

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Ways and MeansThe meeting was called to order by Bill Bunten at
Chairperson8:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on Thursday, April 11, 1985 in room 514-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Wisdom (excused)

Committee staff present:

Gloria Timmer	-	Legislative Research
Laura Howard	-	Legislative Research
Jim Wilson	-	Revisor's Office
Sharon Schwartz	-	Administrative Aide
Nadine Young	-	Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Nancy Zogelman, representing Senator Burke's office
 Joe Furjanic, Legal counsel for KASB
 Representative Kline
 Bud Grant, Kansas Chamber of Commerce
 Majorie Van Buren, Judicial Branch
 Don Clevenger, Parents & Children for Equality
 Professor Linda Elrod
 Dr. Robert Harder, Secretary of SRS
 Representative Wunsch
 Duane Johnson
 Bill Abbott, Boeing Company
 Others present (Attachment 1)

Chairman Bunten called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

SB 48 -- an act concerning municipalities; authorizing governing bodies thereof to issue bonds for payment of the costs of removal or encapsulation of friable asbestos-containing material in public buildings and any remodeling, replacement or restoration costs thereof;

Nancy Zogleman explained the bill in the absence of Senator Burke. SB 48 would authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds to remove or encapsulate friable asbestos-containing material. The House Committee on Local Government amended the bill to clarify bonds may be issued to cover remodeling, replacement, or restoration costs as well as removal of encapsulation costs.

Joe Furjanic testified that the Association of School Boards does support the bill and that it in no way affects the budget of any school districts.

Representative Kline presented a technical amendment to SB 48 (Attachment 2) which provides that prior to January 1, 1986, a municipality may request technical assistance from health and environment in reviewing persons or businesses that bid on the projects. Representative Chronister moved that the amendment be adopted. Seconded by Representative Rolfs. Motion carried.

Representative Chronister then moved that SB 48, as amended, be recommended favorable for passage. Seconded by Representative Teagarden. Motion carried.

SB 267 -- an act concerning certain medical malpractice actions; requiring submission to the state board of healing arts of certain information relating thereto; amending K.S.A. 1984 Supp. 40-3409 and repealing the existing section.

Representative Wunsch presented the bill which was requested by Board of Healing Arts. The bill, as amended, deals with submission to the Board certain information regarding medical malpractice actions.

Representative King moved that SB 267 be recommended favorable for passage. Seconded by Representative Louis. Motion carried.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Ways and Means

room 514-S, Statehouse, at 8:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on Thursday, April 11, 1985

HB 2603 -- an act concerning grants-in-aid to libraries; relating to the eligibility therefor; amending K.S.A. 75-2556 and repealing the existing section.

Duane Johnson, State Librarian, explained the bill. HB 2603 amends the statute to allow the State Librarian latitude in determining if local libraries are eligible for grants-in-aid.

Representative Mainey moved that HB 2603 be recommended favorable for passage. Seconded by Representative Chronister. Motion carried.

SB 51 -- an act concerning support and visitation of certain persons; relating to orders for child support, concerning enforcement thereof.

Secretary Robert Harder addressed the committee in support of the new law. He told the committee that even though the fiscal note is substantial, substantial gains can be made in terms of collecting child support payments throughout the state. The total cost for implementation of the program is \$3.8 million, of which \$827,000 would be in state general funds. The balance would be reimbursed by the federal government. The federal government is calling for the program to be on line by October 1, 1985. Dr. Harder emphasized that these enforced collections would reduce ADC payments.

Professor Linda Elrod testified in support of the legislation. She cited three primary purposes; (1) naming a withholding agency(SRS), (2) a wage withholding mechanism and (3) expedited process which allows for a timetable.

Don Clevenger testified in opposition to the bill and related his personal experience of how he is being forced to pay child support payments in two states. He said he is paid up in Kansas, but approximately \$14,000 in arrears in support payments for the state of Washington. He said the intent of the bill is good, but the system simply doesn't work.

Committee recessed at 9:00 a.m.

Committee reconvened at 12:30 p.m. with continued consideration of SB 51.

Marjorie Van Buren testified on behalf of the Judicial Department (Attachment 3). The Judicial administration office did not take a position on the bill, however, they want to present some information relating to the impact it would have on the court system.

Bill Abbott of the Boeing Company addressed the committee, neither as a proponent nor opponent. Mr. Abbott just talked this morning with a federal officer of the child support office and was told there are changes in the rules and regs. He could not say what the changes are exactly, but did say one is in the area of the "employer". Mr. Abbott indicated that Kansas employers will be the ones bearing the expense and possible legal problems if there is ever a slip in complying with the withholding procedures.

Dr. Robert Harder distributed copies of a memo which gives a summary of the fiscal note detail for SB 51 (Attachment 4). SRS anticipates that the cost in the first 12 months would be offset by the revenue generated by the implementation of the program.

Representative Duncan offered a motion to reinsert the language "and such other equitable relief as the court considers proper" which was stricken from the bill (top of page 8 of the bill). Representative Solbach seconded. Motion carried.

Representative Fuller offered a motion to amend Line 99 to read "if at least one payment is more than 30 days overdue". Seconded by Representative Rolfs. Motion carried. Another amendment offered was to change the amount the payor can deduct from \$2.00 to \$5.00 (Line 222-223). Seconded by Representative Louis. Motion carried. Representative Fuller offered a 3rd amendment that would delete the word "payor" and would read "secretary shall provide written notice to the clerk of the court". Seconded by Representative Duncan. Motion carried.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Ways and Means,
room 514-S, Statehouse, at 8:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on Thursday, April 11, 19 85

Representative Louis offered an amendment to change the word "seven" to "twenty" on Line 176. Seconded by Representative Miller.

Dr. Harder responded that this would leave his department only 25 days to respond, which would be very short notice for them. Representative Louis then changed his motion to fourteen (14) days. Representative Miller seconded.

Representative Heinemann offered a substitute motion to change to ten (10) days which is the same ruling that applies to garnishments and would avoid confusion for employers. Seconded by Representative Chronister. Motion carried.

Representative Louis expressed concern regarding the ten items listed in New Sec. 4 which is information concerning the obligor. He asked if this list is conclusive and if there might be other items. Since staff could not give a yes or no to the question, Representative Louis offered a conceptual motion that language be inserted that would in effect say "this is all the payor is obligated to give". Seconded by Representative Rolfs. Motion carried.

Representative Louis also expressed concern that committee does not have time to consider the bill more thoroughly and made a motion that if the bill passes out of this committee, that the subject matter be assigned to a summer interim study. Seconded by Representative Chronister.

Representative Fuller moved that SB 51, as amended, be recommended favorable for passage. Seconded by Representative Rolfs.

Representative Guldner made a substitute motion that SB 51 be tabled. Seconded by Representative King. Motion failed.

Turning back to Representative Fuller's motion, a vote was taken and the motion carried.

Representative Louis offered a conceptual motion that this committee request in writing, that the LCC assign the subject matter of SB 51 for interim study and that any adjustments necessary with particular reference to requirements of the federal rules and regulations be made. Seconded by Representative Shriver. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

4-11-85

Date 4-10-85

Name	Address	Representing
Bill Holtenbeck	Pittsburg	PSC
PHIL KLINE	Ov. PK	HOUSE
Nickie Stein	Topeka	KSNA
David Litwin	"	KCCJ
Sabrina Wells	"	Budget Div.
Joe Furjanic	"	KASB
Jerry Sloan	"	OJA
Ruth Wilkin	"	AAUP
N. Zogelman	"	MLO
Steve Montgomery	"	Ks. Legal Services, Inc
Woody Houseman	"	Divorced Dads of Topeka
Deanne F. J.	✓	State Library
L.M. CORWIS	"	Ks. Library Assoc
Charles V. Hamm	Forbes Field - Topeka	Ks Dept of H & E
Howard F Saiger	"	"
Bob Wunsch	Topeka	Self
Margie VanBuren	Topeka	FOIA
Don Bevis	Topeka	SRS
Julius C. Whiffel	Topeka	SRS
Robt. Harden	Topeka	SRS
Chuck Stevenson	Topeka	SRS
J. Robertson	"	"
Jude Elrod	Topeka	
Jim Buhala	Topeka	Ks. Adm. Support Comm

STATE OF KANSAS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I move to amend Senate Bill No. 48 (As Amended by House Committee) as follows:

On page 2, after line 74, by adding the following:

"(d) Prior to January 1, 1986, a municipality may request technical assistance from the secretary of health and environment in reviewing persons or business entities bidding on asbestos projects as defined by section 1 of 1985 Senate Bill No. 113 to determine if they are capable of complying with all applicable state or federal standards relating to asbestos projects.";

Also on page 2, in line 75, by striking "(d)" and inserting "(e) After January 1, 1986,"; in line 85, by striking "(e)" and inserting "(f)";

On page 3, in line 89, by striking "(f)" and inserting "(g)"

District.

4/11/85 (2)

Testimony On Senate Bill No. 51

By

Marjorie J. Van Buren

Office of Judicial Administration

April 11, 1985

Senate Bill 51 represents a highly significant change in the way payment of court-ordered child support may be enforced in Kansas. The total ramifications of this change are impossible to foresee at this time, and I will not attempt the impossible.

However, I will address some of the effects which can be predicted as they relate to operation of the Kansas Judicial Branch. First, additional judicial work will be created. Additional hearings will be necessary to handle appeals of withholding orders, motions for change in support orders, and so on. Senate Bill 51 extends the jurisdiction of district magistrate judges to include support matters. At present, we believe that this change would permit expeditious handling of the anticipated additional judicial workload without creation of new judge positions.

Another effect which can be confidently predicted from enactment of SB 51 is an enormous increase in accounting workload in the courts due to the increased collections of support which are the measure's primary goal. More child support being paid equals more accounting in the district courts. Our child support accounting staff will require significant expansion simply to make the required postings and disburse payments. A conservative estimate, explained in more detail in the attached fiscal note, is that 47 additional accounting technicians will be required initially.

The third impact which I would like to discuss also falls into the accounting area. In order to implement New Section 13 of SB 51, it will be necessary to develop and maintain a uniform automated court accounting system for the recording of information regarding support orders and payments in each district court of the state. (An exception may be a few of the very smallest courts, where an automated system may not be cost effective.) For the four largest counties, existing computerized accounting systems will have to be modified to meet the demands of the new law. Elsewhere, microcomputers with development of suitable software can be used to convert the current "one-write" manual accounting system into an automated information system which will be able to supply data to the Child Support Enforcement Agency (SRS). (Our cost estimates for hardware, software, and line charges for central reporting are detailed in the fiscal note.)

In order to implement the kind of information system envisioned by SB 51, a very different order of accounting system will have to be developed and put in place than is now in use in 104 counties of Kansas. (The exception is Johnson County, where all support is paid through the Court Trustee.) In effect, what is needed as an end product is an "accounts receivable" system for support. Planning, coordination of software development, maintenance, training of district court personnel, liaison with SRS and other agencies, and monitoring program effectiveness will require additional staff in the Office of Judicial Administration. In addition to a computer analyst and a lawyer with some experience in the domestic relations area, three administrative staff positions and one clerical support position will be needed to implement the statewide system. (Details are provided in the fiscal note.)

If SB 51 becomes law, the Office of Judicial Administration is prepared to give the new policies and procedures regarding enforcement of child support a high priority. This will require a significant allocation of new resources to the courts, much of which we are advised is reimbursable from federal sources. The material in the attached note represents our best current estimate of the additional resources we will need to fulfill our role if this major new policy is enacted.

Attachment



State of Kansas

Office of Judicial Administration

Kansas Judicial Center
301 West 10th
Topeka, Kansas 66612

(913) 296-2256

March 5, 1985

To: Alden Shields, Director of the Budget
From: Jerry Sloan, Budget and Fiscal Officer
Re: Amended Fiscal Note For Senate Bill No. 51

This bill would provide for the establishment of withholding orders for child support or maintenance and provide for their enforcement. It would require a separate order requiring the withholding of income to be issued whenever an order of support is issued. This withholding order could be effective immediately, but would become effective if a one month arrearage in support ever existed. This bill has a number of items which would fiscally impact the judicial branch.

Proposed amendments to Senate Bill 51 and a reassessment of our fiscal note of February 13 have materially changed our estimate of the fiscal impact of this bill.

Although Section 12, as it is proposed to be amended, provides for a contract between the Office of Judicial Administration and the Secretary of Social and Rehabilitation Services for information to be supplied by district courts, the main thrust of this amendment is to provide for currently established court trustee offices and for emergency needs which may arise for district court clerks.

The current accounting system in place in the district courts for the most part reflects the adversarial system of law which it supports. That is, district courts do not record accounts receivable except for amounts due the state. Accounting records are kept by the clerk of the court in most courts. In Johnson County, however, there are exceptions to these general rules in that the Court Trustee Office accounts for all child support and maintenance records in cases in which the recipient requests the services of the trustee and its system does keep track of cumulative amounts due.

This system is computerized and permits arrearages to be noted as soon as they occur as well as keep a cumulative record of the amount due. In our other courts, the accounting system records amounts which are paid through the court, but does not cumulate amounts due. Whenever litigants dispute the amount due, the accounting record is available to prove that part which has been paid through the court.

In order to implement the child support enforcement system contemplated by Senate Bill 51 and its amendments, the 104 district courts other than the one in Johnson County will have to change from the present system to one which performs the functions of the system in Johnson County. The alternative suggested by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services is for a system under their control to which each court provides input. SRS anticipated cost of this system overlooks personnel cost to the court system. Duplicating a service of this magnitude is cost prohibitive. We would need almost as many additional positions as we now have working in domestic relations departments in order to service the central computer and to keep our own local records. However, if the central system can be configured so that its input is an informational product of the court accounting system, costs may be greatly reduced over the cost of a duplicative system. In order to achieve this result, the court would need a substitute system for the one it now maintains in 104 counties and would need software for the Johnson County computer to report to the SRS central computer. We are proposing a system, which in initial discussions with SRS, appears to meet the needs as well as be compatible with SRS's goals.

According to a survey conducted by the Office of Judicial Administration, sixteen counties in the state have computer systems available for court use. These systems coupled with the purchase of micro computers in counties without computer capabilities would provide the basis for the primary data entry component of the system.

Initial data entry on the system would take place in district court offices throughout the state. Periodically (probably daily if any activity has occurred) the data entered on the local computers would be "up-loaded" to the state's computer in Topeka via telecommunications software and hardware. Once the data is loaded onto the state computer, the data would be processed for use by the state's child support enforcement agency (Figure 1).

This system would effectively "network" existing child support data sources with newly created sources to provide comprehensive, accurate and detailed information pertaining to child support enforcement activities throughout the State of Kansas. Further, this system has several distinct advantages over other types of configurations.

First, the locus of the system is in the counties. Since most of the existing child support data already exists in the district courts of the state, this configuration would prevent unnecessary duplication of existing records.

Next, this type of configuration would reduce the long term operating costs of the system. The initial need for hardware purchase will be somewhat offset by using existing computer resources. Further, the cost of this system would be much lower than any on-line real time system since data could be "up-loaded" for batch processing.

Finally, such a system would make computerization easier to achieve in the district courts. Most child support payments would be processed at the beginning of each month. Once this processing would be completed, the district courts could use the additional computer resources for other functions contingent on software availability.

This type of configuration is predicated on the establishment of a two-tiered software system. The first-tier of the system would be a software module which provides for case initiation, payment receipt and distribution and accounting functions. The data entered into this module would be shared with a second module which would handle case management and enforcement activities. This module would be utilized, primarily, by the State's child support enforcement agency (See Figure 2).

As previously mentioned, support orders, modifications and most enforcement proceedings are processed by the district court. Whenever the court enters or modifies a support order, local personnel will enter the pertinent information on the computer. This information will include all necessary names, addresses, social security numbers, dates of birth, support amounts, payment schedules, etc.

When an obligor or payor makes a regular payment to the local court clerk (or trustee) the payment will be recorded on the local computer. The system may even be able to automatically generate receipts, disbursement checks, and post disbursements. When the disbursement check is generated and posted, the payment will be forwarded to the child support recipient (See Figure 3).

Whenever an arrearage develops, the state computer will generate a notice to the Child Support Enforcement Agency (C.S.E.A.). The C.S.E.A. will commence enforcement proceedings by causing service of any existing withholding order on both the obligor and the payor.

Assuming that the withholding order is not contested, the payor will commence payments to the local court. These payments will be processed in the same manner as any other child support payment.

Whenever other court-related enforcement techniques (e.g., garnishments, executions, etc.) are implemented, the procedure for data entry will be similar to the procedure for processing withholding orders. All court-related enforcement activities will be entered and updated at the local level.

When non-court related enforcement techniques are used (e.g., offsets of tax refunds, benefits, etc.) it will be the responsibility of the C.S.E.A. to coordinate activities with the state computer center and any other agencies (See Figure 4).

All necessary federal reports will be processed and automatically generated by the state computer center. It will be the responsibility of the C.S.E.A. to ensure that these reports are prepared and submitted as required.

Whenever the court, the parties, abstractors or the local credit agencies need access to payment information, the local court will be able to generate the necessary information from its system. Information for interstate requests and use by credit agencies can be handled by the State's computer center.

The information flow outlined in this section is predicated on the development of a centralized state child support enforcement computer fed by a network of locally operated computers. Most data will be entered at the local level, merged with existing data, and also stored in temporary files. At the end of each business day, data will be "up-loaded" to the State's computer via modems. Once the temporary files are loaded onto the State's computer, data will be merged with existing files to provide timely accurate child support records (See Figure 5).

The costs associated with such a system are itemized below. It is our understanding that 90% of the costs associated with the acquisitions and implementation of such a system would be reimbursed by the federal government.

Currently, sixteen district courts in the State of Kansas have or have access to computer hardware. Assuming that not all of these computers could be utilized for child support enforcement, it would be necessary to purchase computer equipment for 95 counties. Cost of this equipment would be approximately \$633,000.00. This equipment would include an IBM PC AT micro computer, a compatible dot matrix printer and modems.

Software costs would fall into two general categories. First, system software including the child support module and the case management/enforcement module would have to be developed. Secondly, appropriate communication software would be needed to allow local computers to "communicate" with the State's computer center. System development costs are difficult to project. The Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services has estimated software development at a cost of \$1,000,000.00. This estimate is compatible with the actual costs incurred by the State of Oregon for the development of a similar system. They also estimate that these costs were evenly divided between the two software components mentioned above. Thus the cost of the court part of this software would be approximately \$500,000.

According to estimates by I.B.M. Corporation communication software costs, using commercially available software, would cost approximately \$84,000.00 statewide. There would also be recurring costs for line costs for data transmission. Line costs (assuming a rate of \$16.87 per hour) would cost approximately \$85,000.00.

These costs estimated above are only for the court component of this automated system. There would also be costs associated with the enforcement component which would be better addressed by SRS. The total costs above would be \$1,302,000 with \$130,200 being required from the State General Fund and \$1,171,800 being paid for with federal funds.

In either the SRS computer system set forth in their fiscal note dated February 1, 1985, or in the system we recommend, the clerical staff in district court domestic relations departments will be required to read and analyze court documents generated by current domestic relations cases in order to set up a case so that it will be available in case an application for aid to dependent children is made by a named obligee, a relative providing care, children in foster care, or those for whom medical services are being provided.

In a very limited survey, it was found that approximately 60% of the domestic relations cases involved child support. This would imply that of the 23,152 domestic relation cases filed in FY 1984, 13,891 of them involved child support. The total caseload for ongoing cases might average ten to fifteen times this number. I would further assume that for accounting purposes and to verify arrearages, nearly all of these would be paid through the courts. Currently it is estimated that about 15% of these cases statewide are paid to the obligee, but of the remaining 85%, it is estimated that a substantial number are in arrears and do not actually impact the current accounting functions in the district courts. Thus we would estimate the accounting work in the district courts would be impacted by approximately 50,000 new cases and this number might be too conservative.

About 23,000 new cases per year must be screened. In those with child support, payment or nonpayment must be monitored monthly. Potentially all cases will come under the program of child support enforcement.

Even with the computerization discussed above, additional help will be needed in the district courts. In one of the urban judicial districts (Johnson County) there is a court trustee program which could probably manage the increase in caseload as long as they are allowed to continue to collect their administrative fees. In the remaining districts, accounting technicians will be required.

We currently have approximately 110 F.T.E. positions committed to child support record keeping. If we assume that we are effectively accounting for 70% of the payments that are to be made, in order to process the ones that are not currently being paid to the court would require 157 F.T.E., an increase of 47 positions. The cost of these additional positions in salaries and fringe benefits would be \$646,751. It is our understanding that 69% of this cost could be reimbursed from federal funds, so the cost to the state general fund would be \$200,493. We do assume that when the computer system is fully operational, this increase in personnel could probably be reduced. We would expect that it will take approximately two years to fully implement the proposed system and at that time we could probably reduce these increased personnel needs by about 50%.

The court trustee office in Johnson County keeps all of its accounts current using 11 clerical positions at a personnel cost of \$231,031. This office processed \$11 million dollars of payments of both IV-D and non-IV-D support payments in calendar year 1984. The office has been operating for about ten years.

Additional staff would also be required in the Judicial Administrator's office to act as liaison with the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services and the district courts, to provide ongoing training to produce and distribute informational materials and to monitor operations in the district courts on the effectiveness of this bill. It is estimated that one Court Programs Analyst, two assistants, and one Secretary II would be required to monitor this system.

In addition, this bill will require our domestic relations departments to learn in a short period of time what has become routine to the Johnson County staff where they have learned to react and interpret orders and modification to orders submitted by a variety of lawyers, few of whom agree on terminology. This is actually paralegal work which will require considerable training. Because the bulk of domestic relations cases will be in courts that do not have a trustee, a staff attorney position will be needed in the office of the Judicial Administrator to help translate legal documents for

clerical employees. The OJA will also require a computer analyst to coordinate the development and maintenance on the computer software discussed above.

Total salaries and fringe benefits cost for these positions would be \$151,220. For operating costs, these positions would require \$3,500 for travel; \$4,500 for telephone costs and minor office supplies; and \$13,740 for capital outlay. This capital outlay would include three terminals which could be used for both word processing and to access the data base proposed by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. There would also be costs associated with printing and disseminating informational materials on this program, which should include information to obligees, obligors and payors. It is estimated that this would cost approximately \$15,000 annually. Thus the total cost for this part of the operation would be \$187,960.

It appears that this amount would also qualify for the 69% reimbursement from federal funds.

There would also be some additional cost and impact in other areas of the operation. New forms would need to be devised and printed for these income withholding. It is estimated this cost would be approximately \$15,000 and would be borne by the counties throughout the state. The amendment to allow paternity suits to be instituted until a child is 18 or more years old will impact the courts with more work, but I do not have any statistics on how many cases this might include.

While the income withholding provisions would not become effective until January 1, 1986, funding to implement this would be required at the beginning of the Fiscal Year 1986. There is a requirement of substantial additional training as well as reviewing and updating the accounting records in these cases that must be done prior to implementation of this bill. The development of the computerized record system also must begin immediately.

I have itemized and summarized the costs below:

	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>State General Fund</u>	<u>Federal Funds</u>
Computer System	\$1,302,000	\$130,200	\$1,171,800
Dist. Court Pers.	646,751	200,493	446,258
Associated OJA Costs	<u>187,960</u>	<u>58,268</u>	<u>129,692</u>
TOTAL	\$2,136,711	\$388,961	\$1,747,750

It should be noted that these are first-year costs. The second year costs would be reduced by approximately \$1,167,440 which subtracts capital outlay and software development but adds for maintenance on the hardware. If, in fact, personnel costs can be reduced as noted above, the third and following years would have even a further cost reduction of \$323,376.

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES
Office of the Secretary

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Robert C. Harder DATE: April 11, 1985
FROM: Charles Stevenson CS SUBJECT: S.B. 51

The following is a summary of the fiscal note detail for S.B. 51. The grand total is slightly less than the previous estimate due to elimination of duplication.

PERSONNEL

SRS

Withholding	29 positions	\$ 300,640	half year
Debt set off	3 positions	64,300	full year
Interstate cases	14 positions	285,908	
Paternity and URESAs actions	14 positions	<u>360,462</u>	
Total		\$1,011,310	

This would place 60 additional positions in SRS field offices and would include 7 new field office attorneys. One of the 5 new positions in SRS Central Office would be an attorney.

Office of Judicial Administration

47 Clerks for clerks of Court	\$ 646,751
6 positions and operating costs	<u>187,690</u>
Total	\$ 834,441

Department of Administration

Debt set off - 2 positions and operating costs	\$ 67,090
Withholding - 4 positions and operating costs	<u>201,337</u>
Total	\$ 268,427

We anticipate the withholding income will be \$30,000 per year from the \$5 fee per check. Therefore net cost would be \$238,427.

Department of Revenue

2 positions	\$ 32,234
Total Personnel and Operating State Funds	\$2,146,382 \$ 656,156

4/11/85

(4)

COMPUTER CAPABILITY - Both Court Services and SRS

Contractual System Development	\$1,000,000
Hardware Costs for Clerks of Court and Court Trustees and SRS Offices	633,000
Communications Costs	<u>85,000</u>
Total	\$1,718,000
State General Fund	\$ 171,800

These costs are matchable at 90% federal funds. Only the communication costs and maintenance for the computer system would be recurring. Therefore, future year costs would be approximately \$200,000 per year.

GRAND TOTAL	\$2,864,382
State Funds	\$ 827,956

JCS:jmw
4882E