,571	5,853	7,471	9,465	11,896	12,685	20,076	24,449	30,283
Total	736,315	4,260,000	4,901,657	5,705,678	6,492,655	7,300,436	8,059,637	9,164,265	10,521,291	11,697,777

[1] Less than $500.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–14.—AVERAGE NUMBER OF AFDC CHILD SUPPORT CASES IN WHICH A COLLECTION WAS MADE, BY STATE FOR SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1978–98

State	1978	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	7,966	9,133	10,860	8,347	9,209	9,077	7,679	6,961	5,749	3,843
Alaska	246	1,120	1,387	1,718	1,949	2,168	2,415	2,620	2,700	2,627
Arizona	819	1,851	3,128	1,930	2,822	3,343	7,384	6,764	6,805	4,614
Arkansas	2,509	5,207	6,372	7,071	8,188	8,301	6,773	6,589	5,673	6,070
California	92,325	103,742	89,304	104,903	116,118	123,776	173,547	224,932	258,104	303,129
Colorado	3,177	5,687	4,437	4,581	5,126	5,210	4,418	4,202	3,730	2,577
Connecticut	8,002	15,565	6,578	7,128	8,445	9,437	10,792	11,574	12,127	10,734
Delaware	1,156	2,891	2,223	2,495	2,663	2,913	2,880	2,543	2,205	1,807
District of Columbia	708	1,925	1,758	1,940	2,281	2,437	2,534	2,357	2,109	2,334
Florida	7,376	16,468	38,500	40,687	40,135	44,727	49,284	41,195	14,477	10,538
Georgia	6,350	6,657	19,310	23,280	24,729	26,676	28,639	25,136	23,768	19,964
Guam	(1)	206	197	573	616	683	646	559	442	477
Hawaii	1,757	4,622	2,658	2,773	4,651	4,551	2,920	3,428	2,930	2,983
Idaho	1,346	4,343	1,752	1,992	2,356	2,719	3,130	3,073	2,155	1,274
Illinois	9,624	18,299	16,968	23,511	23,639	26,028	28,430	29,586	20,045	24,470
Indiana	9,488	22,058	20,444	26,344	30,823	31,159	111,078	30,119	5,927	3,402
Iowa	8,396	11,871	7,289	7,153	7,681	7,365	7,057	5,604	5,006	5,077
Kansas	2,859	4,769	4,595	5,268	6,120	6,857	7,515	7,064	5,241	3,854
Kentucky	3,083	6,729	10,741	12,513	13,516	15,217	12,679	11,607	10,272	8,723
Louisiana	5,204	7,836	11,842	12,198	12,510	12,164	11,887	11,957	30,353	7,177
Maine	2,368	7,178	5,515	5,767	5,287	7,013	8,793	8,981	8,946	8,230
Maryland	14,002	15,861	9,237	18,330	19,366	18,684	18,119	16,574	12,786	9,109
Massachusetts	17,782	25,350	16,029	16,106	17,961	18,378	22,245	17,118	15,458	11,282
Michigan	61,985	59,049	51,747	46,647	45,112	45,211	39,332	36,496	30,641	33,606
Minnesota	9,818	14,872	14,192	12,658	14,563	16,440	17,170	15,778	14,733	10,852
Mississippi	1,846	3,742	7,237	8,808	9,604	10,157	9,970	9,732	7,300	4,621
Missouri	(2)	7,716	6,483	11,241	13,430	14,135	13,096	13,987	9,880	11,824

Montana	748	1,600	1,140	1,298	1,551	1,816	2,169	2,319	2,051	1,442
Nebraska	1,509	2,362	2,811	3,255	4,802	4,811	5,538	5,737	5,608	5,171
Nevada	494	2,370	2,269	2,404	3,096	3,506	3,518	4,792	4,603	4,990
New Hampshire	1,530	1,021	1,091	1,454	2,240	2,703	3,328	3,215	2,889	2,628
New Jersey	16,243	27,686	17,591	19,728	24,376	26,241	26,899	27,310	24,833	18,753
New Mexico	1,429	2,034	3,766	4,383	3,865	4,385	6,613	7,427	6,609	1,897
New York	36,287	48,979	40,219	46,382	51,290	51,407	51,943	52,741	51,495	50,846
North Carolina	11,232	14,216	20,381	24,699	28,028	29,649	28,027	25,276	18,728	844
North Dakota	759	1,656	1,647	1,665	1,597	1,579	943	1,006	769	572
Ohio	24,419	32,582	35,973	34,446	38,445	39,857	47,323	45994	48,117	40,424
Oklahoma	1,101	3,543	7,787	3,895	4,794	5,294	5,671	5,157	4,332	3,636
Oregon	6,761	6,687	6,437	7,437	8,321	9,495	9,390	8,899	8,112	7,313
Pennsylvania	15,172	42,088	47,039	52,269	59,514	61,998	58,646	60,952	48,946	32,634
Puerto Rico	413	3,736	3,696	3,103	3,026	2,811	3,454	1,351	1,177	1,333
Rhode Island	2,419	3,233	4,295	3,100	3,346	4,070	4,830	4,739	4,530	4,552
South Carolina	3,343	5,785	14,614	15,349	16,764	19,026	20,964	21,547	20,832	22,209
South Dakota	1,087	1,532	1,234	1,262	1,526	1,642	1,809	2,268	1,341	1,104
Tennessee	4,705	8,336	16,659	11,625	12,179	11,391	10,344	8,892	3,269	9,899
Texas	5,446	5,652	15,447	18,229	20,387	23,075	26,570	27,897	26,169	12,043
Utah	3,784	5,209	3,333	3,669	3,973	4,033	3,979	4,034	3,718	3,179
Vermont	953	2,329	2,596	2,826	3,556	4,114	2,594	2,856	2,678	2,511
Virginia	4,729	13,054	14,138	16,761	18,679	19,399	45,576	19,188	16,965	16,057
Virgin Islands	232	199	133	135	165	193	214	158	234	246
Washington	14,860	15,895	27,063	23,263	28,618	27,020	29,026	24,317	23,648	19,536
West Virginia	1,430	2,331	2,484	2,622	3,347	4,108	6,185	4,488	4,219	2,750
Wisconsin	16,868	44,799	30,143	30,426	32,693	31,984	32,140	10,681	8,728	6,956
Wyoming	294	453	1,197	1,681	2,094	2,146	2,058	675	547	554
Total	458,439	684,114	700,803	755,328	831,172	872,579	1,050,163	940,452	864,709	789,277

[1] Data not reported for this item or insufficient data reported to perform indicated computation. [2] Less than $500.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–15.—AVERAGE NUMBER OF NON-AFDC CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT CASES IN WHICH A COLLECTION WAS MADE BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1978–98

State	1978	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	110	5,023	19,971	28,512	33,741	39,586	47,785	51,547	57,479	57,751
Alaska	2,309	3,205	3,947	4,211	4,598	4,997	5,891	6,331	6,714	9,662
Arizona	(1)	4,770	4,668	9,144	11,107	10,283	21,881	25,800	25,788	35,524
Arkansas	764	3,613	8,473	11,232	15,088	18,449	23,243	27,015	31,538	33,648
California	69,696	64,686	96,101	101,913	97,597	104,864	155,144	200,129	237,234	285,220
Colorado	1,017	3,976	7,281	9,008	10,492	11,360	14,524	16,883	19,858	24,187
Connecticut	(1)	9,392	9,884	13,289	14,441	15,721	17,950	20,071	22,526	26,477
Delaware	3,210	4,395	6,770	8,058	8,303	9,191	11,575	9,856	10,259	11,204
District of Columbia	93	1,007	4,252	4,964	5,704	6,278	6,904	7,164	7,520	12,054
Florida	1,200	7,593	56,329	66,748	67,948	77,734	96,394	102,045	92,641	102,959
Georgia	1,207	5,487	30,217	34,545	35,419	40,698	50,178	55,749	81,366	105,275
Guam	(1)	65	114	495	616	803	1,582	1,508	1,398	1,494
Hawaii	(1)	352	2,804	10,398	15,305	16,299	10,237	10,393	11,637	12,609
Idaho	455	1,047	6,493	7,403	8,689	9,889	11,522	11,612	11,599	13,194
Illinois	196	10,030	26,184	36,363	36,246	40,744	48,174	54,714	62,397	62,763
Indiana	450	2,881	25,586	27,111	34,855	36,865	39,155	45,017	57,723	48,065
Iowa	671	4,913	12,400	14,103	16,352	19,266	24,161	25,634	28,661	33,162
Kansas	210	758	11,520	13,855	16,003	18,846	24,991	27,187	30,415	33,193
Kentucky	255	3,647	17,473	20,489	23,531	28,950	35,072	38,815	43,479	49,190
Louisiana	6,866	10,636	16,739	20,001	24,194	28,146	37,396	42,588	47,949	53,144
Maine	638	1,496	6,425	6,510	5,479	7,630	11,793	12,752	14,070	14,004
Maryland	130	26,154	27,339	49,380	52,024	54,989	61,259	65,038	70,096	75,372
Massachusetts	(1)	0	22,921	14,264	24,605	25,899	33,533	40,266	44,261	47,520
Michigan	(1)	88,675	115,081	129,461	133,652	141,489	151,518	164,057	179,822	201,862
Minnesota	2,766	12,615	26,712	27,174	35,791	43,272	56,720	64,251	72,944	73,253
Mississippi	81	1,319	7,917	10,077	12,997	16,007	24,355	29,377	29,626	35,172
Missouri	(1)	5,362	26,994	32,317	38,492	41,022	47,438	57,745	50,365	67,848

Montana	444	344	1,448	2,208	2,748	3,750	6,148	7,488	8,711	10,231
Nebraska	176	7,874	14,748	14,883	15,185	17,771	18,399	19,113	18,524	15,239
Nevada	4,026	5,360	4,451	5,327	6,676	7,819	9,387	10,072	11,146	12,256
New Hampshire	(1)	4,939	5,260	5,875	7,077	7,870	10,079	11,316	12,784	14,186
New Jersey	20,000	45,868	66,885	68,753	78,789	84,267	89,409	97,360	103,379	105,719
New Mexico	286	2,249	5,360	5,758	5,947	5,849	8,095	9,455	9,509	6,465
New York	39,623	63,829	83,651	94,031	103,924	108,419	152,556	136,975	152,311	173,196
North Carolina	1,715	10,137	27,632	31,810	37,172	43,884	59,956	68,579	61,255	2,724
North Dakota	154	266	1,911	2,357	3,320	4,026	4,245	6,582	7,028	7,789
Ohio	1,430	10,853	101,553	107,806	135,535	149,104	191,748	158,967	234,784	260,203
Oklahoma	(1)	1,968	10,509	8,558	8,479	10,707	13,730	15,347	17,094	18,548
Oregon	17,957	19,331	25,657	19,754	21,810	25,063	31,968	35,821	31,931	44,005
Pennsylvania	49,621	108,498	147,885	171,525	182,098	190,671	195,144	209,436	219,075	169,472
Puerto Rico	710	26,873	35,295	36,731	33,075	41,130	45,963	47,320	48,994	50,848
Rhode Island	57	1,969	3,705	3,017	3,060	3,291	4,271	4,670	5,341	6,161
South Carolina	203	2,777	4,896	10,393	25,764	27,771	34,471	36,395	42,911	48,375
South Dakota	297	502	2,739	3,262	3,881	4,607	6,339	7,916	7,709	8,825
Tennessee	6,360	12,156	28,174	31,554	35,358	40,003	53,498	55,076	42,622	69,067
Texas	2,861	8,833	37,741	51,039	65,152	79,037	111,451	133,427	151,245	169,850
Utah	400	1,068	6,738	8,605	9,704	10,573	13,446	15,343	18,848	22,458
Vermont	181	393	1,659	1,870	2,433	3,154	3,380	4,603	5,644	6,742
Virginia	38	876	31,492	34,242	38,267	46,760	88,500	66,164	72,765	80,067
Virgin Islands	1	1,288	1,247	1,301	1,348	1,538	1,655	1,410	1,790	1,926
Washington	4,822	9,802	34,791	46,930	55,788	64,929	74,479	69,233	80,647	90,587
West Virginia	130	288	8,045	7,555	9,513	11,971	22,022	20,762	22,932	26,807
Wisconsin	4,685	20,288	56,769	65,718	70,780	88,601	111,438	94,760	104,860	113,704
Wyoming	89	77	2,352	2,853	3,275	1,738	3,564	6,582	7,287	8,326
Total	248,590	653,803	1,362,821	1,554,740	1,749,427	1,953,580	2,404,716	2,563,716	2,850,491	3,069,582

[1] Data not reported for this item or insufficient data reported to perform indicated computation.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–16.—SUPPORT ORDERS ESTABLISHED, ENFORCED, AND MODIFIED TO INCLUDE HEALTH INSURANCE BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1998

State	Total number of orders established	Total number with health insurance	Percent with health insurance	Total number of orders enforced or modified	Total number enforced or modified with health insurance	Percent with health insurance
Alabama	21,176	11,399	53.83	608,877	123,919	20.35
Alaska	3,146	3,119	99.14	3,655	3,540	96.85
Arizona	9,121	9,121	100.00	624,217	8,807	1.41
Arkansas	9,070	6,030	66.48	157,368	6,002	3.81
California	223,541	175,227	78.39	1,378,352	1,043,809	75.73
Colorado	9,982	8,287	83.02	75,453	44,838	59.43
Connecticut	31,995	20,726	64.78	169,970	90,931	53.50
Delaware	2,354	2,354	100.00	18,205	15,114	83.02
District of Columbia	6,814	79	1.16	6,092	39	0.64
Florida	25,958	3,486	13.43	66,747	13,772	20.63
Georgia	31,092	13,362	42.98	508,876	156,667	30.79
Guam	336	141	41.96	698	267	38.25
Hawaii	4,150	4,150	100.00	117,044	117,044	100.00
Idaho	3,218	3,160	98.20	204,583	144,380	70.57
Illinois	30,765	13,419	43.62	647,959	141,839	21.89
Indiana	32,272	695	2.15	7,271	16	0.22
Iowa	14,930	12,373	82.87	166,137	93,595	56.34
Kansas	17,318	14,473	83.57	172,949	45,405	26.25
Kentucky	27,190	9,849	36.22	161,396	30,602	18.96
Louisiana	17,419	16,594	95.26	169,646	137,112	80.82
Maine	4,687	3,386	72.24	12,759	1,359	10.65
Maryland	20,933	13,949	66.64	1,199,586	265,442	22.13
Massachusetts	12,297	6,469	52.61	81,744	1,806	2.21
Michigan	28,212	24,952	88.44	1,407,431	76,904	5.46
Minnesota	18,657	8,134	43.60	371,521	43,957	11.83
Mississippi	14,561	6,542	44.93	92,695	25,344	27.34

Missouri	22,756	17,064	74.99	88,191	59,112	67.03
Montana	2,232	2,062	92.38	44,300	9,124	20.60
Nebraska	4,887	2,233	45.69	1,613	391	24.24
Nevada	4,186	3,172	75.78	65,302	2,033	3.11
New Hampshire	3,877	2,057	53.06	64,798	4,426	6.83
New Jersey	23,192	16,235	70.00	30,712	11,926	38.83
New Mexico	3,633	1,833	50.45	9,436	393	4.16
New York	49,481	19,790	40.00	43,048	17,218	40.00
North Carolina	35,959	35,959	100.00	71,839	NA	0.00
North Dakota	2,177	2,076	95.36	13,861	118	0.85
Ohio	63,014	44,891	71.24	723,398	345,704	47.79
Oklahoma	9,272	7,366	79.44	8,651	6,258	72.34
Oregon	12,850	10,915	84.94	58,760	20,161	34.31
Pennsylvania	108,510	89,286	82.28	352,843	265,558	75.26
Puerto Rico	9,359	NA	0.00	78,542	8	0.01
Rhode Island	2,283	1,480	64.83	19,614	14,187	72.33
South Carolina	13,641	8,649	63.40	34,463	17,234	50.01
South Dakota	3,792	3,430	90.45	26,354	21,507	81.61
Tennessee	28,842	6,804	23.59	50,799	30,365	59.77
Texas	37,019	24,417	65.96	52,081	8,486	16.29
Utah	4,386	3,405	77.63	170,415	149,609	87.79
Vermont	2,229	900	40.38	28,924	13,937	48.18
Virginia	20,298	16,198	79.80	137,783	32,192	23.36
Virgin Islands	556	9	1.62	1,216	NA	0.00
Washington	27,248	24,536	90.05	851,861	395,963	46.48
West Virginia	9,712	4,658	47.96	89,607	2,898	3.23
Wisconsin	19,418	8,677	44.69	175,076	22,386	12.79
Wyoming	1,698	874	51.47	47,500	18,475	38.89
Total	1,147,701	750,452	65.39	11,772,218	4,102,179	34.85

NA—Not available.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–17.—PERCENTAGE OF AFDC PAYMENTS RECOVERED THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979–96

State	1979	1985	1987	1989	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Alabama	8.5	23.2	30.8	31.7	33.7	27.0	23.8	23.1	25.6	31.2
Alaska	1.5	8.3	12.6	13.7	14.6	12.7	11.9	13.6	16.2	18.9
Arizona	2.0	5.1	3.8	4.4	4.2	5.4	7.1	8.2	9.8	10.6
Arkansas	4.8	17.6	21.0	20.7	23.6	26.5	28.0	28.0	32.5	41.3
California	6.5	6.1	6.0	5.9	6.3	6.5	7.1	7.8	8.3	10.6
Colorado	4.8	9.5	11.4	12.3	13.0	15.0	16.7	19.5	22.7	28.6
Connecticut	6.5	12.2	12.7	9.5	10.2	10.5	11.2	11.0	15.0	18.0
Delaware	4.4	17.3	21.2	20.3	20.6	19.7	19.8	20.2	22.1	24.5
District of Columbia	1.0	3.8	4.7	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.7	5.0
Florida	5.5	11.5	11.9	11.6	11.1	9.9	9.6	10.2	11.3	12.1
Georgia	4.3	10.4	12.4	14.3	15.4	18.2	20.1	20.3	20.9	27.2
Guam	5.3	9.1	11.9	10.8	32.7	34.6	28.7	18.6	14.5	16.0
Hawaii	2.9	8.9	7.3	8.8	7.4	6.9	6.7	6.6	7.2	7.8
Idaho	8.9	25.0	33.2	35.7	34.7	36.5	35.3	36.3	35.1	38.1
Illinois	1.5	4.8	5.0	5.6	5.7	7.0	6.6	7.1	7.8	9.1
Indiana	7.2	21.5	23.0	22.4	23.8	24.0	24.5	24.2	26.8	30.4
Iowa	9.0	19.3	19.2	20.1	20.6	23.2	24.3	26.3	30.4	34.1
Kansas	5.0	14.1	13.4	15.9	17.8	19.4	19.7	21.8	25.9	30.8
Kentucky	3.8	8.5	12.0	12.4	15.0	18.8	20.0	21.0	22.9	21.6
Louisiana	5.2	9.1	10.5	11.1	12.4	14.2	15.3	16.1	18.7	23.8
Maine	7.3	20.6	26.1	22.9	21.5	18.8	24.5	28.3	30.4	33.5
Maryland	6.1	11.2	13.0	14.5	11.4	14.2	16.9	15.8	15.3	16.5
Massachusetts	6.6	10.7	12.0	11.8	10.4	10.5	11.4	11.6	12.8	13.6
Michigan	9.0	12.5	13.0	13.9	15.1	15.7	16.6	17.7	18.7	21.9
Minnesota	7.8	12.7	14.2	14.4	14.6	16.3	17.3	19.2	23.0	21.5
Mississippi	2.9	9.4	13.7	16.8	22.3	24.2	24.9	28.0	29.3	35.9
Missouri	2.8	12.0	15.0	17.8	15.6	19.0	18.9	20.1	21.0	26.0
Montana	4.4	8.6	9.9	11.1	12.9	16.0	15.0	14.2	17.3	20.3

Nebraska	5.4	11.5	12.9	13.0	13.2	16.0	16.9	18.1	21.4	24.6
Nevada	6.3	16.4	12.4	12.2	14.1	17.1	16.6	15.7	15.3	17.9
New Hampshire	9.4	15.2	12.4	11.3	10.1	12.3	14.4	16.0	19.4	21.5
New Jersey	5.9	12.5	14.4	14.0	16.4	16.5	16.4	16.9	18.3	20.2
New Mexico	3.4	7.4	9.4	9.2	7.8	8.0	11.6	9.7	6.0	4.2
New York	3.5	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.7	7.2	7.0	6.7	6.9	8.0
North Carolina	5.6	17.4	18.9	18.8	18.4	19.6	20.5	22.4	23.1	25.7
North Dakota	9.6	16.8	17.4	21.0	23.4	24.0	24.1	25.4	28.9	29.7
Ohio	4.8	10.1	9.9	10.0	10.3	11.7	12.2	13.4	15.5	17.5
Oklahoma	1.6	6.4	8.0	9.0	9.9	10.7	11.1	12.8	14.9	20.1
Oregon	9.0	13.0	13.0	13.5	13.5	12.5	13.4	14.3	15.0	16.9
Pennsylvania	4.6	11.0	13.2	12.6	13.7	14.0	13.7	13.6	14.5	16.2
Puerto Rico	0.7	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.9	3.5	4.4
Rhode Island	6.1	7.6	8.9	10.4	9.2	10.8	11.6	12.6	13.9	15.2
South Carolina	5.4	13.1	15.9	16.8	16.8	17.9	21.1	23.6	26.1	29.5
South Dakota	6.5	14.4	17.9	17.1	18.1	18.8	19.5	23.2	27.4	31.2
Tennessee	5.0	10.3	14.1	13.7	14.3	11.2	15.7	15.9	23.3	17.7
Texas	5.4	6.2	9.4	9.5	10.2	11.8	12.9	14.5	17.6	22.2
Utah	13.7	19.6	22.1	23.4	23.2	25.6	26.2	28.3	29.7	34.5
Vermont	4.1	11.1	13.4	12.7	13.0	12.7	14.7	14.6	17.7	21.4
Virginia	6.3	9.0	13.5	15.7	17.2	17.3	17.3	16.2	21.8	23.8
Virgin Islands	8.5	8.3	7.9	7.3	7.1	8.5	10.2	10.6	8.7	11.0
Washington	12.5	10.9	14.4	17.1	18.1	20.0	20.8	21.1	22.4	23.5
West Virginia	2.6	7.8	6.1	5.1	8.1	10.6	18.2	13.8	15.1	17.5
Wisconsin	9.5	12.4	15.4	15.5	15.7	16.2	17.0	21.6	27.3	28.5
Wyoming	5.6	8.2	10.0	13.5	13.3	14.3	17.0	20.7	25.1	30.1
Total	5.8	9.1	10.0	10.3	10.7	11.4	12.0	12.5	13.6	15.5

Note.—Payments to Aid to Families with Dependent Children—Unemployed Parent (AFDC–UP) families have been excluded from the payment totals in those States having AFDC–UP Programs.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–18.—FEDERAL INCOME TAX REFUND OFFSET COLLECTIONS BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1983–98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1983	1987	1990	1991	1992	1993	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	$1,555	$5,135	$8,009	$8,827	$20,586	$17,818	$18,688	$25,609	$25,208	$26,068
Alaska	212	891	1,208	1,387	1,711	1,464	2,156	2,946	2,917	4,011
Arizona	385	2,049	2,605	2,876	4,007	8,381	7,538	8,763	12,923	11,520
Arkansas	1,104	3,770	4,669	5,575	7,106	6,862	7,515	11,391	12,176	13,729
California	35,034	46,287	57,624	57,098	67,569	62,460	86,508	129,209	132,838	152,738
Colorado	3,016	3,020	5,604	6,179	7,614	7,851	9,283	13,973	13,932	15,000
Connecticut	4,455	6,140	9,907	9,250	10,190	9,315	10,823	13,699	14,034	15,073
Delaware	166	1,319	1,966	2,467	2,683	2,313	2,626	3,291	3,424	3,730
District of Columbia	567	779	1,942	1,606	1,788	1,701	1,992	2,555	2,832	2,913
Florida	1,980	7,318	21,038	24,880	31,569	30,689	38,045	50,377	51,709	54,020
Georgia	1,526	7,258	13,032	15,693	22,016	22,441	30,103	36,429	31,895	31,363
Guam	13	44	13	11	51	43	70	92	99	285
Hawaii	817	1,122	1,573	1,976	2,328	3,704	3,589	4,519	4,567	5,543
Idaho	1,183	1,594	2,173	2,270	2,690	2,595	3,205	4,061	4,441	4,867
Illinois	4,525	15,415	19,307	18,876	26,631	20,891	28,836	33,620	37,064	39,738
Indiana	4,940	11,390	15,860	16,853	21,169	19,809	23,429	27,690	26,129	24,179
Iowa	5,526	7,798	8,828	9,439	11,240	10,633	13,055	15,623	15,189	18,285
Kansas	2,525	3,704	5,300	6,101	7,525	7,207	9,196	12,292	13,626	13,489
Kentucky	1,165	3,262	6,680	7,891	12,919	11,994	14,121	16,550	18,097	18,491
Louisiana	1,536	4,722	6,582	6,519	8,438	9,356	13,934	18,758	21,696	19,524
Maine	1,844	3,377	5,383	4,925	5,477	4,862	6,103	7,140	7,406	8,094
Maryland	5,688	9,646	14,343	14,182	15,542	15,454	17,936	22,333	23,833	22,704
Massachusetts	3,325	5,269	11,899	10,936	13,077	11,465	9,997	11,739	13,229	15,158
Michigan	18,250	25,893	29,854	32,776	44,968	45,314	49,346	56,625	59,784	62,184
Minnesota	5,576	6,762	8,096	8,831	9,904	9,217	10,575	12,886	13,607	9,621
Mississippi	1,019	2,252	4,958	6,392	8,270	8,532	10,765	19,839	15,959	16,949

Missouri	4,289	8,482	14,205	10,189	17,711	16,367	19,546	24,207	26,814	27,772
Montana	431	1,209	1,301	1,374	1,636	1,679	1,794	2,242	2,712	2,871
Nebraska	502	1,395	2,485	2,548	3,121	3,213	3,671	4,684	5,411	5,218
Nevada	354	433	768	1,363	2,449	2,291	3,127	4,235	5,144	5,264
New Hampshire	757	1,284	1,177	1,350	2,028	1,997	2,869	3,551	3,845	4,145
New Jersey	9,458	14,268	16,171	18,266	20,132	17,990	21,309	25,717	27,200	27,063
New Mexico	533	2,278	2,585	2,863	3,259	3,041	3,907	4,908	5,468	5,368
New York	9,945	27,991	24,763	31,307	33,734	31,084	35,960	42,715	49,517	49,824
North Carolina	4,235	7,229	11,270	12,718	16,410	17,403	21,154	28,187	30,002	27,682
North Dakota	352	848	1,302	1,501	1,767	1,656	2,303	2,465	2,715	2,916
Ohio	2,886	11,186	16,514	21,027	27,476	28,651	46,843	58,189	60,171	65,003
Oklahoma	703	2,218	4,647	5,803	7,575	7,077	9,148	10,938	12,469	12,816
Oregon	3,782	4,863	5,381	5,622	6,259	5,694	7,997	10,199	10,451	11,540
Pennsylvania	6,112	17,123	24,354	27,946	32,560	29,012	36,956	44,673	47,174	47,776
Puerto Rico	2	13	6	63	231	218	287	3,107	3,997	3,200
Rhode Island	838	880	1,548	1,522	1,799	1,424	1,857	2,242	2,438	2,701
South Carolina	368	1,789	3,233	3,449	4,678	5,198	6,296	8,643	10,153	10,292
South Dakota	374	998	1,498	1,648	2,110	2,018	2,465	3,018	3,239	3,106
Tennessee	642	3,025	7,539	8,341	16,033	12,577	16,865	20,384	19,971	25,389
Texas	3,906	11,316	19,926	24,133	34,346	36,561	54,142	70,006	78,613	95,996
Utah	2,540	2,991	4,066	4,297	5,604	5,431	6,270	6,056	5,804	6,289
Vermont	611	887	1,017	1,074	1,294	1,073	1,633	1,881	2,127	2,234
Virginia	1,674	6,840	9,761	10,298	12,594	12,601	16,898	18,962	22,028	22,207
Virgin Islands	.....	37	7	25	44	68	81	68	306	284
Washington	4,278	10,510	13,732	13,957	17,417	17,236	19,506	23,271	26,012	27,853
West Virginia	1,038	2,013	3,066	3,265	3,705	3,551	7,221	7,566	8,741	8,912
Wisconsin	6,266	10,029	13,290	14,384	17,486	18,055	22,800	31,773	27,956	27,696
Wyoming	222	503	684	1,131	1,190	932	1,977	3,328	3,217	2,920
Total	175,021	338,853	474,748	515,279	661,711	636,466	803,952	1,021,449	1,082,309	1,143,616

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–19.—TOTAL CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS PER DOLLAR OF TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1978–98

State	1978	1986	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	0.75	2.45	2.50	2.46	2.78	2.68	3.11	3.27	2.24	3.41	4.14	3.40
Alaska	3.19	2.61	3.46	4.06	4.14	3.64	3.92	3.71	2.93	3.31	3.48	3.52
Arizona	0.88	1.46	2.11	1.84	1.49	1.54	1.57	1.79	1.48	2.41	2.69	2.66
Arkansas	1.00	2.62	2.94	3.38	2.80	3.00	3.15	3.20	2.75	2.77	1.98	2.88
California	2.15	2.37	2.75	2.66	2.59	2.63	2.59	2.54	2.17	2.36	2.29	2.66
Colorado	1.78	1.89	1.99	2.21	2.82	3.22	2.70	2.47	2.54	2.82	3.07	3.11
Connecticut	4.20	3.49	2.73	2.76	2.46	2.73	2.97	3.19	2.88	2.91	3.09	3.23
Delaware	7.14	2.46	2.62	3.01	3.13	2.87	2.88	2.39	2.04	2.50	2.23	2.55
District of Columbia	0.73	0.92	1.21	1.33	1.78	1.88	2.33	2.51	2.03	2.38	4.10	1.98
Florida	1.20	2.12	2.28	2.58	2.66	2.86	3.03	3.78	3.53	3.13	3.45	3.04
Georgia	2.22	2.59	2.88	3.06	3.06	3.61	4.26	4.47	3.50	3.92	3.88	3.53
Guam	NA	1.39	1.62	1.28	1.24	1.98	1.87	1.89	1.33	2.57	1.89	1.72
Hawaii	1.71	2.26	3.62	3.62	3.64	4.06	3.94	3.79	2.36	2.18	2.35	2.60
Idaho	2.10	3.58	3.79	3.95	4.02	3.21	3.62	3.43	2.39	2.32	2.73	3.69
Illinois	2.10	2.40	2.68	2.77	2.61	2.63	2.90	2.36	2.23	2.41	2.05	2.50
Indiana	2.42	4.82	5.49	5.34	6.15	7.27	6.56	6.45	5.18	6.54	6.18	5.45
Iowa	3.49	6.77	6.36	5.66	4.99	5.02	5.79	5.14	4.72	5.23	4.87	4.79
Kansas	3.01	2.15	2.51	2.00	2.76	3.43	3.73	2.57	1.69	5.82	3.06	3.05
Kentucky	1.14	2.52	2.44	2.63	2.55	2.33	2.97	3.05	3.21	3.43	3.80	3.90
Louisiana	1.82	1.99	2.60	2.85	3.12	2.51	2.74	3.19	3.37	4.16	4.33	4.03
Maine	3.40	3.74	4.01	4.14	3.82	3.06	2.84	3.39	4.28	4.05	4.23	4.25
Maryland	2.14	3.77	3.31	3.36	3.80	3.80	4.49	4.56	4.07	4.36	4.41	4.31
Massachusetts	5.12	3.50	4.09	3.24	3.80	3.41	4.18	4.30	3.54	4.05	4.05	4.50
Michigan	9.50	8.33	8.80	8.58	7.83	8.07	8.20	8.43	7.20	6.63	6.76	7.18
Minnesota	2.15	3.02	3.59	3.65	3.58	3.74	4.27	4.20	3.96	4.36	4.14	3.85
Mississippi	0.87	2.29	3.06	2.23	1.56	1.76	2.22	2.20	2.16	2.87	3.15	3.69
Missouri	0.89	3.89	4.22	4.45	4.71	4.75	4.88	4.30	3.41	3.75	4.05	3.36

Montana	1.58	2.59	2.97	4.21	2.74	2.78	2.38	2.76	2.87	2.42	2.75	3.15
Nebraska	2.10	5.44	5.02	4.69	4.48	3.83	3.54	4.17	3.44	3.16	3.70	4.66
Nevada	1.83	2.10	1.95	2.22	2.12	2.52	3.06	2.39	2.08	2.53	1.61	2.90
New Hampshire	4.05	4.39	4.93	3.18	3.71	2.86	3.26	2.87	2.50	3.42	4.01	4.50
New Jersey	4.16	4.64	4.12	3.85	3.66	3.49	4.02	4.02	6.13	4.52	4.78	4.64
New Mexico	1.17	2.27	1.76	1.96	2.00	2.00	2.30	3.08	1.54	1.43	1.45	1.59
New York	1.75	1.83	2.36	2.74	2.55	2.81	3.22	3.10	3.39	4.03	4.01	4.16
North Carolina	1.50	3.26	3.32	3.20	3.18	3.15	3.20	3.20	2.40	2.94	2.83	2.86
North Dakota	1.83	2.46	3.14	3.31	3.62	3.59	3.93	4.05	4.13	4.34	5.14	4.75
Ohio	2.50	4.41	10.83	6.07	7.21	6.01	5.35	5.48	5.63	6.07	5.19	5.67
Oklahoma	0.76	1.78	2.48	2.28	2.29	2.41	2.69	3.13	2.70	3.06	3.03	3.10
Oregon	9.48	4.47	4.27	4.45	4.49	4.48	5.10	4.95	4.81	5.60	4.65	5.28
Pennsylvania	9.14	7.78	8.52	8.97	8.71	8.03	9.27	9.09	8.15	7.74	7.42	7.06
Puerto Rico	0.92	14.02	17.60	13.61	7.84	15.68	10.43	11.73	3.96	4.44	5.37	5.38
Rhode Island	3.51	3.90	3.65	3.67	2.52	2.22	2.31	4.35	3.45	4.31	4.33	4.18
South Carolina	2.38	2.37	3.23	3.01	2.60	3.01	3.59	3.88	2.84	3.37	4.30	4.71
South Dakota	0.99	2.74	3.50	3.99	3.96	4.43	4.82	4.90	5.27	5.87	5.79	6.13
Tennessee	2.49	3.31	4.09	3.57	4.28	4.27	3.87	5.42	3.75	4.06	3.85	3.58
Texas	0.74	2.01	2.81	2.41	1.93	2.50	2.53	2.31	3.01	3.71	3.59	3.76
Utah	1.99	2.21	2.86	2.92	3.09	2.80	3.08	2.86	1.96	2.66	2.84	3.03
Vermont	2.24	2.34	3.31	2.93	3.61	3.77	2.82	3.06	2.69	3.79	3.57	4.20
Virginia	0.72	1.57	2.39	3.03	2.35	3.13	2.91	3.09	3.63	4.18	5.23	4.53
Virgin Islands	0.40	2.14	4.16	3.11	4.18	2.07	4.10	4.50	0.86	2.25	2.44	2.67
Washington	2.96	2.42	2.48	2.66	3.13	3.41	3.29	3.42	3.35	3.53	4.06	3.74
West Virginia	0.74	1.98	2.16	2.95	2.75	2.55	2.98	2.77	3.24	3.61	4.03	4.47
Wisconsin	3.80	4.78	6.01	6.18	5.76	6.68	6.83	7.15	6.09	5.94	5.81	5.49
Wyoming	3.18	3.27	4.91	3.50	3.37	3.50	4.87	2.34	1.76	2.96	3.34	3.72
Total	3.35	3.45	3.94	3.85	3.75	3.82	3.99	3.98	3.60	3.93	3.90	4.00

NA—Not available.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–20.—NUMBER OF PATERNITIES ESTABLISHED BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979–98

State	1979	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	6,161	6,998	7,839	6,517	6,612	7,942	10,779	7,816	7,103	6,558	5,418
Alaska	3	364	797	767	673	906	1,070	1,576	929	1.025	1,806
Arizona	154	1,009	1,327	1,237	2,674	3,056	5,007	11,608	10,389	10,454	14,544
Arkansas	2,586	5,326	4,453	3,191	4,703	5,175	6,580	8,294	8,283	7,122	9,273
California	19,364	28,570	35,193	41,065	56,912	65,062	77,324	129,593	183,424	200,272	210,340
Colorado	1,046	1,291	1,939	1,864	2,887	4,135	5,258	6,201	5,908	5,294	5,065
Connecticut	3,029	3,908	3,888	4,499	5,309	6,196	5,368	7,578	8,318	8,333	7,082
Delaware	205	1,867	1,641	801	728	1,573	1,395	2,292	3,522	3,085	2,946
District of Columbia	386	1,021	2,079	2,791	3,895	2,792	2,884	1,683	1,482	1,760	2,364
Florida	7,078	12,136	13,399	19,534	17,907	16,119	10,879	13,010	2,806	20,535	48,385
Georgia	3,642	14,112	18,198	24,615	28,015	30,181	29,329	13,978	3,146	6,923	9,970
Guam	NA	122	109	563	884	642	440	866	802	461	526
Hawaii	854	1,061	1,295	1,843	1,672	1,419	1,746	1,493	1,785	1,761	1,671
Idaho	287	384	1,100	1,310	1,551	1,722	1,509	2,079	2,533	1,942	2,910
Illinois	3,025	20,848	29,926	25,496	21,157	18,900	19,017	22,236	26,483	47,516	50,456
Indiana	1,644	3,570	4,943	5,309	6,291	5,631	4,950	4,202	4,484	19,857	2,260
Iowa	575	1,664	1,980	3,045	1,904	4,416	4,952	4,378	3,414	1,881	614
Kansas	696	1,119	2,101	3,644	3,125	3,198	4,445	10,677	11,801	9,218	10,404
Kentucky	784	3,881	4,498	6,092	6,816	7,951	7,979	8,950	9,994	9,747	9,345
Louisiana	1,304	2,926	4,451	5,525	11,098	11,764	13,272	9,299	11,235	12,560	22,391
Maine	382	951	1,609	1,381	1,376	3,189	1,370	1,704	2,129	2,274	2,243
Maryland	13,307	6,671	9,995	7,538	12,081	11,259	9,993	9,052	10,931	12,716	38,392
Massachusetts	2,096	7,025	6,194	6,339	5,742	8,195	6,234	10,862	10,201	10,145	10,047
Michigan	7,529	18,274	23,142	25,574	27,955	29,087	28,076	22,471	24,898	17,656	13,443
Minnesota	1,786	3,856	6,098	5,661	7,695	5,348	3,749	8,936	9,696	8,801	4,510
Mississippi	932	1,824	7,929	10,740	11,950	8,978	8,588	12,734	14,246	14,560	13,218
Missouri	NA	14,308	11,146	16,242	21,976	23,982	24,292	24,679	24,800	19,731	23,970
Montana	92	179	388	429	677	1,155	413	1,368	1,567	1,404	1,187

Nebraska	NA	710	759	885	1,280	1,628	2,019	4,329	4,598	4,031	3,536
Nevada	233	531	664	1,033	1,655	1,702	1,602	1,797	2,252	1,832	2,293
New Hampshire	35	195	518	614	645	580	604	722	628	580	920
New Jersey	8,242	13,938	13,182	12,243	10,595	10,314	7,453	13,239	14,768	12,574	11,273
New Mexico	322	412	1,571	1,992	1,601	1,591	2,491	3,574	2,325	2,774	9,563
New York	17,503	18,239	18,056	20,492	30,197	34,434	42,748	36,474	41,292	49,694	38,001
North Carolina	6,592	9,916	11,663	14,504	18,186	19,308	21,371	25,429	29,581	24,777	30,592
North Dakota	293	1,134	820	784	935	1,446	1,386	906	1,427	1,337	1,699
Ohio	4,808	9,133	11,637	15,823	20,857	23,672	28,151	32,785	34,962	38,239	37,784
Oklahoma	43	512	1,361	2,710	4,939	2,721	2,764	4,525	5,312	6,295	7,124
Oregon	1,521	1,902	3,131	4,081	3,836	4,942	5,830	5,159	5,740	5,244	3,674
Pennsylvania	4,450	15,277	18,921	20,231	23,063	24,239	23,246	27,642	29,592	80,822	30,555
Puerto Rico	22	6	144	216	264	198	206	204	11	21	33
Rhode Island	347	601	673	868	764	1,425	2,001	3,971	5,489	4,518	3,585
South Carolina	1,378	3,994	5,243	5,273	6,066	6,996	8,331	8,038	8,925	13,378	13,941
South Dakota	60	552	504	509	687	916	1,333	1,160	1,030	798	725
Tennessee	5,003	7,666	9,647	8,976	10,309	10,902	11,463	14,358	11,524	10,057	6,785
Texas	202	684	6,465	12,623	19,627	24,890	30,002	38,516	43,272	44,628	71,571
Utah	487	1,292	1,801	2,087	2,484	2,957	3,496	4,287	4,058	2,918	1,985
Vermont	44	1,091	468	533	438	800	1,065	949	863	747	978
Virginia	1,452	2,667	8,471	13,647	15,971	18,038	21,506	26,174	18,952	11,570	11,793
Virgin Islands	4	235	270	160	215	344	492	485	34	120	31
Washington	656	4,066	5,762	6,985	8,601	10,540	12,539	13,608	16,963	12,667	13,726
West Virginia	156	288	820	997	1,324	2,373	2,790	7,077	4,219	6,521	6,964
Wisconsin	4,803	8,750	8,695	10,808	12,931	15,435	17,678	20,982	21,689	13,776	13,361
Wyoming	44	105	340	618	370	3,493	3,670	4,829	1,305	627	906
Total	137,645	269,161	339,243	393,304	472,105	515,857	553,135	660,834	716,821	814,136	848,178

NA—Not available.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–21.—OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1987–98

State	1987	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	15,955	18,640	19,131	20,000	20,680	21,003	20,798	20,366	20,635	21,185
Alaska	2,564	2,869	3,113	3,148	3,101	3,125	3.061	3,110	3,048	3,090
Arizona	17,227	20,708	22,532	23,899	26,151	27,162	27,709	29,243	28,495	30,006
Arkansas	8,498	9,944	10,713	10,601	10,878	11,310	11,589	12,335	12,478	12,949
California	136,785	171,189	193,559	204,229	206,376	202,803	177,131	169,313	172,017	170,629
Colorado	10,171	10,787	11,374	12,684	13,373	13,510	13,502	13,863	14,273	15,309
Connecticut	11,045	13,005	13,330	13,581	13,919	13,914	13,575	13,940	14,116	13,713
Delaware	2,742	3,125	3,222	3,559	3,577	3,614	3,586	3,603	3,693	3,926
District of Columbia	6,094	7,580	7,692	7,806	7,211	6,831	5,935	5,547	5,041	4,832
Florida	48,200	58,305	63,169	64,101	67,431	68,127	67,474	68,077	69,285	71,603
Georgia	28,647	34,926	36,979	38,116	39,575	39,429	39,474	39,928	41,879	44,299
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,940	2,066	2,125	2,338
Hawaii	3,968	4,609	5,088	5,195	5,328	5,533	5,428	5,569	5,202	5,522
Idaho	2,073	2,561	2,738	2,924	3,268	3,273	3,590	3,969	3,848	4,266
Illinois	50,677	58,867	62,148	63,225	65,130	64,933	62,829	61,743	60,443	62,229
Indiana	17,260	19,898	22,562	24,294	25,844	26,044	26,456	27,002	27,184	28,100
Iowa	6,147	7,575	8,282	8,657	9,297	9,211	9,267	9,760	9,601	10,141
Kansas	6,633	7,577	8,397	8,746	9,696	9,709	9,619	9,847	10,274	10,677
Kentucky	10,658	12,048	12,829	13,796	14,401	14,646	14,935	15,693	15,669	16,236
Louisiana	23,594	25,692	26,601	27,694	29,179	28,918	27,863	28,320	29,011	30,031
Maine	3,338	3,806	3,931	4,180	4,061	4,067	3,859	3,959	4,060	4,207
Maryland	22,866	22,607	23,789	24,292	24,335	24,943	24,124	23,977	23,493	24,778
Massachusetts	17,616	21,798	22,886	22,873	22,380	22,291	20,880	20,458	20,836	21,284
Michigan	28,724	36,441	40,289	40,941	36,326	48,339	46,211	45,052	44,454	43,981
Minnesota	11,114	13,142	14,192	14,984	15,099	15,430	15,099	15,798	16,141	16,692
Mississippi	14,499	16,958	17,627	18,317	18,718	19,067	18,747	18,463	18,859	19,534
Missouri	17,823	21,123	22,643	23,736	24,353	23,913	23,421	24,483	24,516	25,705
Montana	2,379	2,539	2,757	2,898	3,104	2,822	2,950	3,026	3,119	3,193

Nebraska	4,006	4,662	5,056	5,181	5,449	5,739	5,650	5,765	6,021	6,167
Nevada	2,740	4,607	5,480	7,016	7,614	8,359	10,513	11,145	9,555	9,948
New Hampshire	2,511	2,797	2,967	2,996	3,179	3,338	3,259	3,400	3,404	3,521
New Jersey	26,647	29,364	29,756	31,972	31,949	33,043	31,711	31,959	31,738	32,975
New Mexico	8,067	9,447	9,704	10,445	11,526	11,496	11,459	11,470	11,696	12,260
New York	80,939	92,996	98,110	99,738	105,101	104,732	102,791	104,416	90,673	90,088
North Carolina	23,262	28,315	30,718	32,340	32,586	32,321	31,923	33,419	34,468	36,632
North Dakota	1,429	1,615	1,699	1,952	1,999	1,971	1,996	2,099	2,174	2,142
Ohio	39,237	45,921	48,289	50,826	52,385	51,363	50,852	50,265	51,544	51,986
Oklahoma	9,892	11,258	11,998	12,973	13,441	13,616	13,927	14,267	15,660	16,427
Oregon	8,672	10,436	11,041	11,324	11,730	12,012	12,365	12,959	12,631	13,447
Pennsylvania	41,143	47,093	49,258	51,360	51,783	51,518	49,228	47,976	47,234	47,907
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,069	27,886	29,345	27,737
Rhode Island	3,064	3,684	3,997	4,073	4,436	4,327	3,975	4,208	4,128	4,271
South Carolina	15,333	18,116	19,148	20,000	19,359	19,172	19,071	19,075	19,857	20,855
South Dakota	2,225	2,415	2,515	2,720	2,968	2,914	2,932	3,091	3,166	3,292
Tennessee	17,897	21,281	22,662	24,026	24,556	24,480	24,185	24,645	25,383	27,008
Texas	57,464	60,303	55,435	56,528	54,670	92,721	96,816	100,573	102,496	107,818
Utah	3,929	4,504	4,910	5,196	5,744	6,005	6,224	6,809	7,145	7,722
Vermont	1,459	1,685	1,666	1,811	1,805	1,864	1,689	1,786	1,726	1,842
Virginia	20,562	24,410	25,874	27,125	27,532	27,760	27,090	26,634	26,908	28,165
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,288	1,224	1,368	1,245
Washington	14,629	17,638	18,746	19,861	20,670	20,090	20,635	21,287	21,218	22,225
West Virginia	4,722	5,212	5,743	6,040	6,328	6,454	6,463	6,504	6,495	6,725
Wisconsin	14,698	16,815	17,656	18,235	18,882	18,565	18,457	18,413	18,707	19,224
Wyoming	1,189	1,276	1,383	1,546	1,689	1,765	1,653	1,697	1,747	1,853
Total	933,013	1,094,169	1,165,384	1,213,769	1,240,172	1,289,592	1,253,976	1,260,306	1,257,444	1,323,997

NA—Not available.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and National Center for Health Statistics (1995 and previous years).

TABLE 8–22.—PERCENTAGE OF CHILD SUPPORT PATERNITIES ESTABLISHED BY STATE, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1987–94

State	1987	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	43.9	42.1	34.1	33.05	52.1	40.47	37.6	34.9	31.8	25.6
Alaska	14.2	27.8	24.6	21.3	34.5	48.19	51.5	29.9	33.6	58.4
Arizona	5.9	6.4	5.5	11.19	19.2	33.18	35.9	34.0	36.7	48.5
Arkansas	62.7	44.8	29.8	44.3	60.5	65.31	71.6	67.2	57.1	71.6
California	20.9	20.6	21.2	27.8	37.4	45.11	73.2	108.3	116.4	123.3
Colorado	12.7	18.0	16.4	22.7	39.3	41.56	45.9	42.6	37.1	33.1
Connecticut	35.4	29.9	33.8	39.1	38.6	40.28	55.8	59.7	59.0	51.6
Delaware	68.1	52.5	24.9	20.5	53.8	75.90	63.9	97.8	83.5	75.0
District of Columbia	16.8	27.4	36.3	49.9	40.0	36.39	28.4	26.7	34.9	48.9
Florida	25.2	23.0	30.9	27.9	16.1	18.57	19.3	27.0	29.6	67.7
Georgia	49.3	52.1	66.6	73.5	74.1	62.95	35.4	7.9	16.5	22.5
Guam	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44.6	38.8	21.7	22.5
Hawaii	26.7	28.1	36.2	32.2	32.8	37.39	27.5	32.1	33.9	30.3
Idaho	18.5	43.0	47.8	53.0	46.2	54.17	57.9	63.8	50.5	68.2
Illinois	41.1	50.8	41.0	33.5	29.2	37.63	35.4	42.9	78.6	81.1
Indiana	20.7	24.8	23.5	25.9	19.2	15.06	15.9	16.6	73.0	8.0
Iowa	27.1	26.1	36.8	22.0	53.3	56.03	47.2	35.0	19.6	6.1
Kansas	16.9	27.7	43.4	35.7	45.8	89.20	111.0	119.8	89.7	97.4
Kentucky	36.4	37.3	47.5	49.4	55.4	51.12	59.9	63.7	62.2	57.6
Louisiana	12.4	17.3	20.8	40.0	45.5	42.42	33.4	39.7	43.3	74.6
Maine	28.5	42.3	35.1	32.9	33.7	41.14	44.2	53.8	56.0	53.3
Maryland	29.2	44.2	31.7	49.7	41.1	42.46	37.5	45.6	54.1	154.9
Massachusetts	39.9	28.4	27.7	25.1	23.9	40.96	51.0	49.9	48.7	47.2
Michigan	63.6	63.5	63.5	68.3	77.3	55.57	48.6	55.3	39.7	30.6
Minnesota	34.7	46.4	39.9	51.4	24.8	47.23	59.2	61.4	54.5	27.0
Mississippi	12.6	46.8	60.9	65.2	45.9	51.92	67.9	77.2	77.2	67.7
Missouri	80.3	52.8	71.7	92.6	99.8	96.09	105.4	101.3	80.5	93.3
Montana	7.5	15.3	15.6	23.4	13.3	25.27	46.3	51.8	45.0	37.2

Nebraska	17.7	16.3	17.5	24.7	38.2	41.51	76.6	79.8	66.9	57.3
Nevada	19.4	18.4	14.4	18.9	21.0	15.61	17.1	20.2	19.2	23.0
New Hampshire	7.8	18.5	20.7	21.5	19.0	21.93	22.2	18.5	17.0	26.1
New Jersey	52.3	45.6	44.9	41.1	23.3	27.80	41.7	46.2	39.6	34.2
New Mexico	5.1	16.6	20.5	15.3	21.6	25.66	31.2	20.3	23.7	78.0
New York	22.5	19.4	20.9	30.3	41.1	36.55	35.5	39.5	54.8	42.2
North Carolina	42.6	41.2	47.2	56.2	65.6	70.24	79.7	88.5	71.9	83.5
North Dakota	79.4	50.8	46.1	47.9	69.3	70.47	62.8	68.0	61.5	79.3
Ohio	23.3	19.7	25.3	32.8	55.6	63.41	64.5	69.6	74.2	72.7
Oklahoma	5.2	12.1	22.6	38.1	20.6	26.53	32.5	37.2	40.2	43.4
Oregon	21.9	30.0	37.0	33.9	49.7	48.52	41.7	44.3	41.5	27.3
Pennsylvania	37.1	40.2	41.1	44.9	44.9	44.17	56.2	61.7	171.1	63.8
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.8	0.0	0.1	0.1
Rhode Island	19.6	18.3	21.7	18.8	45.1	61.45	99.9	130.4	109.4	83.9
South Carolina	26.1	28.9	27.5	30.3	43.0	40.35	42.1	46.8	67.4	66.8
South Dakota	24.8	20.9	20.2	25.3	44.9	45.92	39.6	33.3	25.2	22.0
Tennessee	42.8	45.3	39.6	42.9	46.7	59.21	59.4	46.8	39.6	25.1
Texas	1.2	10.7	22.8	34.7	54.9	35.88	39.8	43.0	43.5	66.4
Utah	32.9	40.0	42.5	47.8	60.9	67.13	68.9	59.6	40.8	25.7
Vermont	74.8	27.8	32.0	24.2	59.0	43.78	56.2	48.3	43.3	53.1
Virginia	1.3	34.7	52.7	58.9	78.1	79.57	96.8	71.2	43.0	41.9
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	37.7	2.8	8.8	2.5
Washington	27.8	32.7	37.3	43.3	60.7	66.70	65.9	79.7	59.7	61.8
West Virginia	6.1	15.7	17.4	21.9	44.1	30.68	109.5	87.4	100.4	103.6
Wisconsin	59.5	51.7	61.2	70.9	93.6	92.51	113.7	117.8	73.6	69.5
Wyoming	26.7	44.7	23.9	217.3	59.43	292.1	76.9	35.9	48.9	
Total	28.8	31.0	33.7	38.8	44.6	45.78	52.6	58.2	64.7	64.1

NA—Not available.

Sources: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and National Center for Health Statistics (1995 and previous years).

TABLE 8–23.—STATE SHARE OF PROGRAM SAVINGS BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 1989–98

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Alabama	$380	−$518	−$1,982	−$3,053	−$2,529	−$6,319	−$8,672	−$6,250	−$3,291	−$10,203
Alaska	2,264	2,469	2,982	3,431	3,797	4,278	4,201	5,091	5,629	4,869
Arizona	−1,219	−2,899	−3,125	−3,320	−4,242	−4,761	−6,804	−5,252	−3,343	−7,693
Arkansas	1,574	1,013	1,830	1,009	530	−283	−135	−2,595	−5,642	−5,737
California	79,779	76,552	88,584	98,465	101,406	115,539	110,774	139,416	177,731	198,398
Colorado	4,552	4,991	5,954	5,661	6,064	7,107	7,490	7,237	8,999	3,646
Connecticut	11,330	7,310	10,332	11,711	13,396	12,523	5,671	6,770	17,118	15,423
Delaware	797	812	923	902	455	312	−644	435	−1,282	−1,611
District of Columbia	−3,145	−89	−574	144	757	−272	−585	−390	2,274	−2,272
Florida	5,601	2,932	7,179	11,482	14,368	14,863	11,797	1,471	11,546	−17,656
Georgia	2,861	1,299	3,930	7,937	12,856	13,099	10,801	10,379	4,950	−3,893
Guam	−87	−227	−293	−450	−305	−375	−919	−591	−727	−941
Hawaii	1,648	1,622	1,502	1,655	1,873	1,618	539	−670	1,645	−710
Idaho	1,029	895	751	955	922	720	665	−1,317	−359	−422
Illinois	10,935	5,159	5,785	9,767	3,716	3,711	3,965	4,304	6,611	9,219
Indiana	14,027	11,731	16,134	20,359	20,257	22,131	18,262	18,475	10,312	4,886
Iowa	11,767	11,631	10,840	11,765	11,000	12,048	12,560	9,599	10,173	8,608
Kansas	1,170	2,229	3,694	4,041	3,711	3,142	−3,222	8,701	3,652	201
Kentucky	207	207	−475	1,958	3,467	5,104	3,696	1,449	1,691	664
Louisiana	696	150	−1,049	−1,845	−1,241	−1,270	−2,098	−1,251	−1,027	−4,646
Maine	5,236	4,229	3,852	3,890	5,877	5,509	6,359	9,590	10,147	7,438
Maryland	6,860	8,631	6,120	10,366	12,037	8,926	4,819	3,844	−322	−7,054
Massachusetts	23,373	23,391	21,789	25,917	29,957	22,670	25,468	20,782	22,964	16,696
Michigan	57,413	54,088	58,032	53,107	52,078	53,216	49,500	30,837	32,654	42,871
Minnesota	13,969	12,083	11,468	12,377	12,274	11,880	11,950	9,009	10,559	4,068
Mississippi	−232	−2,987	−2,549	−1,243	−1,065	−2,843	−3,336	−2,599	−2,524	−3,981

Missouri	8,046	9,002	7,846	11,772	10,303	10,566	7,695	8,598	1,850	−365
Montana	1,093	769	454	532	618	37,868	37,431	−850	−160	−579
Nebraska	−252	−572	−582	−2,093	−1,054	−574	−1,270	−4,617	−3,410	−1,021
Nevada	−32	−417	−334	608	−172	604	−902	−1,774	−4,159	−2,160
New Hampshire	362	185	271	826	443	1,165	1,157	1,010	1,579	1,174
New Jersey	15,081	6,836	9,100	13,551	11,876	13,809	24,571	14,092	17,561	7,624
New Mexico	305	−148	−361	−224	1,278	456	−1,083	−1,917	−4,074	−4,005
New York	24,201	22,865	30,313	41,091	41,790	46,036	43,880	45,673	63,963	55,620
North Carolina	5,857	3,598	4,257	6,343	6,962	8,504	2,853	1,898	1,588	−10,945
North Dakota	955	1,074	1,231	973	989	888	788	441	1,006	−199
Ohio	21,558	12,040	6,054	445	3,453	6,800	5,761	4,422	−3,673	−4,416
Oklahoma	705	69	380	1,110	2,457	2,412	2,241	3,205	3,150	882
Oregon	3,703	2,658	3,358	4,863	5,935	8,029	5,548	6,200	1,768	1,434
Pennsylvania	22,018	19,846	21,226	27,102	29,234	33,738	30,971	27,231	30,183	18,847
Puerto Rico	−1,075	−3,121	−2,165	−2,008	−2,171	−3,073	−5,161	−8,179	−7,391	−8,353
Rhode Island	2,999	3,439	3,940	4,375	5,427	5,466	6,142	7,013	9,256	8,922
South Carolina	490	−1,639	91	437	1,309	1,049	191	−1,159	−818	−4,381
South Dakota	969	1,254	820	672	1,048	967	1,338	1,629	1,451	840
Tennessee	1,278	3,432	5,989	1,578	5,915	5,408	7,519	2,340	−947	−7,706
Texas	2,163	−4,832	−4,774	−6,111	13,969	−12,335	−6,212	−1,274	410	−2,692
Utah	1,362	1,111	892	980	343	181	−1,526	−1,326	−1,395	−1,012
Vermont	1,440	1,957	1,918	1,621	2,066	1,175	1,741	1,602	746	1,369
Virginia	2,567	−1,113	4,292	4,324	6,347	5,109	7,348	4,889	9,216	6,377
Virgin Islands	−223	−184	−459	−227	−256	−305	−885	−656	−226	−550
Washington	15,386	14,053	22,038	19,695	24,875	29,978	25,869	26,794	33,265	20,947
West Virginia	−59	−1,214	−722	−1,047	16	−2,038	−2,484	−2,494	−1,778	−2,927
Wisconsin	21,306	18,451	16,740	15,553	15,386	15,757	12,695	8,280	1,983	4,442
Wyoming	574	363	340	589	226	159	86	−200	−681	−1,178
Total	403,400	338,469	384,691	433,317	462,092	482,243	431,013	407,314	470,398	326,153

Note.—Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding. 1997 and 1998 data include actual incentive payments. 1998 data include Federal hold-harmless payments.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 8–24.—STATES USING THE INCOME SHARES AND PERCENTAGE OF INCOME APPROACHES TO ESTABLISHING CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

Income shares		
Alabama	Maine	Oklahoma
Arizona	Maryland	Oregon
California	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Colorado	Missouri	Rhode Island
Florida	Montana	South Carolina
Idaho	Nebraska	South Dakota
Indiana	New Jersey	Utah
Iowa	New Mexico	Vermont
Kansas	North Carolina	Virginia
Kentucky	Ohio	Washington
Louisiana		
Percentage of income		
Alaska	New Hampshire	Georgia
Arkansas	North Dakota	Mississippi
Connecticut	Tennessee	Nevada
Illinois	Texas	New York
Minnesota	Wyoming	Wisconsin

Source: Garfinkel, McLanahan, & Robins (1994).

REFERENCES

American Institutes for Research. (1999). *State child access and visitation programs: A preliminary report, Fiscal Year 1997 Funding.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Bumpass, L. (1984). Children and marital disruption: A replication and update. *Demography, 21,* 71–82.

Cooper, P., & Johnson, A. (1993, April). *Employment-related health insurance in 1987* (AMCPR Pub. No. 93–0044). Rockville, MD: Public Health Service.

Federal Register. (1992, December 28). Regulations for updating child support orders. *57*(249).

Garfinkel, I., McLanahan, S., & Robins, P.K. (1994). *Child support and child well-being*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Garfinkel, I., Melli, M.S., & Robertson, J.G. (1994, Spring). Child support orders: A perspective on reform (pp. 88–93). In R.E. Behrman (Ed.), *The future of children: Children and divorce, 4*(1). Los Altos, California: Packard Foundation.

Georgeson, L.M. (1989, May). *DNA in paternity cases.* Paper presented at the American Bar Association Third National Child Support Conference, Arlington, VA.

Gordon, A.R. (1994). Implementation of the income withholding and medical support provisions of the 1984 child support enforcement amendments (pp. 86–87). In I. Garfinkel, S. McLanahan, & P. Robins (Eds.), *Child support and child well-being.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Hill, M.S. (1988, May). *The role of economic resources and dual-family status in child support payments.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

McKillop, L.T. (1981). *Benefits of establishing paternity.* Washington, DC: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

National Center for Health Statistics. (1995, September). Advance report of final natality statistics: 1993. *Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 44*(3, Supplement).

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1986). Employer fees for wage withholding. *Child Support Report, 8*(10), p. 7.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1987, September). *Development of guidelines for child support orders: Advisory panel recommendations and final report.* Washington, DC: Author.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1990). *Paternity establishment* (3d ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1991, June). *Child support enforcement in the military.* Washington, DC: Author.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1992). Uniform Interstate Family Support Act proposed to replace URESA. *Child Support Report, 14*(8), pp. 4–5.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1994). *Annual Report to Congress* (for period ending September 30, 1994). Washington, DC: Author.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1996 and various years). *Annual Report to Congress* (21 annual reports for the years 1976–96). Washington, DC: Author.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1995a). FYI—Census report: Single parent growth rate stabilizes. *Child Support Report, 17*(11), p. 5.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1995b). President Clinton signs executive order: Federal agencies to facilitate support order establishment and enforcement. *Child Support Report, 17*(3), pp. 1–2.

Office of Child Support Enforcement. (1995c). DOD consolidates garnishment operation. *Child Support Report, 17*(3), p. 3.

Pirog, M.A., Klotz, M., & Buyers, K.V. (1997). *Interstate comparisons of child support awards using State guidelines, 1997.* Bloomington, IN: Institute for Family and Social Responsibility, Indiana University.

Shulman, G.A. (1994). *Qualified medical child support order handbook.* New York: Wiley Law Publications.

Smith, M.R. (2000). More money for former welfare moms: Simplify the distribution rules. *Child Support Quarterly, 32*(1), pp. 10–12.

Sorensen, E. (1997, November). A national profile of nonresident fathers and their ability to pay child support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59,* 785–97.

Sorensen, E., & Halpern, A. (1999, April). Child support enforcement is working better than we think. *New Federalism: Issues and options for States* (Series A, No. A–31). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1981). Child support and alimony: 1978. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–112. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census Bureau. (1983). Child support and alimony: 1981. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–124. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1985). Child support and alimony: 1983. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–141. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1987). Child support and alimony: 1985. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–152. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1990). Child support and alimony: 1987. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–167. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1991). Child support and alimony: 1989. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–173. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1994). *Household and family characteristics: March 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1995). Child support for custodial mothers and fathers: 1991. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–187. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1998). Poverty in the U.S.: 1998. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–207. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (1999). Child support for custodial mothers and fathers: 1995. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60–196. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. Census Bureau. (in press). Child support and alimony: 1997. *Current Population Reports*, Series P–60.
U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support. (1992). *Supporting our children: A blueprint for reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
U.S. General Accounting Office. (1987). *Child support: Need to improve efforts to identify fathers and obtain support orders* (HRD–87–37). Washington, DC: Author.
U.S. General Accounting Office. (1992a). *Interstate child support: Wage withholding not fulfilling expectations* (HRD–92–65BR). Washington, DC: Author.
U.S. General Accounting Office. (1992b). *Child support enforcement—timely action needed to correct system development problems* (IMTEC–92–46). Washington, DC: Author.
U.S. General Accounting Office. (1996). *Child support enforcement: Early results on comparability of privatized and public offices.* (HEHS–97–4). Washington, DC: Author.
U.S. House of Representatives. (1983). *Child support enforcement amendments of 1983* (House Report No. 98–527). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
Weaver, R.L., & Williams, R.G. (1989, May). *Problems with URESA: Interstate child support enforcement isn't working but could.* Paper presented at the American Bar Association Third National Child Support Conference, Washington, DC.
Wheaton, L., & Sorensen, E. (1998). Reducing welfare costs and dependency: How much bang for the child support buck? *Georgetown Public Policy Review, 4*(1), 23–37.

Williams, R.G. (1994). Implementation of the child support provisions of the Family Support Act: Child support guidelines, updating of awards, and routine income withholding (pp. 93–132). In I. Garfinkel, S. McLanahan, & P. Robins (Eds.), *Child support and child well-being*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.