



ERICSA

2022

*Jazzin' It Up
for Children
and Families*

New Orleans

May 22 – 26, 2022

**59TH ANNUAL
TRAINING CONFERENCE
& EXPOSITION**

Interstate *Hot* Topics

Speakers: Rob Velcoff, Diane Potts, Beth Dittus

Moderator: Kelly Micka



Interstate Payment Processing

- A. The current interstate payment processing policies are fine and do not need to be changed.**
- B. The current interstate payment processing policies should be changed, but the concept that the controlling order state is responsible for maintaining the official determination of arrears should remain in place.**
- C. The current interstate payment processing policies should be changed, and the concept that the controlling order state is responsible for maintaining the official determination of arrears should be eliminated.**
- D. The current interstate payment processing policies should be changed, but I'm not sure what kind of changes are needed.**



Case Closure

- A. The current case closure policies are fine and do not need to be changed.**
- B. The current case closure policies should be changed, but the initiating jurisdiction should still be able to tell the responding jurisdiction when and if to close their two-state case.**
- C. The current case closure policies should be changed, and the responding jurisdiction should be able to close their two-state case based on only some of the existing case closure criteria.**
- D. The current case closure policies should be changed, and the responding jurisdiction should be able to close their two-state case based on any and all of the existing case closure criteria.**



Enforcement of “Dead” Cases

- A. The initiating jurisdiction should be able to send whichever cases they want to the responding jurisdiction regardless of the enforceability of the order, and the responding jurisdiction must accept these cases and attempt enforcement.**
- B. The initiating jurisdiction should be able to send only “enforceable” cases to the responding jurisdiction, and the responding jurisdiction must accept these cases and attempt enforcement.**
- C. The initiating jurisdiction should be able to send whichever cases they want to the responding jurisdiction regardless of the enforceability of the order, but the responding jurisdiction may refuse to accept an “unenforceable” case.**
- D. The initiating jurisdiction should be able to send only “enforceable” cases to the responding jurisdiction, but the responding jurisdiction may refuse to accept an “unenforceable” case.**



\$0 Orders

- A. Courts should not establish \$0 orders. “Minimum wage” orders should be established instead, which may be registered for enforcement in another state.**
- B. Courts should not establish \$0 orders. “Current needs of the child” orders should be established instead, which may be registered for enforcement in another state.**
- C. Courts should continue to establish \$0 orders, but these should not be registered for enforcement in another state.**
- D. Courts should continue to establish \$0 orders, and these may be registered for enforcement in another state.**



Interest

- A. Interest rates should continue to be determined on a state by state basis.
- B. Interest rates should be made uniform either by federal statute or by a requirement that all states pass regulations that use the same percentage – 0%.
- C. Interest rates should be made uniform either by federal statute or by a requirement that all states pass regulations that use the same percentage – something greater than 0% (between 1% - 10%), the specific number to be determined.
- D. States that do not charge interest should not be expected to enforce interest accrued by another state.



Limited Services

- A. The current limited services that are listed on the CSE Transmittal #3 are fine and should not be changed.**
- B. There are too many limited services listed on the CSE Transmittal #3, and some should be eliminated.**
- C. There are not enough limited services listed on the CSE Transmittal #3, and some new ones should be added.**
- D. The amount of limited services that are listed on the CSE Transmittal #3 is fine, but some should be dropped while some new ones should be added.**



Debt Compromise

- A. States should not vigorously pursue debt compromise.**
- B. States should vigorously pursue debt compromise, but only on TANF arrears (including interest).**
- C. States should vigorously pursue debt compromise on both TANF and non-TANF cases (including interest), with the CP's permission on non-TANF arrears.**
- D. States should vigorously pursue debt compromise on both TANF and non-TANF cases (including interest), and the CP's permission should not be needed on non-TANF cases.**



IWO on Unemployment Insurance Benefits

- A. States should not be required to honor IWOs on Unemployment Insurance Benefits.**
- B. States should be required to honor IWO on Unemployment Insurance Benefits.**
- C. States should continue to decide on their own whether they want to honor IWOs on Unemployment Insurance Benefits, and those that do not should require full registration of the order.**
- D. States should continue to decide on their own whether they want to honor IWOs on Unemployment Insurance Benefits, but those that do not should do this as a limited service option and not require full registration of the order.**



THANK YOU!

Rob Velcoff, Independent Consultant
Intergovernmental Support Services
robvelcoff@intergovernmentalsupportservices.com
<https://intergovernmentalsupportservices.com>

Diane Potts, Director
National Strategy Team
CGI Inc.
diane.potts@cgi.com

Beth Dittus, Policy and Legal Unit Counsel
North Dakota Child Support
bldittus@nd.gov

Kelly Micka, Director
Alvarez and Marsal, LLC
kmicka@alvarezandmarsal.com

