

MINUTES OF THE JOINT HOUSE & SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairpersons Michael O'Neal & John Vratil at 3:30 p.m. On January 22, 2001 in Room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representative Rehorn - Excused

Committee staff present:

Jerry Ann Donaldson, Legislative Research Department
Mike Heim, Legislative Research Department
Jennifer Strait, Intern for Legislative Research Department
Jill Wolters, Revisor of Statutes Office
Cindy O'Neal, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Representative Peggy Palmer
Lori Hogan, Topeka
Cindy Withers, Erie
Rick Coyne, Scott City
Susan Kang, Douglas County Court Trustee
Kathleen Sloan, Johnson County Court Trustee
Karen Griffith, Norton County Court Trustee
Lee Fisher, Trego County Court Trustee
Anne McDonald, Wyandotte County Court Trustee

A copy of the appropriations proviso from the 2000 Session which authorized the Department of Social & Rehabilitative Services and the Kansas Supreme Court to enact the Kansas Payment Center (Attachment 1). Also a copy of the Supreme Court Administrative Order Number 154 which sets out the procedural guidelines for the payment center to follow (Attachment 2).

Representative Peggy Palmer was contacted by a constituent who has had trouble receiving her child support payments since the Kansas Payment Center had been processing them. Rep. Palmer met with the payment center and believes that the Center is grossly understaffed. Many families depend on these payments and when they are not received it causes them a financial burden. She requested that the legislature consider allowing families to opt out of sending their checks to the Payment Center without receiving a penalty.

Lori Hogan, Topeka, informed the Committee that sometimes she receives her child support check in one payment and at other times it two or three different checks. She questioned who is receiving the interest on the child support money and why she has to pay a \$12.80 per month service fee (Attachment 3)

Cindy Withers, Erie, was concerned when she heard that there would be one payment center handling all the child support checks because the courts were efficient. She stated that her payments have been consistently late and have caused her to miss bill payment deadlines, write hot checks and now she is \$1,000 in debt for overdraft charges and late charges. She also has experienced problems in getting the payment center to automatically deposit her support (Attachment 4)

Rick Coyne, Scott City, reminded the Committee that SRS's moto is to help family & children. He believes that both SRS & the Kansas Payment Center should share in the blame of not providing an adequate payment center for the children of Kansas. He was concerned about the long waits that people have on the phone to get any help. The longest he as waited was an hour and forty-five minutes. He believes that this is totally unacceptable. He encouraged the committee to consider allowing the Clerks of the Courts to handle the payments again (Attachment 5).

Susan Kang, Douglas County Court Trustee, stated that since the inception of the Kansas Payment Center they have spent many hours working with mothers & fathers who have problems with the Payment Center. Types of problems they have encountered range from:

- ◆ Payments that should be applied to two different obligations are consistently applied to one child support
- ◆ Payments have been applied to an incorrect case even though the correct case number is listed on the check
- ◆ Payments have not been posted
- ◆ They have found that there is no procedure for securing refunds for parents who have been overpaid
- ◆ There is no procedure for holding payments until a necessary change is made
- ◆ Lack of a timely response for questions and problems

The courts are supposed to be the enforcement behind the child support but are finding that they are spending more time on helping those with problems than they were originally when they were in charge of the Child Support System (Attachment 6).

Kathleen Sloan, Johnson County Court Trustee, stated that while the payment center is mandated by the federal government it does not enhance the collection & distribution of child support payments (Attachment 7). She proposed several changes, which were discussed with Court Trustee and the Office of Judicial Administration.

- ◆ Payment Center must provide the courts and trustee with ongoing access to the suspense list
- ◆ Permit the courts and trustees to have more access to information about payments being processed
- ◆ Enhance the secure web site so that more information is provided
- ◆ Provide more trained staff and separate telephone access for the court to deal with questions and problems
- ◆ Extend the amount of time access to the web site is permitted.

Karen Griffith, Norton County Court Trustee, commented that her main problem is with not having access to the unidentified payments so she can help those from her county find their payments. She has problems with the internet site being maxed out and then closing down on a regular basis. Also many of the checks are taking a week or more to get from St. Louis to the receiver. She proposed that the State not reject the contract with Tier but help them with the problems they are experiencing with the current system (Attachment 8).

Lee Fisher, Trego County Court Trustee, has seen major improvements in most areas with the Payment Center but is very concerned with the turn around time that it is taking for checks to be posted, cut and mailed out to the receiver (Attachment 9).

Anne McDonald, Wyandotte County Court Trustee, has been asked numerous times about the ability to opt out of sending their child support payments to the Center and just paying their ex-spouses directly because of the financial burden waiting for the check causes (Attachment 10).

The Committee meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 23, 2001 at 3:30 in room 313-S.

(m) In addition to the other purposes for which expenditures may be made by the department of social and rehabilitation services from any moneys appropriated from the state general fund or any special revenue fund for the fiscal year 2001, as authorized by this or other appropriation act of the 2000 regular session of the legislature, expenditures shall be made by the department of social and rehabilitation services from any such moneys appropriated for fiscal year 2001 for the receipt, crediting and disbursement of moneys received by the department of social and rehabilitation services for payments of support pursuant to a rule or administrative order issued by the Kansas supreme court, which is hereby authorized to be issued by the Kansas supreme court, directing payments of support, which are made pursuant to any court order entered in this state regardless of the date of the order, to be made to a central unit for the collection and disbursement of support payments, notwithstanding the provisions of any statute to the contrary.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 154

Re: Redirection of Court-ordered Support Payments to the Kansas Payment Center

Pursuant to the provisions of L. 2000, ch. 183, sec. 20(m), this order authorizes redirection of payments on all Kansas court orders for child support, spousal maintenance, and other support-related payments, including support payments made pursuant to income withholding orders, which are currently made to the Clerk of the District Court or the District Court Trustee, to the Kansas Payment Center, at P.O. Box 758599, Topeka, Kansas 66675-8599.

Redirection to the Kansas Payment Center will occur on the date set out in the Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines, which are attached to this order. The Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines shall contain policies and procedures which shall be followed to promote the efficient receipt and disbursement of support payments by the Kansas Payment Center.

The Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines may be updated as deemed necessary by the Judicial Administrator.

This order is effective through June 30, 2001.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT this 14th day of Sept, 2000.



Kay McFarland
Chief Justice

KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

1. Beginning September 29, 2000, payments on existing, new, and modified child support, maintenance, and other support-related orders from all Kansas counties shall be paid to the Kansas Payment Center, at P.O. Box 758599, Topeka, Kansas 66675-8599.
2. Court-ordered support which is currently ordered excepted for good cause from payment through the Clerk of the District Court or the District Court Trustee shall not be required to be paid to the Kansas Payment Center.
3. Prior to September 29, 2000, the Kansas Payment Center shall send a redirect notice to each support payor and payee, and if there is an income withholding order in effect, to the employer. Each district court will have notice, by virtue of this order, of the September 29, 2000, redirection of payments to the Kansas Payment Center. Therefore, it is not required that each case file contain a copy of the Kansas Payment Center redirection notice. A copy of this order may be placed in each applicable case file, should a district so choose.
4. Employers withholding support payments for multiple individuals may submit to the Kansas Payment Center a single payment for each pay period, provided that the payment is for the total amount due on all Kansas income withholding orders issued to that employer. The payment must be accompanied by a detailed list itemizing the breakdown between court orders. The employee's social security number must be included, as well as the withholding date.
5. Each payment submitted to the Kansas Payment Center must include the court order number, which must begin with the two digit alpha character identifier for the county in which the order was entered. For example, a payment on a case from Shawnee County must be identified in the following format: SN99D 123456.

6. Support-related payments made pursuant to garnishment proceedings shall continue to be directed to the Clerk of the District Court. The Clerk shall forward the funds to the Kansas Payment Center immediately after receipt of the order to pay out, and shall specify the debt to which the payment shall apply.
7. Payments currently made to child support agencies in states other than Kansas shall continue to be made to those other states, and shall not be redirected to the Kansas Payment Center.
8. All new or modified non-IVD support orders entered on or after September 29, 2000, must be accompanied by a support order information sheet which will be developed by the Office of Judicial Administration and which will be available in the office of each Clerk of the District Court.
9. The official payment history for support payments made prior to September 29, 2000, shall continue to be maintained, as occurs currently, by the Clerk of the District Court or District Court Trustee.

For payments made following September 29, 2000, the official payment history shall be maintained by the Kansas Payment Center, and will be made available for requesting parties by the Clerk of the District Court, who will access the payment history from the electronic Kansas Payment Center database. Clerks' offices will certify information accessed from the Kansas Payment Center as a true and correct copy of information provided by the Kansas Payment Center. Parties will also be able to access payment information regarding their support cases from the Kansas Payment Center website.

10. Any local district court rules which contain support payment provisions contrary to those set out in this order are hereby repealed.

(9/00)

Lori L. Hogan
4821 SW 17th St., Apt. 1
Topeka, Kansas 66604

January 22, 2001

To: Senate and House Judiciary Committees

Re: Child support payments

Here are a few facts regarding my situation:

My child was born September 26, 1992.

I was granted a divorce from the child's father on September 28, 1992. The divorce became final six weeks later.

Court ordered child support began October 1, 1992.

Payments of \$400 per month were withheld from U. S. Army pay and received regularly about the first of each month.

"Administrative Hearing Officer Court Order filed on 4-2-96 decrease child support to \$320.00 a month effective 4-1-96 and journalized the arrears as \$1,000.00 effective 3-30-96." (Entry from MONTH BY MONTH ARREARS COMPUTATION.) The \$1,000.00 was the balance owed from a court ordered settlement for an automobile.

The monthly payments beginning April 1, 1996 were changed to \$320.00 child support and \$30.00 payment on the \$1,000.00 arrears for a total of \$350.00 per month. These payments were received regularly until MAXIMUS began administering the program.

From that point until now I have received sporadic payments. Payment times vary. Some months one check pays the amount in full. In other months, I receive a small amount with the balance following at varying times. This seems strange because military pay dates are always about the first of each month. I had hoped that this situation would be corrected when the Kansas Payment Center began forwarding the payments but this has not happened. Example: January, 2001 – payment issued January 2 of \$76.80, received January 7. Remainder of \$230.40 paid on January 9, received January 13. They received the payment from the Army on December 30, 2000.

I would like to know who is collecting the interest on my money.

For all of this, I am paying \$12.80 per month in fees.

House Judiciary
1-22-01
Attachment 3

I have contacted my social worker in accordance with SRS policies, but even this was not easy. I tried numerous times to contact him and left messages for him to call me. He did not return my calls. I understand that he may be busy if others are having similar problems. When I finally reached him, he offered to provide some documentation of my account, but suggested that the available information might not be helpful. He said that information, which might be more helpful, could not be provided for 4 to 6 months because he was too busy. He did send some information about 2 weeks later. I'm not sure whether it is the helpful or unhelpful material but, so far, it hasn't helped me.

I'll appreciate anything you can do to help resolve this situation.


Lori L. Hogan

When I first learned that all Kansans would be receiving child support through a new payment center, I was concerned. In my particular case, child support payments are to be made on the 15th and 31st, as ordered by the Court of Neosho County. However, when my ex-husband took new employment out of the State of Kansas, his payroll was paid monthly on the 28th, therefore making the child support already behind by two weeks. As with any type of changeover, I knew there would be glitches and errors that would be unavoidable and I also knew that the possibility of child support payment for the first month might be delayed. I had no idea, however, that it's disorganization would cause my financial destruction. As soon as I received the letter of notification regarding the particulars about the Kansas Payment Center, I requested a form off the Internet web site in order to have child support payments deposited directly to my bank account. I had hoped this would expedite receiving payments. I sent the automatic deposit form in as soon as I received it, but since it was towards the latter part of September, I did not expect the request to go in effect for the September payment, which it did not. I was excited by the payment center having a web site, as I could check daily to see when payments had been received and disbursed and in that way could anticipate an approximate date of receipt of support checks. According to the information on the web site, the payment center received a support check and disbursed it on October 5th. However, when I had not received it by October 15th, I became concerned and attempted to contact them. I found (and have found since then) that it is virtually impossible to get through on the phone. Their message indicates they are having an unusually high volume of calls, which I believe is self-explanatory. I finally received September's child support payment from the Kansas Payment Center on October 17th. In the meantime, our area newspaper ran an article indicating that the payment center was experiencing difficulty getting payments out on time and that a letter to this effect would be sent to recipients to file with their creditors if one was requested. I sent a request for said letter along with my automatic deposit request form.

I had hoped that by October things would be worked out and that my request for direct deposit would be in effect. When October's check had not arrived by November 10th (having been posted on the web site on November 1st), I once again became concerned. This time, I contacted my bank on several occasions to see if a direct deposit had been made. The child support check finally came to my home on November 12th. By this time, I had incurred many expenses for lack of funds. In September, I had enrolled four children in school; one in college, one in high school and two in junior high. With these extra expenses and no child support, I had to put off paying some creditors, which resulted in late payment fees. Also, unfortunately, with the child support payment coming in so late, I also had overdraft costs and even some returned check fees. Of course, with receipt of the November payment so late, all of this snowballed, leading to more late costs, overdraft fees, etc.

December was a repeat of the prior months, except worse. According to the web site, November's payment had reached the Kansas Payment Center on December 4th. On December 10th an envelope arrived in the mail from the payment center to my relief. However, it contained my original letter and request form for automatic deposit. The payment center had lost my voided check and could not automatically deposit without it!

No letter was included that could be forwarded to my creditors. I promptly returned the form with a voided check and a handwritten note once again asking for a letter. By December 15th I still had not received payment. I was extremely worried—Christmas was fast approaching and I had absolutely no reserves left with the financial problems created by the Kansas Payment Center; it looked like my children would not have Christmas!! I tried calling the payment center on the 15th, only to get the same recorded message as stated earlier. I stayed on the line for over two hours until finally, close to 5 o'clock my call was taken. I explained my situation to the employee who indicated that according to their records payment was disbursed on the 4th. She informed me I would have to request a stop payment request and once they received it, they would issue a new check. I also asked why I had not received the letter for my creditors. At first, she indicated she didn't know what I was talking about, but finally stated I would have to request this from SRS, which was not what the newspaper article had indicated. I did request a stop payment form from her. That same day, I contacted SRS and requested the letter for my creditors. **The very next day, I received the stop payment request form in the mail, thus verifying my skepticism that the delay in receiving payment lay in the fault of the mail service.** Fortunately, I also received November's check the following day. Once I received the letter from SRS, I wrote letters to the two institutions where I bank. I requested that, if possible, could some of the charges I had incurred please be overturned. I sent copies of these letters to my state representatives.

To date, I have heard nothing from either bank whether they will overturn any charges or not. I have incurred over \$1,000.00 in expenses due to late fees on credit cards, loan payments and overdraft charges. (Of note, December's child support check was received by the Kansas Payment Center on January 2nd; I received it **in the mail** on January 11th.)

As far as how to correct the problems with the Kansas Payment Center, most of my proposals may already be in effect or would have been better had they been made at the conception of the payment center; for example, 1) correspondence between the clerks of each district court wherein they set up the payment records and then transmit records and payments for six months to a year to the payment center before it actually would take over those duties; 2) overstaffing to take the place of at least 105 clerks (one for each county); 3) staffing of individuals who receive child support and understand the desperate need for payments being made on time. However, I do know that something needs to be done regarding the reimbursement of expenses incurred to those who have suffered the incompetence of the Kansas Payment Center--possibly a tax deduction for anyone receiving child support or a reimbursement of expenses on an individual basis. I know that I have been humiliated, both emotionally and financially, by this situation—unfortunately, the Kansas Payment Center cannot be reimburse my pride.

Cindy Withers

Testimony by
Mr. Rick Coyne
before
The Reviewing Committee
on
The Kansas Payment Center
January 22, 2001

For further information contact me at:
(316) 872-2545 on Mon, Wed, Fri, all day
or mail me at:
Rick Coyne
1602 Church St.
Scott City, Ks 67871

Distinguished committee members, I am Rick Coyne, a Fort Hays State student. I am a Social Work Major, husband and father. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns and comments towards the Kansas Payment Center and the SRS. I will try to be brief and to the point.

As a father and as a Social Worker I am opposed of the Kansas Payment Center and in the next few minutes try to show you why and how the program has failed, and why it needs to be placed back into the District Courts.

The Kansas Payment Center has failed to meet the needs of the children and the parents because:

1. The needs of the children have been lost. Child support is to help meet all the needs of the children. 6,000 to 9,000 is not an acceptable number of people not getting their child support on time.
2. The duty of the SRS is to make sure that a child's needs are being met. If a parent is relying on Child support and is not receiving it on time, how can that parent take care of their children's needs.
3. The SRS or Kansas payment center is handling over 300,000 clients. The center is totally under staffed. I have called over thirty times and my average wait time is forty-five minutes and my longest wait time was one and a half hours before I hung up. If I charged the payment center for my time I spend on the phone waiting my children would not need child support.

These points that I have made may not seem that big of a deal, but the people that the payment center is hurting are the children. Are not they who we are all to be protecting! Unfortunately, those at the top are not paying attention to who they are hurting or we would not be here now fighting to abolish the payment center. There is not a reasonable number of checks not getting sent out on time or not being sent out at all.

Attached are my and my wife's child support payments. On Co#: 98D 000033 seq # 1- 6, show an allocation of \$92.00 all on the same day, we have to figure out if this is several different payments or just another mess up. It doesn't help to call because no one seems to know. As of yet we have only received one of those payments.

Co# 97D 000288 seq # 21 - 23, this money was paid by my ex-wife's employer on September 24 2000 to the payment center. The date on here is November 9 2000. But that date was not when the money was sent., over a full month had past before any money was paid out to my children. That is acceptable according to Janet. If I depended totally on this money I would have had to go on assistance to meet my children's needs. I tried to understand that the system was new and glitches had to be worked out, but the attitude I received when I called to find out where the support was, blew me away. I waited on the phone for an hour, when someone did answer they had no idea where the support was, I ran up against this same wall all the way up. I spoke to Virginia Taylor and I was told that the money had already be sent out when it had not. It took several weeks to finally get someone to admit the money had not been sent and an emergency check was cut and sent.

In conclusion, as you consider to continue allowing the payment center to collect the support or put it back into the hands of the clerks, remember, that support belongs to the children. It is to put a roof over their heads, food in their stomachs, and clothing on their backs. Today will pass, as will this week and month, you and Janet will continue to receive your paychecks. As you put them into the bank will you stop and wonder if all the children that the payment center services are getting their money or will you think of one of the 6,000 to 9,000 that are not, and will have to very possibly go hungry until they get that support! If that money is not on time every time who is being hurt! Again, thank you for letting me speak before you.



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New

County Name: SCOTT

CO #: 98D 000033

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333652	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
2	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333654	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
3	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333656	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
4	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333658	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
5	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333659	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
6	MEMO	1/9/2001	1333660	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
7	MEMO	1/3/2001	1238490	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
8	MEMO	12/27/2000	1138629	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
9	MEMO	12/19/2000	1038613	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
10	MEMO	12/12/2000	945008	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
11	MEMO	12/5/2000	849753	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
12	MEMO	11/28/2000	746471	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
13	MEMO	11/21/2000	675295	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
14	MEMO	11/14/2000	850971	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
15	MEMO	11/7/2000	514901	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
16	MEMO	10/31/2000	420137	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
17	MEMO	10/24/2000	329504	HALL, KEVIN		\$92.00	CS	
18	PYMT	10/9/2000	86752	HALL, KEVIN	\$275.00		CS	
19	ALOC	10/9/2000	77554	SRS		\$275.00	SRS	7913



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a Ne

County Name: FINNEY

CO #: 97D 000288

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	PYMT	1/16/2001	1382406	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$289.00		CS	
2	ALOC	1/16/2001	1382407	COYNE, RICK		\$289.00	CS	
3	DISB	1/16/2001	1382407	COYNE, RICK			CS	
4	PYMT	1/2/2001	1177613	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$289.00		CS	
5	ALOC	1/2/2001	1177614	COYNE, RICK		\$289.00	CS	
6	DISB	1/2/2001	1177614	COYNE, RICK			CS	
7	PYMT	12/20/2000	1031703	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$289.00		CS	
8	ALOC	12/20/2000	1031704	COYNE, RICK		\$289.00	CS	
9	DISB	12/20/2000	1031704	COYNE, RICK			CS	
10	PYMT	12/5/2000	827447	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$289.00		CS	
11	ALOC	12/5/2000	827448	COYNE, RICK		\$289.00	CS	
12	DISB	12/5/2000	827448	COYNE, RICK			CS	50093804
13	PYMT	12/4/2000	798582	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$573.00		CS	
14	PYMT	12/4/2000	798582	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$189.00		CS	
15	ALOC	12/4/2000	798583	COYNE, RICK		\$573.00	CS	
16	ALOC	12/4/2000	798583	COYNE, RICK		\$189.00	CS	
17	DISB	12/4/2000	798583	COYNE, RICK			CS	50087385
18	PYMT	11/20/2000	635503	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$289.00		CS	
19	ALOC	11/20/2000	635504	COYNE, RICK		\$289.00	CS	
20	DISB	11/20/2000	635504	COYNE, RICK			CS	50064651
21	PYMT	11/9/2000	519762	COYNE, SOPHIA	\$867.00		CS	
22	ALOC	11/9/2000	519318	SRS		\$867.00	SRS	
23	DISB	11/9/2000	519318	SRS			SRS	

**TESTIMONY OF SUSAN KANG, DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE,
FOR THE 7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT—DOUGLAS COUNTY
LAWRENCE, KANSAS
January 22, 2001**

**TESTIMONY REGARDING THE OFFICE OF DOUGLAS COUNTY COURT
TRUSTEE'S EXPERIENCE WITH THE KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER (KPC)
BEFORE THE JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES**

Good afternoon, my name is Susan Kang. I am the District Court Trustee for the 7th Judicial District. Prior to my recent tenure as the District Court Trustee, I served as an Assistant Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under former Attorney General, Scott Harshbarger. I am honored to be here to give testimony with regard to the experience that my staff and I have had with the Kansas Payment Center (KPC).

BACKGROUND OF TRUSTEE'S OFFICE

As you all know, the Douglas County Trustee's Office is responsible for enforcing child support orders for Douglas County residents. Prior to the KPC, my office, like other local trustee's offices, not only enforced child support orders but also processed the child support and maintenance payments. During that period, we processed payments for not only trustee cases, those cases which we were responsible for enforcing, but for what we call regular cases. We do not enforce those cases but served as a conduit through which payments were to be made by the obligor to the obligee. In those cases, we recorded the payments into our system for the purpose of providing an accurate, official payment record. We also acted as a payment channel for SRS cases as well. We would post the payments, record them in our system, send the payment data to SRS, and cut a check to equaling the amount received for that day. We do not carry any IV-D cases in Douglas County. All those cases are handled through SRS. The trustee system was a well-oiled machine that worked virtually without glitches. When there were problems, we addressed them immediately.

KPC'S GENERAL IMPACT ON THE OFFICE

Fielding Calls from Frustrated Parents and Calling Employers

Since the inception of the KPC, my office does not process payments. Instead, we have spent many hours fielding calls from frustrated mothers who understandably want their check; talking to fathers who have to provide documentation they have paid, though it is not documented on the official KPC payment history; and talking to employers who are getting tired of us calling to ask yet again, "did you send that check in?"

Spend a Considerable Amount of Time Trying to Locate Checks and Requesting KPC to Disburse Them

Since the inception of the KPC, my office does not process payments. Instead, we spend hours trying to locate the check that did not make its way to a payee. Once we locate the payments, we spend in some cases, months requesting KPC to back it out of the wrong case and apply it to the correct one for disbursement to the correct payee.

Negative Affect on Enforcement Efforts

Since the inception of the KPC, my office does not process payments-- and yet we've have fallen behind on our enforcement efforts. In theory, the additional time we should have gained by not processing payments would have meant even more efficient enforcement, but that has not been the case because of the other demands on our time as stated above.

The 97-98% Success Rate in Processing Checks Does Not Paint a Full Picture

Recently there have been numerous articles discussing the plight of various Kansas residents who either hadn't received or received late the expected support payment. The statistics cited in those articles state that every month only 2-3% of the some 300,000 payments that have been handled in "other than a routine manner." These are the checks that are in "suspense" or "unidentifieds." This would mean that every month 6,000-9,000 individuals are not receiving their payments. I would argue that these numbers are somewhat misleading because they do not paint the full picture. For every parent who does not receive a child support payment, one needs to consider the child or children who are not counted in the 2-3% figure. In addition, one needs to factor in the paying parent, who because of a mistake by the KPC, is put in a position of having to prove that in fact he or she made the payment. To more accurately reflect the number of individuals affected by the KPC, I would argue that the numbers have to be tripled at a minimum. If one considers that in actuality at least 18,000 -27,000 individuals are affected by KPC's actions, then our current situation is worse than the numbers would indicate.

Even if we use the 2-3% figure, which is touted as a very successful rate, the fact still remains that up to 9,000 parents are not receiving or receiving late child support payments on a monthly basis. On a local level, that is enormously significant. These are the people we deal with on a daily basis. They are the ones who cannot pay their rent, pay their bills, or pay for their groceries.

The cases that fall in the 2-3% suspense category have caused my office a lot of additional work. One paralegal in my office spends approximately 40-50% of her time on KPC problems. Another spends about 25% of her time on the similar issues. My office manager spends at least 25% of her time dealing with the technical issues associated with the KPC as well as payment issues. Finally, a clerk in my office

generally spends at least 25-30% of her time KPC problems. This is not to mention the court's programmer who, along with the office manager, spent months preparing for the implementation of the KPC and who continues to expend energy troubleshooting problems. Finally, I have personally spent many days devoted entirely to KPC issues either in meetings or on the telephone trying to talk to anyone and everyone who could help me help a mother who did not get her check.

The KPC has had an enormous effect on my office; it pervades every aspect of our work. KPC's piece of the child support enforcement scheme is really the most important: it is responsible for getting the money out to the children. Because of the critically important role it plays, KPC must improve its operation to meet the needs of every single parent whose lives often depend on receiving his or her support check.

TYPES OF PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

We in Douglas County have experienced and continue to experience the following types of problems:

- **Payments that should be applied to two different obligations-child support and maintenance or child support and "other"- are consistently applied in their entirety to child support. This is the case despite clear notes on the checks KPC receives indicating how and in what increments the check should be split (Tab A);**
- **Payments applied to the incorrect case even with checks that contain the correct case number and county identifier (Tab B);**
- **Payments not posted despite the fact that the check contains the correct case number, complete with the county identifier (Tab C);**
- **No procedure for securing refunds for parents who overpay; and**
- **No procedure for holding payments until a necessary change is made (e.g. We'd want the money held in cases where we knew that the payee's address has changed, but the KPC does not yet have that information.)**

MOST SERIOUS ISSUE AT PRESENT: LACK OF TIMELY RESPONSE (OR LACK OF RESPONSE AT ALL) TO REPORTED PROBLEMS

The above problems are only compounded by the fact that KPC does not deal with them in a timely manner, if at all. At present, the most time-consuming issue involves trying to obtain answers to questions sent to the KPCresearch email address. On average, it takes over a month to secure an answer. We have a number of questions that have been outstanding for over two months. This is the case despite repeated emails

(in some cases) and despite providing detailed procedure for how to resolve the problems we have identified.

NEGATIVE IMPACT ON ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

The time expended by my staff, ranging from dealing with frustrated parents, to emailing KPCresearch, to communicating with KPC customer service, to the checking, rechecking and checking yet again to determine whether our requests or inquiries have been answered, has had a significant negative impact on our ability to perform the work necessary to enforce the child support orders.

Inaccurate Payment Histories Impede Enforcement Efforts

The inaccuracies in the payment histories also cause us to spend additional time that should be spent on enforcement. The KPC payment history is the official document, a certified copy of which is to be used for legal purposes. However, due to misapplied payments (wrong case is credited with a payment), missing payments (the payment is not posted), and incorrect postings (the wrong amount is posted or amount is posted to the incorrect obligation), the payment history in many cases is inaccurate. Confronted with any one of the above scenarios, the paralegals in my office must start an investigation process to find the money and then take the appropriate steps to get it disbursed to the correct individual. This requires talking to, among others, employers, who are not always pleased to hear that the check they sent to the KPC has not been posted. Ironically, the system that was allegedly designed to help employers is in fact a source of great frustration for them.

Because the KPC pay histories are inaccurate, we cannot use them as an enforcement tool: we have sent out letters to payers who, according to the pay history, did not make payments in a certain month, only to discover that payments had in fact been made, but simply not posted for some reason. We cannot use these "official documents" in court in contempt proceedings because we would not be able to prove our case.

Some Payees Want to Circumvent the KPC and Pay Directly to Ex-Spouse

As a result of the frustration payees have experienced, some are asking to bypass the KPC altogether and be paid directly by their ex-spouses. Marie Mack, who was featured in a recent newspaper article, was a Douglas County Trustee case. We found out through the article that she has started receiving payments directly from her ex-husband.

Interest Calculations on Past Due Support and Maintenance Payments Affected

In Douglas County, we keep a separate running total of interest due on any past due child support and maintenance obligations. The interest is paid to the parent who

has custody of the child. We are no longer able to do this in many cases because the KPC, rather than separating out the designated amount for maintenance and applying it to the maintenance obligation, keeps crediting the entire amount of the check to child support. This error continues to occur consistently despite the fact that the checks clearly delineate the breakdown between child support and maintenance, or child support and "other," which can include items such as medical payments. To deal with this category of errors, we have had to combine the interest calculations for both child support and maintenance. At this point we are not aware of all the cases in which this type of an error is occurring. We do not hear any complaints from the payees because he or she is receiving the entire amount due.

OTHER PROBLEMS THAT ARE STARTING TO ARISE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF KPC ERRORS

Cannot Provide Accurate Pay History for Deduction on Income Tax Returns

Last week a payer requested a printout detailing his maintenance payments. We were unable to provide him an accurate record off the KPC web site because many of the payments have been posted incorrectly. This printout is necessary so that the payer can deduct the maintenance payments from reported income. By the same token, the payees need to know what amounts were received as maintenance, which they would have to declare as income. Prior to the KPC, we would have provided the payer with a printout of our payment history screen, which reflected the monthly maintenance payments that were remitted. That option no longer exists.

KPC Should Provide a Legible Copy of the Pay History Detailing Maintenance Payments

We will continue to receive such requests as payers start preparing their tax returns. As noted previously, my staff has already fallen behind on enforcement efforts and we cannot afford to spend additional time trying to decipher extremely confusing, incorrect payment histories so that we can provide the payer with the requested information. The KPC should provide such documents.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

KPC Needs to Respond to Problems Immediately

The longer the problems we report go unresolved, the harder it will be to make the necessary corrections. The longer a posting error languishes in the KPC unidentified list or suspense list or undisbursed list, the more likely it will become a lost cause—ultimately hurting the children of Kansas.

KPC Must Make its Priority the Disbursement of Monies in the Suspense and Unidentified Accounts

Currently there are 5426 checks totaling \$688,000 in suspense at the KPC. It's difficult to know how many cases are affected, as each check may contain payments for numerous cases. No matter how statistically insignificant this number may seem, the money must be distributed to the payees, to whom each penny is incredibly significant!

KPC Must also Implement the Suggested Changes Resulting From the Meetings with Trustees, SRS and OJA

The urban trustees, representatives from SRS, OJA and Tier began meeting last November because the trustees were so frustrated with KPC problems. Some progress has been made as a result of those meetings, but there are many outstanding issues that have yet to be addressed. KPC, among other things, needs to:

- Make the necessary program changes to enable smooth data transfers;
- Hire additional personnel for the long term (particularly for research and customer service);
- Be able to accommodate more than 250 users at a time on their web site;
- Clean up pay records to accurately reflect actual transactions that occurred;
- Create a less confusing payment history screen for the public.

This is not an exhaustive list.

It's difficult to imagine that 2-3% of payments that are "handled in other than a routine manner" are causing such problems for my office. Our experience in Douglas County Trustee's Office indicates it is a much bigger problem than we are led to believe.

Thank you very much for your time.

A

Payor: Anthony Backus, DG 00 D 604 -

Mr. Backus came to our office with Check No. 1702 and we helped him write a breakdown of the check between child support & maintenance. This was ignored and all money was receipted to child support.


A secondary issue on this case: The payment shown on 11/16/00 belongs on Case No. DG 99 D 604, Michael Wintermantel & Heather Rhodes. It is a payment posted to the Wintermantel case & was sent to SRS by mistake on 10/13/00. The SRS office returned the money to the KPC on 11/7/00, who in turn posted the check to 00 D 604 (Backus) by mistake. The mother on 99 D 604 did receive her money; however, the KPC's pay records do not reflect that the mother ever received the money.


This case also demonstrates, as evidenced by the attached emails, the inordinate length of time and amount of effort that was required to correct the misposted payment. It is worth noting again that the pay history for Ms. Rhodes still needs to reflect the payment she ultimately received.

check this pt. I w/ KPC. Did they not it correctly?

BACKUS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY 09-97 83-360/1011 1708
 1144 RHODE ISLAND PH. 785-766-0701 7105371
 LAWRENCE, KS 66044 DATE Jan. 1 2001

Anthony
 PAY TO THE ORDER OF DOUGLAS COUNTY DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE \$ 1,156.00

ELEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY SIX & 00/100'S..... DOLLARS  Security Features included. Details on back.

 **EMPRISE BANK** N.A. *500.00 -> Maintenance*
 P.O. Box 3466 • Lawrence, KS 66044 *CS: 656.00*

MEMO #DC CO-D-604 *Anthony S. Beckus* MP

⑆101103602⑆ 1708 ⑈7105371⑈ soc. sec.# 515-64-1844



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

6-9.

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000604

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

payer wrote amt to CS & mailed on check. Mailed from our office.

1	PYMT	12/6/2000	848501	BACKUS, ANTHONY	\$1156.00	CS		
2	ALOC	12/6/2000	835479	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$27.80	FEE	1702
3	ALOC	12/6/2000	835479	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$30.00	FEE	1702
4	ALOC	12/6/2000	848502	VLACH, EVA		\$1098.20	CS	
5	DISB	12/6/2000	848502	VLACH, EVA			CS	50097772 (\$1098.20)
6	PYMT	11/16/2000	606135	BACKUS, ANTHONY	\$314.00		CS	
7	ALOC	11/16/2000	595432	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$15.70	FEE	69165342
8	ALOC	11/16/2000	606136	VLACH, EVA		\$298.30	CS	
9	DISB	11/16/2000	606136	VLACH, EVA			CS	50062365 (\$298.30)

Never booked off and shown

our pymt to DE on 99 D 604



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

6-10

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 99D 000604

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

1	PYMT	12/5/2000	834120	WINTERMANTEL, MICHAEL	\$314.00		CS		
2	ALOC	12/5/2000	822411	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$15.70	FEE	2062	
3	ALOC	12/5/2000	834121	RHODES, HEATHER		\$298.30	CS		
4	DISB	12/5/2000	834121	RHODES, HEATHER			CS	50095709	(\$298.30)
5	PYMT	11/9/2000	525298	WINTERMANTEL, MICHAEL	\$8000.00		CS		
6	ALOC	11/9/2000	515464	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$400.00	FEE	2757	
7	ALOC	11/9/2000	525299	RHODES, HEATHER		\$7600.00	CS		
8	DISB	11/9/2000	525299	RHODES, HEATHER			CS	50050793	(\$7600.00)
9	PYMT	11/3/2000	452123	WINTERMANTEL, MICHAEL	\$314.00		CS		
10	ALOC	11/3/2000	437236	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$15.70	FEE	2749	
11	ALOC	11/3/2000	452124	RHODES, HEATHER		\$298.30	CS		
12	DISB	11/3/2000	452124	RHODES, HEATHER			CS	50039802	(\$298.30)
13	PYMT	10/13/2000	172625	WINTERMANTEL, MICHAEL	\$314.00		CS		
14	ALOC	10/13/2000	155596	SRS		\$314.00	SRS	2720	



Payment returned to KPC by SRS on approx. 11/7/00 to be disbursed to the mother. Instead it was receipted to case 00 D 604 (previous page). The mother finally received a check for this; however, the pay record does not reflect the mother ever receiving the money.

DC Kang, Susan

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2000 10:55 AM
To: 'taylorv@kscourts.org'; 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Humphrey, Carmie; 'hytena@kscourts.org';
'watersm@kscourts.org'
Subject: 2nd Request--FW: KPC Holding Checks Returned by SRS

As of today's date, only one of these payments returned by SRS to the KPC has been posted to a case.

DG 99 D 466 (Leroux) has been posted.

DG 00 D 663 (Dreiling). We have been checking on this one, and the money still has not been posted to this case. See below for the check number that SRS sent back to the KPC on approximately 11/7/00.

DG 99 D 604 (Wintermantel). This money has not been posted either. See SRS check number below sent back to KPC on approximately 11/7/00. However, we did have a call from a payee on our case number DG 00 D 604 (Backus) wherein she received a check but her ex-husband did not send any money to the KPC. When we looked at the payment record, we saw that it was a payment of \$314 and has the SRS check number of 9165342. It appears to us that you have found the money sent back to you from SRS for the Wintermantel case, but now posted it to the wrong case number. The person that received it in error informed us she is not going to give it back. She already deposited the money.

Please receipt & send out the \$314 to DG 99 D 604 (Wintermantel). There appears to be a mix-up here and it should be corrected immediately. The mother has been waiting for 6 weeks to receive her payment. SRS has sent the money back to you and it was posted to the wrong case. We are having a difficult time explaining why all of these mistakes are happening to her case.

We would appreciate it if you could take care of these two cases asap. The original payments were posted on October 13 & 15. SRS sent back the money to you on approximately 11/7/00. I have provided the SRS check numbers below. If there is further information you need to get these cleared up, please let us know. Thank you.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 11:41 AM
To: 'jvinette@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; 'watersm@kscourts.org'; 'taylorv@kscourts.org'
Subject: KPC Holding Checks Returned by SRS

Jane,

Can you help find these two payments that were sent to SRS in error back in October and now have been returned to the KPC? I have talked to SRS and they have given us the check number that they sent back to you to send the money back through the system. They are:

DG 00 D 663 - Dreiling. You should have Ck. #9161838 dated approx 11/7/00 for \$600.

DG 99 D 466 - Leroux. You should have Ck. #9165372 dated approx 11/7/00 for \$400.

I think Susan Kang, our Court Trustee, has already e-mailed someone about a third check, but I will add it on here too. It is:

DG 99 D 604 - Wintermantel/Rhodes. You should have Ck. #9165342 for \$314.

Thanks very much for your assistance in finding these. All of the above individuals have been waiting for more than a month to get this money.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

- Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2000 4:52 PM
To: 'virginia taylor'
Cc: DCT - Taylor, Karen; DCT - Humphrey, Carmie
Subject: Update on DG99d604/ Wintermantel

Virginia- This is the case where we're trying to get SRS to release the \$314 that was sent in October. We've now confirmed that SRS has in fact released the money to KPC in the last couple of weeks. The SRS check number is 9165342. Can you please let me know when this payment will go out to the correct payee, Heather Rhodes?

Thanks very much.

*Susan Kang
District Court Trustee
785/832-5316
skang@douglas-county.com*

DCT - Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2000 11:30 AM
To: DCT - Taylor, Karen; DCT - Humphrey, Carmie
Subject: FW: 99D604/ Need payment back from SRS

fyi

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2000 11:29 AM
To: 'ami hyten'
Cc: 'virginia taylor'; 'watersm@kscourts.org'
Subject: 99D604/ Need payment back from SRS

Ami- In the above-numbered case, we need your help in getting the money back from SRS; to which the KPC erroneously sent the first payment. The payee's name is Heather Rhodes. Payor's is Michael Wintermantel. The payee is not happy and "wants to know when she's going to get her money back." It was our understanding that SRS was going to release the money to KPC for appropriate distribution, but has not done so to date (at least that is what appears on the web). Fortunately, the other two payments have been distributed correctly. The amount in question is \$314.00.

Thanks

*Susan Kang
District Court Trustee
785/832-5316
skang@douglas-county.com*

DC Kang, Susan

From: Carla Nakata [CNN@srskansas.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 02, 2000 5:16 PM
To: skang@douglas-county.com
Cc: ktaylor@douglas-county.com
Subject: Re: FW: SRS Needs to Send Money Back to KPC

I did locate both of these payments in suspense in receivables and asked receivables to refund to kpc and notify them of the refund. You probably want to track to see if it happens.

>>> <skang@douglas-county.com> 11/02/00 08:41AM >>>

Carla- can you help with these cases? thx

> -----Original Message-----

> From: DCT - Taylor, Karen

> Sent: Wednesday, November 01, 2000 11:54 AM

> To: DCT - Kang, Susan

> Subject: SRS Needs to Send Money Back to KPC

>
> We have two cases where the KPC shows money went to SRS but they are not
> SRS cases. Everything is in place at the KPC to accept & process the
> money correctly. I remember that Carla Nakata mentioned that she could
> not even find the money out there when she checked to see if these were
> SRS cases. The cases are:

>
> 99 D 604 - Michael Wintermantel -- \$314 to SRS on 10/13/00

>
> 00 D 663 - Roger Dreiling -- \$600 to SRS on 10/15/00

DC Kang, Susan

From: Carla Nakata [CNN@srskansas.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2000 10:10 AM
To: ktaylor@douglas-county.com; skang@douglas-county.com
Subject: RE: FW: Additional List of New Cases with SRS Assignment

I looked again for payments related to these individuals and could find none. That is not to imply that we don't have the money; I am just saying I could not find it. Several of these obligees do have other cases and are at least known to the CSE system but I could not find any unusual payments in any of the cases.
Sorry. I guess these are ones that the KPC will have to investigate and resolve.

>>> <ktaylor@douglas-county.com> 10/22/00 03:44PM >>>
Thanks, Carla --

00 D 530 -- David Jaroscak is the dad, Kerry Jaroscak is the mom, Derick W. Jaroscak is the child.

00 D 653 -- Billy Bob Tomlin is the dad, Jessica Tomlin is the mom, Chelsey Tomlin & Mia Tomlin are the children.

00 D 663 -- This is a maintenance only case. Roger Dreiling is the husband & Jean Dreiling is the wife.

99 D 604 -- Michael Wintermantel is the father, Heather Rhodes is the mom, Luke Rhodes is the child.

If you need anything else, let me know.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Carla Nakata [SMTP:CNN@srskansas.org]
> Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 1:27 PM
> To: skang@douglas-county.com
> Cc: ktaylor@douglas-county.com
> Subject: Re: FW: Additional List of New Cases with SRS Assignment

>
> I looked at all 4 of these and could not find any CSE case that these
> orders were known to. If you would give me a more full name on the
> obligor and obligee i would try to find them that way.

>
> >>> <skang@douglas-county.com> 10/19/00 05:24PM >>>
> Yet more cases.... Carla, would you please "reply to all" with your
> response
> so that Karen will get a copy of your answer too?

>
> thanks

>
> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
> > Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2000 4:48 PM
> > To: DCT - Kang, Susan
> > Subject: Additional List of New Cases with SRS Assignment

> >
> > I have come across 4 more cases that were rejected by the KPC because
> > they
> > show an SRS assignment. They are brand new cases, all have private
> > attorneys in the divorce. There has not been anything filed with the
> > court stating a notice of assignment. Two of these cases have payment
> > sitting at SRS.

> >
> > 00 D 530 -- Jaroscak
> > 00 D 653 -- Tomlin
> > 00 D 663 -- Dreiling -- This is a maintenance only case/ \$1200 per
> > month.

- > > is a \$600 payment sitting out there.
- > > 900 604 -- Rhodes. This also has a payment sitting at SRS.

Payor: Randy Guenther, DG 95 D 809 -

Special instruction written on check and the accompanying documentation by our office asking the payment be receipted to medical payments. All money was receipted to child support.

DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
SUPPORT TRUST ACCOUNT

7004

DOUGLAS COUNTY COURT TRUSTEE

DATE	DESCRIPTION	CASE NO.	AMOUNT
1/02/01	GUENTHER, RANDY A	95D0000809	1991.76

DC 95 D 809 - Medical payment only - No Child support!!

DETACH AND RETAIN THIS STATEMENT

DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
SUPPORT TRUST ACCOUNT
JUDICIAL CENTER, 111 E. 11TH
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044-2966
PH. 785-832-5315

FIRSTAR BANK MIDWEST, N.A.
18-18-1010

7004

ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED NINETY ONE DOLLARS 76 CENTS

DATE	AMOUNT
1/02/01	1,991.76

091013/7-95

PAY
TO THE
ORDER
OF

KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER
P.O. BOX 758566

TOPEKA KS 66675 - 8566

VOID AFTER 180 DAYS

Karen R. Taylor

⑈070049⑈ ⑆101000187⑆ 4343919447⑈



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 95D 000809

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

1	PYMT	1/19/2001	1456735	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$177.07		CS		
2	PYMT	1/19/2001	1456735	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$0.03		OT		
3	ALOC	1/19/2001	1446320	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$8.85	FEE	70057	
4	ALOC	1/19/2001	1456736	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$168.22	CS		
5	ALOC	1/19/2001	1456736	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$0.03	OT		
6	DISB	1/19/2001	1456736	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT	E27475	(\$168.25)
7	PYMT	1/16/2001	1403239	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$151.87		CS		
8	PYMT	1/16/2001	1403239	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$0.03		OT		
9	ALOC	1/16/2001	1364665	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$7.59	FEE	92808	
10	ALOC	1/16/2001	1403240	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$144.28	CS		
11	ALOC	1/16/2001	1403240	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$0.03	OT		
12	DISB	1/16/2001	1403240	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$144.31)
13	PYMT	1/5/2001	1257043	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$1991.16		CS		
14	PYMT	1/5/2001	1257043	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$0.60		OT		
15	ALOC	1/5/2001	1241903	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$12.75	FEE	70049	
16	ALOC	1/5/2001	1241903	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$86.81	FEE	70049	
17	ALOC	1/5/2001	1257044	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$1891.60	CS		
18	ALOC	1/5/2001	1257044	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$0.60	OT		
19	DISB	1/5/2001	1257044	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$1892.20)
20	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104972	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$151.81		CS		
21	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104972	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$0.09		OT		
22	ALOC	12/26/2000	1074586	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$5.16	FEE	92642	
23	ALOC	12/26/2000	1074586	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$2.44	FEE	92642	
24	ALOC	12/26/2000	1104973	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$144.21	CS		
25	ALOC	12/26/2000	1104973	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$0.09	OT		
26	DISB	12/26/2000	1104973	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$144.30)
27	PYMT	12/12/2000	930116	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$151.90		CS		
28	ALOC	12/12/2000	917666	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$7.60	FEE	92374	
29	ALOC	12/12/2000	930117	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$144.30	CS		
30	DISB	12/12/2000	930117	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$144.30)
31	PYMT	11/27/2000	719003	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$151.81		CS		
32	PYMT	11/27/2000	719003	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$0.09		OT		
33	ALOC	11/27/2000	677622	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$5.16	FEE	92258	
34	ALOC	11/27/2000	677622	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$2.44	FEE	92258	
35	ALOC	11/27/2000	719004	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$144.21	CS		
36	ALOC	11/27/2000	719004	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$0.09	OT		
37	DISB	11/27/2000	719004	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$144.30)
38	PYMT	11/14/2000	579205	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$151.90		CS		
39	ALOC	11/14/2000	567295	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$7.60	FEE	92027	
40	ALOC	11/14/2000	579206	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$144.30	CS		
41	DISB	11/14/2000	579206	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT		(\$144.30)
42	PYMT	10/2/2000	27762	GUENTHER, RANDY	\$255.00		CS		
43	ALOC	10/2/2000	16523	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$12.75	FEE	12967265	
44	ALOC	10/2/2000	27763	GUENTHER, TERESA		\$242.25	CS		
45	DISB	10/2/2000	27763	GUENTHER, TERESA			OT	4155	(\$242.25)

Payor: Roger Dreiling, DG 00 D 663 -

Missing payment

Numerous e-mails beginning 11/00

E-mails never answered

As of 1/16/01, payment not posted.

(B)

This is another case where SRS received money in error. They sent the money back to the KPC for processing on 11/7/00. I have e-mailed the SRS check number and amount several times, but the payment still has not been posted.



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000663

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

1	PYMT	12/1/2000	778235	DREILING, ROGER	\$400.00		MN		
2	ALOC	12/1/2000	778236	DREILING, JEAN		\$400.00	MN		
3	DISB	12/1/2000	778236	DREILING, JEAN			MN	50087124	(\$400.00)
4	PYMT	11/16/2000	605976	DREILING, ROGER	\$600.00		MN		
5	ALOC	11/16/2000	605977	DREILING, JEAN		\$600.00	MN		
6	DISB	11/16/2000	605977	DREILING, JEAN			MN	50062310	(\$600.00)
7	PYMT	11/2/2000	436020	DREILING, ROGER	\$400.00		MN		
8	ALOC	11/2/2000	436021	DREILING, JEAN		\$400.00	MN		
9	DISB	11/2/2000	436021	DREILING, JEAN			MN	50037125	(\$400.00)
10	PYMT	10/15/2000	210917	DREILING, ROGER	\$600.00		MN		
11	ALOC	10/15/2000	117770	SRS		\$600.00	SRS	1521	

Dreiling

6-20

SRS
Mandatory still not
sent back for ok 10/15/00

DCI - Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:57 PM
To: DCT - Kang, Susan
Subject: RE: SRS Refund Check from Nov. 7 Still Not Received to Case DG 00 D 663, Dreiling

No, not one phone call or e-mail.

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:38 PM
To: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Subject: FW: SRS Refund Check from Nov. 7 Still Not Received to Case DG 00 D 663, Dreiling

have we heard back on this case?

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 3:11 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; 'bertranda@kscourts.org'; 'rkeeton@tier.com'
Subject: SRS Refund Check from Nov. 7 Still Not Received to Case DG 00 D 663, Dreiling

KPC Research:

We have contacted representatives from Tier several times about a misdirected payment to SRS on Case DG 00 D 663 (Dreiling). SRS refunded the payment back to Tier on approximately 11/7/00, their Check No. 9161838 for \$600. This payment still has not been posted to this account. You received this payment back over a month ago. The payee and her attorney have been calling me several times a week about this.

There is nothing more we can do on our end. We have provided all the information SRS gave us as to the description of the check. This money needs to be receipted and disbursed to the payee on this case asap. It has now been TWO months since the original payment was received by the KPC. This woman should not have to wait any longer for her payment.

Please give this situation your immediate attention. Thank you.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

DC: Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2000 10:55 AM
To: 'taylorv@kscourts.org'; 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Humphrey, Carmie; 'hytena@kscourts.org'; 'watersm@kscourts.org'
Subject: 2nd Request--FW: KPC Holding Checks Returned by SRS

As of today's date, only one of these payments returned by SRS to the KPC has been posted to a case.

DG 99 D 466 (Leroux) has been posted.

DG 00 D 663 (Dreiling). We have been checking on this one, and the money still has not been posted to this case. See below for the check number that SRS sent back to the KPC on approximately 11/7/00.

DG 99 D 604 (Wintermantel). This money has not been posted either. See SRS check number below sent back to KPC on approximately 11/7/00. However, we did have a call from a payee on our case number DG 00 D 604 (Backus) wherein she received a check but her ex-husband did not send any money to the KPC. When we looked at the payment record, we saw that it was a payment of \$314 and has the SRS check number of 9165342. It appears to us that you have found the money sent back to you from SRS for the Wintermantel case, but now posted it to the wrong case number. The person that received it in error informed us she is not going to give it back. She already deposited the money.

Please receipt & send out the \$314 to DG 99 D 604 (Wintermantel). There appears to be a mix-up here and it should be corrected immediately. The mother has been waiting for 6 weeks to receive her payment. SRS has sent the money back to you and it was posted to the wrong case. We are having a difficult time explaining why all of these mistakes are happening to her case.

We would appreciate it if you could take care of these two cases asap. The original payments were posted on October 13 & 15. SRS sent back the money to you on approximately 11/7/00. I have provided the SRS check numbers below. If there is further information you need to get these cleared up, please let us know. Thank you.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 11:41 AM
To: 'jvinette@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; 'watersm@kscourts.org'; 'taylorv@kscourts.org'
Subject: KPC Holding Checks Returned by SRS

Jane,

Can you help find these two payments that were sent to SRS in error back in October and now have been returned to the KPC? I have talked to SRS and they have given us the check number that they sent back to you to send the money back through the system. They are:

DG 00 D 663 - Dreiling. You should have Ck. #9161838 dated approx 11/7/00 for \$600.

DG 99 D 466 - Leroux. You should have Ck. #9165372 dated approx 11/7/00 for \$400.

I think Susan Kang, our Court Trustee, has already e-mailed someone about a third check, but I will add it on here too. It is:

DG 99 D 604 - Wintermantel/Rhodes. You should have Ck. #9165342 for \$314.

Thanks very much for your assistance in finding these. All of the above individuals have been waiting for more than a month to get this money.

Karen Taylor
Office Manager
785-832-5315

Payor: Victoria R. Smith, DG 89 D 315 - Missing payment
(3) e-mails sent, 12/6/00, 12/7/00 &
1/4/01
Never answered
Payment not posted as of 1/16/01

Documentation by way of our cancelled check and a copy of the cash payment list
we send with the court's check to the KPC is also attached showing which case
the payment was erroneously receipted to.

DCT - Taylor, Karen

Not used

From: DCT - Martin, Sylvia
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2000 9:31 AM
To: 'kpresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen

Incorrect Case #	Correct Case# DG 89D 000315
Payor	Payor VICTORIA SMITH
Payee	Payee WILLIAM SMITH
Amount of check \$100.00	
Check # (if known) #70025	R/T # 101000187: 4343919447
Employer (if applicable)	

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

This payment was in cash - we sent one of our checks #70025 on 11/3/00 all other checks we sent that day were posted on 11/6/00. That check did not get posted to her account. Would you please check into this problem? If you have any questions please give me a call - (785) 832-5315.

THANKS, SYLVIA MARTIN

DC Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Martin, Sylvia
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2000 3:20 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.
Incorrect Case # Correct Case# DG 89D 000315
Payor Payor VICTORIA SMITH
Payee Payee WILLIAM SMITH

Amount of check \$100.00
Check # (if known) #70025
Employer (if applicable)

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

Our bank statement came today and we looked on it to find out where this payment was posted
It was posted to Wendell Wilburn's account # DG 91D 000210 on 11/6/00. Will you please
correct this and get Victoria Smith's payment out correctly as soon as possible to the correct
case #DG 89D 000315. Please let me know when this has been done.

THANKS, SYLVIA MARTIN - 785-832-5315

92-9



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 91D-000210

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	10/12/2000	145415	WILBURN, WENDELL	\$240.99		CS		
2	ALOC	10/12/2000	138565	SRS		\$240.99	SRS	188185	
3	PYMT	10/24/2000	315440	WILBURN, WENDELL	\$240.99		CS		
4	ALOC	10/24/2000	309457	SRS		\$240.99	SRS	188842	
5	PYMT	11/6/2000	468567	WILBURN, WENDELL	\$340.99		CS		
6	ALOC	11/6/2000	454564	SRS		\$100.00	SRS	70025	
7	ALOC	11/6/2000	454565	SRS		\$240.99	SRS	189317	
8	PYMT	11/21/2000	657111	WILBURN, WENDELL	\$240.99		CS		
9	ALOC	11/21/2000	652768	SRS		\$240.99	SRS	189845	
10	PYMT	12/6/2000	841132	WILBURN, WENDELL	\$240.99		CS		
11	ALOC	12/6/2000	835528	SRS		\$0.00	SRS	190560	

This payment belongs on case 89 D 315, the subject of several e-mails to KPC.

Several e-mails sent - No response, not backed off - posted to correct case

Our check clearly marked w/ name and case number - also attachment w/ name! Case number - #8 posted to wrong case.

DOUGLAS COUNTY COURT TRUSTEE

DATE	DESCRIPTION	CASE NO.	AMOUNT
11/02/00	SMITH, VICTORIA RENEE	89D000031535	100.00

DETACH AND RETAIN THIS STATEMENT

70025

DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE

SUPPORT TRUST ACCOUNT
JUDICIAL CENTER, 111 E. 11TH
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044-2966
PH. 785-832-5315

FIRSTAR BANK MIDWEST, N.A.
18-18-1010

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS 00 CENTS

DATE	AMOUNT
11/02/00	100.00

TO THE ORDER OF

KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER
P.O. BOX 758566

TOPEKA KS 66675 - 8566

VOID AFTER 180 DAYS

Karen R. Taylor

⑈070025⑈ ⑆101000187⑆ 4343919447⑈

DOUGLAS COUNTY CHIEF DISBURSEMENT REPO

EDIT

11/02/00 SUMMARY

BANK ACCTS: 990256
 DISB FREQS:
 CASE DESC:
 PERIOD ENDING

 CASE NUMBER DEFENDANT NAME
 VIOL. DATE/OFFENSE
 AGENCY

 DIST. TOTAL

89D000031535 SMITH, VICTORIA RENEE

 100.00
 =====
 100.00
 =====

TOTAL DISTRIBUTION BY CASE TYPE

 100.00
 =====

SUMMARY TOTALS FOR ALL CASE TYPES

 100.00
 =====

Payment clearly mailed with correct case number

Details on back Security Features included.

11/4/00

D~~C~~ Humphrey, Carmie

To: kpcresearch@tier.com
Subject: Missing Payment, DG 89D 000315

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case #

Payor: **Victoria R. Smith**

Payee: **William B. Smith**

Amount of check: **\$100.00**

Check # (if known): **#70025**

Employer (if applicable):

Case Number #: **DG 89D 000315**

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

The payment above was received on November 2, 2000, and mailed from the District Court Trustee's Office of Douglas County on November 3, 2000, to the Kansas Payment Center. The payor (Victoria R. Smith) did make a cash payment in our office on November 2, 2000.

The check mailed to KPC was a District Court Trustee check #70025, dated 11/2/00 for the amount of \$100.00 with all of the required information attached. Please search your records for the missing payment. If you have any questions regarding this matter or if additional information is required. Please contact me at the number below.

Thanks,

Carmela L. Humphrey
District Court Trustee Office, Douglas County
785 832-5315 ext. 5405
chumphrey@douglas-county.com

DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
SUPPORT TRUST ACCOUNT
JUDICIAL CENTER, 111 E. 11TH
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044-2966
PH. 785-832-5315

FIRSTAR BANK MIDWEST, N.A.
18-18-1010

70025

62-9

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS 00 CENTS

DATE

AMOUNT

11/02/00

100.00

Security Features Included. Details on back.

PAY
TO THE
ORDER
OF

KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER
P.O. BOX 758566

VOID AFTER 180 DAYS

Karen R. Taylor

TOPEKA KS 66675 - 8566

⑈070025⑈ ⑆101000187⑆

4313919417⑈

⑈0000010000⑈

05 11/07/00
081000210 FIRSTAR
⑈101000187⑈

NO 06 07

101000008

00 081000210

11/07/00
MERCANTILE
STL NO

⑈0613009⑈

LEAK Child Supp 11/06/00 17:53:35
11/05/00 02:38 0001-5001
DB 310 000218
100.00

03371

Back of check etc
deposit with internet
case #

DCT - Pennington, Debra

(C)

From: DCT - Pennington, Debra
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2000 3:18 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen
Subject: Missing Payment

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case # Correct Case# DG 90D 536
Payor Payor - Bahm, Ivan
Payee Payee - Crain, Caroline
Amount of check - total amount of check is \$740.32 missing payment is for \$74.53
Check # (if known) 0100562922 dated 10/13/00
Employer (if applicable) United States Postal Service.
Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

This check had five different cases referenced on the stub. The only payment that did not get posted was for Mr. Bahm. The payment was for \$74.53. Could this money be in your suspense account?

This check was mailed from our office and had the DG in front of the case number. Please advise the status of this payment from 10/13/00.

Thanks,
Debra

11/16/01 still not posted

DCT - Pennington, Debra

From: DCT - Pennington, Debra
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 9:48 AM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen
Subject: 3 Missing Payments

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case # Correct Case# **DG 95D 000129**
Payor Payor - **Goldring, Jeffery**
Payee Payee - **Watson, Sharon**

Amount of check **\$136.40** each

Check # (if known) **11/24/00 18240; 12/1/00 18280; 12/8/00 18324**

Employer (if applicable) **Diamond Everley Roofing**

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

These three payments are missing. The employer has informed me that the checks have the county code of DG, the case number, payor name and social security number on them. Could you please explain why they have not been posted yet? The employer has also informed me that the checks have cleared the bank. Are these payments in the suspense account? Please advise as to when these three payments will posted.

Thanks,
Debra

✓# 18240 posted 12/20

✓# 18324 posted 1/4/01

✓# 18280 never posted

KPC RESEARCH QUESTIONS

14. Payor - Kendall Anderson DG00D 000294

- Payment mailed to a party not associated with this case.

Several e-mails sent starting 11/7/00

Payment received by OE 12/30/00

See attachments

6-33



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Create New Search](#)

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000294

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Dist
1	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104860	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24	443.54	CS		
2	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104860	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$518.38		CS		
3	ALOC	12/26/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
4	ALOC	12/26/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
5	ALOC	12/26/2000	1074429	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	65527028	
6	ALOC	12/26/2000	1104861	YOUNG, TERESA		\$492.46	CS		
7	ALOC	12/26/2000	1105640	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		
8	DISB	12/26/2000	1104861	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50163020	(\$492.46)
9	DISB	12/26/2000	1105640	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS		(\$349.83)
10	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA		(\$71.10)	CS	50151492	
11	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$349.83)	CS	50151614	
12	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$368.24)	CS		
13	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$74.84)	CS		
14	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		\$3.74	CS	1264	
15	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		\$18.41	CS	1264	
16	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$3.74)	CS	1264	
17	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$18.41)	CS	1264	
18	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
19	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$74.84		CS		
20	ALOC	12/21/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
21	ALOC	12/21/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
22	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA		\$71.10	CS		
23	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		
24	DISB	12/21/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50151492	(\$71.10)
25	DISB	12/21/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50151614	(\$349.83)
26	MSPY	12/21/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA		(\$71.10)	CS	50080431	
27	MSPY	12/21/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$349.83)	CS	50080591	
28	MSPY	12/21/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$368.24)	CS		
29	MSPY	12/21/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$74.84)	CS		
30	MSPY	12/21/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$3.74)	CS	1264	
31	MSPY	12/21/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$18.41)	CS	1264	
32	PYMT	12/11/2000	908939	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
33	ALOC	12/11/2000	879189	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	63415446	
34	ALOC	12/11/2000	908940	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
35	DISB	12/11/2000	908940	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50107809	(\$421.36)
36	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
37	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$74.84		CS		
38	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
39	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
40	ALOC	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA		\$71.10	CS		
41	ALOC	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		

6-34

42	DISB	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50080431	(\$71.10)
43	DISB	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50080591	(\$349.83)
44	MSPY	11/28/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$420.93)	CS	50029028	
45	MSPY	11/28/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$443.08)	CS		
46	MSPY	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		(\$22.15)	FEE	1264	
47	PYMT	11/27/2000	718838	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
48	ALOC	11/27/2000	677402	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	59758578	
49	ALOC	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
50	DISB	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50077999	(\$421.36)
51	PYMT	11/13/2000	565040	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
52	ALOC	11/13/2000	527565	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	57916221	
53	ALOC	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
54	DISB	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50056054	(\$421.36)
55	PYMT	11/2/2000	435659	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$225.00		CS		
56	ALOC	11/2/2000	100791	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$11.25	FEE	553	
57	ALOC	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$213.75	CS		
58	DISB	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50037206	(\$213.75)
59	PYMT	10/30/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
60	ALOC	10/30/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1264	
61	ALOC	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$420.93	CS		
62	DISB	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50029028	(\$420.93)
63	PYMT	10/18/2000	255736	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
64	ALOC	10/18/2000	239720	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1246	
65	ALOC	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
66	DISB	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50009534	(\$420.93)
67	PYMT	10/9/2000	100005	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
68	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$17.50	FEE	1227	
69	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$4.65	FEE	1227	
70	ALOC	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
71	DISB	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	16194	(\$420.93)

This pymt does not belong to this case.



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

12/29/00
 Spoke to Pay Dept on 12/26/00 re: 12/26/00 pymt. of
 manual check # 275,73 was sent to
 Teresa Young 12/28/00

How to Interpret Results
 Print & Mail Search

6-35

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000294

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Dist
1	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104860	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
2	PYMT	12/26/2000	1104860	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$518.38		CS		
3	ALOC	12/26/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
4	ALOC	12/26/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
5	ALOC	12/26/2000	1074429	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	65527028	
6	ALOC	12/26/2000	1104861	YOUNG, TERESA		\$492.46	CS		
7	ALOC	12/26/2000	1105640	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		
8	DISB	12/26/2000	1104861	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50163020	(\$492.46)
9	DISB	12/26/2000	1105640	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS		(\$349.83)
10	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA		(\$71.10)	CS	50151492	
11	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$349.83)	CS	50151614	
12	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$368.24)	CS		
13	MSPY	12/26/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$74.84)	CS		
14	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		\$3.74	CS	1264	
15	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		\$18.41	CS	1264	
16	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$3.74)	CS	1264	
17	MSPY	12/26/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$18.41)	CS	1264	
18	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
19	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051476	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$74.84		CS		
20	ALOC	12/21/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
21	ALOC	12/21/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
22	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA		\$71.10	CS		
23	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		
24	DISB	12/21/2000	1051477	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50151492	(\$71.10)
25	DISB	12/21/2000	1051767	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50151614	(\$349.83)
26	MSPY	12/21/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA		(\$71.10)	CS	50080431	
27	MSPY	12/21/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$349.83)	CS	50080591	
28	MSPY	12/21/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$368.24)	CS		
29	MSPY	12/21/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$74.84)	CS		
30	MSPY	12/21/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$3.74)	CS	1264	
31	MSPY	12/21/2000	358198	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$18.41)	CS	1264	
32	PYMT	12/11/2000	908939	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
33	ALOC	12/11/2000	879189	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	63415446	
34	ALOC	12/11/2000	908940	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
35	DISB	12/11/2000	908940	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50107809	(\$421.36)
36	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
37	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$74.84		CS		
38	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
39	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
40	ALOC	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA		\$71.10	CS		
41	ALOC	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		

443.54
 x
 2
 886.62

6-36

42	DISB	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50080431	(\$71.10)
43	DISB	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50080591	(\$349.83)
44	MSPY	11/28/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$420.93)	CS	50029028	
45	MSPY	11/28/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$443.08)	CS		
46	MSPY	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		(\$22.15)	FEE	1264	
47	PYMT	11/27/2000	718838	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
48	ALOC	11/27/2000	677402	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	59758578	
49	ALOC	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
50	DISB	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50077999	(\$421.36)
51	PYMT	11/13/2000	565040	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
52	ALOC	11/13/2000	527565	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	57916221	
53	ALOC	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
54	DISB	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50056054	(\$421.36)
55	PYMT	11/2/2000	435659	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$225.00		CS		
56	ALOC	11/2/2000	100791	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$11.25	FEE	553	
57	ALOC	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$213.75	CS		
58	DISB	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50037206	(\$213.75)
59	PYMT	10/30/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
60	ALOC	10/30/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1264	
61	ALOC	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$420.93	CS		
62	DISB	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50029028	(\$420.93)
63	PYMT	10/18/2000	255736	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
64	ALOC	10/18/2000	239720	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1246	
65	ALOC	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
66	DISB	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50009534	(\$420.93)
67	PYMT	10/9/2000	100005	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
68	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$17.50	FEE	1227	
69	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$4.65	FEE	1227	
70	ALOC	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
71	DISB	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	16194	(\$420.93)

pay record looks like they made some ^{same} error again. Spoke to Roy Keaton 10:00 am to look into. Looks like Styla will get \$349.83 + Teresa \$71.10 again!

6-37



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

Go To: [Payment Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000294

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payer/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Due
1	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$368.24		CS		
2	PYMT	11/28/2000	732624	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$74.84		CS		
3	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$3.74	FEE	1264	
4	ALOC	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$18.41	FEE	1264	
5	ALOC	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA		\$71.10	CS		
6	ALOC	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$349.83	CS		
7	DISB	11/28/2000	732625	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50080431	(\$71.10)
8	DISB	11/28/2000	732973	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50080591	(\$349.83)
9	MSPY	11/28/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		(\$420.93)	CS	50029028	
10	MSPY	11/28/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL		(\$443.08)	CS		
11	MSPY	11/28/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		(\$22.15)	FEE	1264	
12	PYMT	11/27/2000	718838	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
13	ALOC	11/27/2000	677402	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	59758578	
14	ALOC	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
15	DISB	11/27/2000	718839	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50077999	(\$421.36)
16	PYMT	11/13/2000	565040	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
17	ALOC	11/13/2000	527565	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	57916221	
18	ALOC	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
19	DISB	11/13/2000	565041	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50056054	(\$421.36)
20	PYMT	11/2/2000	435659	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$225.00	*	CS		
21	ALOC	11/2/2000	100791	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$11.25	FEE	553	
22	ALOC	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$213.75	CS		
23	DISB	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50037206	(\$213.75)
24	PYMT	10/30/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
25	ALOC	10/30/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1264	*
26	ALOC	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$420.93	CS		
27	DISB	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50029028	(\$420.93)
28	PYMT	10/18/2000	255736	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
29	ALOC	10/18/2000	239720	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1246	
30	ALOC	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
31	DISB	10/18/2000	255737	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	50009534	(\$420.93)
32	PYMT	10/9/2000	100005	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
33	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$17.50	FEE	1227	
34	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$4.65	FEE	1227	
35	ALOC	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
36	DISB	10/9/2000	100006	YOUNG, TERESA			CS	16194	(\$420.93)

11/2/00 Pymt is not for Teresa. Not sure where it belongs. 1st pymt was mailed to Styla Anderson.

12/18/00 CE calls Roy left VM - Roy did not return call. 12/21/00 8:15 am CE talked to Roy - he had not done anything regarding \$349.83 like he said he would in telephone / trustee mtg 12/12/00. He would hand write a check today 12/01/2000. today. was not happy CE had this.

6-38



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start A New Search](#)

County Name: DOUGLAS

CO #: 00D 000294

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range: *suppose to miss check have been mailed monday.*

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	11/13/2000	565040	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.54		CS		
2	ALOC	11/13/2000	527565	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.18	FEE	57916221	
3	ALOC	11/13/2000	565041	ANDERSON, TERESA		\$421.36	CS		
4	DISB	11/13/2000	565041	ANDERSON, TERESA			CS	50056054	(\$421.36)
5	PYMT	11/2/2000	435659	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$225.00		CS		
6	ALOC	11/2/2000	100791	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$11.25	FEE	553	
7	ALOC	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$213.75	CS		
8	DISB	11/2/2000	436193	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50037206	(\$213.75)
9	PYMT	10/30/2000	387300	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
10	ALOC	10/30/2000	358198	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1264	
11	ALOC	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA		\$420.93	CS		
12	DISB	10/30/2000	388040	ANDERSON, GUYLA			CS	50029028	(\$420.93)
13	PYMT	10/18/2000	255736	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
14	ALOC	10/18/2000	239720	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$22.15	FEE	1246	
15	ALOC	10/18/2000	255737	ANDERSON, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
16	DISB	10/18/2000	255737	ANDERSON, TERESA			CS	50009534	(\$420.93)
17	PYMT	10/9/2000	100005	ANDERSON, KENDALL	\$443.08		CS		
18	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$17.50	FEE	1227	
19	ALOC	10/9/2000	70691	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 07		\$4.65	FEE	1227	
20	ALOC	10/9/2000	100006	ANDERSON, TERESA		\$420.93	CS		
21	DISB	10/9/2000	100006	ANDERSON, TERESA			CS	16194	(\$420.93)

KPC not sure when OE will get this pymt

11/21/00 - left message of candi Hagerman (KPC) - lost and stolen affidavit

Jessie → 841-3700 (W) 594-0598 (H)

Merrion - KPC

DC1 - Pennington, Debra

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 5:51 PM
To: DCT - Pennington, Debra
Subject: FW: Teresa Anderson order # 00d 294

This is really weird now. Can you verify the SSN Jane provided for Teresa "Guyla" Anderson "Young"? Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: DCT - Kang, Susan
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 5:48 PM
To: 'Jane Vinette'
Cc: DCT - Taylor, Karen
Subject: RE: Teresa Anderson order # 00d 294

Jane- did the payor call you and provide you with this information? The information we'd sent was on Teresa Anderson, at the same Baldwin City address you provide below. I really don't know what happened here. All we know is that Teresa's name got changed, not by us, to Guyla, who lives in Leavenworth. We were trying to get that issue resolved, when you notified us that Teresa's last name is Young.

The important thing is that the payee needs to get her money. We will call the payee tomorrow and ask about her last name. I'm a little puzzled as to why the payor would give you information about the payee. Sounds like it's possible she's changed her last name, but it's highly unusual for the payee not to call us to report such a change. We'll verify as to the correct name she is going by. If we can ascertain that she is the same woman we think she is, we'll let you know and then you can release the money to her.

I did not know that you can no longer make changes on Douglas County cases because of "things like this happening." Can you tell me a little more about this? What types of things have been happening with Douglas cases? No one has notified me of anything like that. What types of changes were made before this new policy of not making any changes to Douglas County cases? I'd really appreciate your help with this because in order for me to resolve our problems, I need to have a better sense of what has been going on at your end.

Thanks very much. I look forward to your reply.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Vinette [SMTP:jvinette@tier.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 5:29 PM
To: skang@douglas-county.com
Subject: Teresa Anderson order # 00d 294

Susan,

Teresa Young is the name we have on this case. She lives at 884 N. 500 Rd. Baldwin. Her social security # is 509-80-8923. We were given this information by the payor. As you know we can no longer make changes on Douglas because of things just like this happening. We do not know who Guyla is either.

Hope this helps. Let me know so we can resolve the problem. We just go by what we are told by the participants and Courts.

Thanks for your help
Jane KPC

DC. Taylor, Karen

From: DCT - Pennington, Debra
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 4:54 PM
To: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen
Subject: FW: IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Vinette [SMTP:jvinette@tier.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 4:39 PM
To: Debra@douglas-county.com
Subject: Re: IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

FIRST OFF WE DO NOW MAKE CHANGES ON DOUGLAS COUNTY UNLESS IT IS A IVD CASE. TERESA ANDERSON IS NOT TERESA YOUNG AND SHE IS THE CORRECT PERSON ON THE CASE. WHICH IS HOW YOU SET IT UP.

TKS. JANE

----- Original Message -----

From: Debra@douglas-county.com <<mailto:Debra@douglas-county.com>>
To: jvinette@tier.com <<mailto:jvinette@tier.com>> ; taylorv@kscourts.org <<mailto:taylorv@kscourts.org>>
Cc: skang@douglas-county.com <<mailto:skang@douglas-county.com>> ; ktaylor@douglas-county.com <<mailto:ktaylor@douglas-county.com>> ; watersm@kscourts.org <<mailto:watersm@kscourts.org>> ; hytena@kscourts.org <<mailto:hytena@kscourts.org>>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 4:24 PM
Subject: IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case # Correct Case# 00D 000294

Payor Payor - Anderson, Kendall

Payee Payee - Anderson, Teresa

Amount of check 10/30/00 \$443.08; 11/13/00 \$443.08

Check # (if known)

Employer (if applicable)

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

I SENT YOU AN E-MAIL ON 11/7/00 ABOUT THIS CASE. SOMEONE CHANGED THE PAYEE NAME AND ADDRESS IN ERROR. THERE WAS ANOTHER PAYMENT POSTED 11/13/00, GOING TO THE WRONG PERSON. **CHANGE THE NAME AND ADDRESS IMMEDIATELY!!!** TERESA HAS NOW NOT RECEIVED A TOTAL OF **\$887.08** BECAUSE OF KPC ERRORS. SHE DOES NOT HAVE A LOT OF FAITH IN YOUR SYSTEM AT THIS POINT. PLEASE ADVISE THIS OFFICE AS TO WHEN TERESA WILL RECEIVE HER CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS. I'M HOPING YOU CAN GET THIS PROBLEM RESOLVED TODAY (11/14/00).

THE CORRECT PAYEE AND ADDRESS FOR CASE NUMBER IS:

TERESA ANDERSON
884 N 500 ROAD
BALDWIN CITY, KS 66006

THANK YOU,

DEBRA PENNINGTON

11/14/00

DCT - Pennington, Debra

To: jvinette@tier.com; taylorv@kscourts.com
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen; watersm@kscourts.com; hytena@kscourts.com
Subject: IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case # Correct Case# 00D 000294
Payor Payor - Anderson, Kendall
Payee Payee - Anderson, Teresa
Amount of check 10/30/00 \$443.08; 11/13/00 \$443.08
Check # (if known)
Employer (if applicable)
Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

I SENT YOU AN E-MAIL ON 11/7/00 ABOUT THIS CASE. SOMEONE CHANGED THE PAYEE NAME AND ADDRESS IN ERROR. THERE WAS ANOTHER PAYMENT POSTED 11/13/00, GOING TO THE WRONG PERSON. **CHANGE THE NAME AND ADDRESS IMMEDIATELY!!!** TERESA HAS NOW NOT RECEIVED A TOTAL OF **\$887.08** BECAUSE OF KPC ERRORS. SHE DOES NOT HAVE A LOT OF FAITH IN YOUR SYSTEM AT THIS POINT. PLEASE ADVISE THIS OFFICE AS TO WHEN TERESA WILL RECEIVE HER CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS. I'M HOPING YOU CAN GET THIS PROBLEM RESOLVED TODAY (11/14/00).
THE CORRECT PAYEE AND ADDRESS FOR CASE NUMBER IS:

TERESA ANDERSON
884 N 500 ROAD
BALDWIN CITY, KS 66006

THANK YOU,

DEBRA PENNINGTON

Sent 11/17/00

DC1 - Pennington, Debra

To: kpresearch@tier.com
Cc: DCT - Kang, Susan; DCT - Taylor, Karen; watersm@kscourts.org; taylorv@kscourts.org; hytena@kscourts.org
Subject: URGENT! URGENT! POSTING ERROR - URGENT! URGENT! POSTING ERROR

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.
Incorrect Case # Correct Case# **DG 00D 000294**
Payor Payor - **Anderson, Kendall**
Payee Payee - **Anderson, Teresa**
Amount of check **10/30/00 \$443.08; 11/2/00 \$225.00**
Check # (if known) **10/30/00 1264; 11/2/00 553**
Employer (if applicable)
Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

PROBLEM #1

WHY WAS THE PAYEE'S NAME CHANGED IN THIS CASE? THE FIRST TWO PAYMENTS POSTED TO THIS CASE WENT TO TERESA (WHO IS THE CORRECT PAYEE). ON 10/30/00 A PAYMENT WAS POSTED AND THE PAYEE'S NAME WAS CHANGED TO GUYLA. WE (DOUGLAS COUNTY COURT TRUSTEE'S OFFICE) HAVE NEVER PROVIDED YOU WITH A NAME CHANGE ON THIS CASE. CAN YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THIS WAS DONE? APPARENTLY THIS MONEY WAS MAILED TO SOMEONE ELSE BECAUSE TERESA HAS NEVER RECEIVED THE PAYMENTS POSTED ON 10/30/00 OR 11/2/00. THE AMOUNT OF \$433.08 IS THE CORRECT AMOUNT TERESA IS TO RECEIVE. PLEASE LET ME KNOW WHERE THIS PAYMENT WAS SENT. IF IT WAS SENT TO THE WRONG PERSON WHAT IS THE KPC GOING TO DO TO GET THE MONEY TO THE RIGHT PERSON?

PROBLEM #2

THE PAYMENT POSTED 11/2/00 FOR \$225.00 ALSO HAS GUYLA AS THE PAYEE. THIS IS NOT THE USUAL AMOUNT TERESA RECEIVES SO I AM THINKING THIS PAYMENT WAS POSTED TO THE WRONG CASE. TERESA HAS NOT RECEIVED THIS PAYMENT EITHER. WHERE WAS THIS PAYMENT MAILED TO?

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION TO THIS MATTER.

DEBRA PENNINGTON

6-42

**TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN L. SLOAN
DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE
OF THE
HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES**

TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN L. SLOAN
DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
JANUARY 22, 2001

BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE
OF THE
HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES

TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN L. SLOAN
DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
JANUARY 22, 2001

BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE

**TESTIMONY OF KATHLEEN L. SLOAN
DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE - TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE
OF THE
HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES
JANUARY 22, 2001**

Mr. Chairman, members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the recent implementation of the Kansas Payment Center. This transition in the way child support is collected and distributed in the State of Kansas has led to a number of serious and continuing issues, issues that affect District Court Trustees, employers, parents, and most importantly, children all across our State.

I serve as the District Court Trustee for the Tenth Judicial District of Kansas. I am an attorney, and as the Court Trustee I am charged by Kansas law to collect support payments and to pursue all civil remedies in order to enforce those payments of support. We are fortunate, in my office, to have one of the most sophisticated computer systems in the State which maintains, monitors and tracks every case enforced by my office. Broadly described, our computer system identifies the type of case whether divorce, protection from abuse, paternity, or state custody, the obligor, the obligee, the children, birth dates, emancipation dates, the social security numbers of the parties, addresses, due dates of the support, amounts due, arrears balances, the date on which payments were collected and disbursed, the date a delinquent notice went out, income withholding, names and addresses of employers, amounts to be deducted and paid pursuant to the income withholding order, terminations of employment, employment histories, the date a citation in contempt is prepared, the dates of court hearings, and much more.

I am also fortunate to have a staff that is passionate about child support. They are committed and dedicated to seeing it collected, distributed and enforced on behalf of the families and children who rely upon it. It is more than just a business or a statutory duty for us - it is a passion.

To give you additional perspective on my office and our history, we were the first Trustee office established in the State of Kansas, established in 1972. At the "age" of 28, we currently maintain a caseload of over 16,000 cases. Last year alone, we collected and disbursed over \$68 million in support payments. Since 1972, it has been the policy and practice of the Trustee's office to process payments with a 24-hour turnaround. We have an aggressive income withholding department which implements, processes and enforces all income withholding orders to employers for the enforcement of support payments. In addition to the administration of child support payments, my office aggressively enforces child support orders. The deputy trustees, paralegals and I handle 75 to 100 court hearings a week at various stages of contempt

for nonpayment of support. We have an aggressive Weekend Jail program for individuals held in contempt of court for nonpayment of support. We are proud to have an excellent working relationship with District Attorney Paul Morrison in the event that criminal prosecution becomes necessary.

The collection, disbursement and enforcement of child support changed in 2000 with the creation of the Kansas Payment Center. Although the potential for this new system as a "change for the better" may exist, it has not yet been realized. The Kansas Payment Center exists because of a federal mandate that every state establish and operate a "state disbursement unit" for the collection and disbursement of payments under support orders.¹ It does not exist primarily to enhance collection of child support or enforcement of child support. It exists primarily to accommodate employers to provide them with one central location to send monies withheld for the purpose of child support and maintenance. States were also given the opportunity to "opt out" of the requirement by linking local disbursement units through an automated information network and providing employers with one location to which income withholding was sent. Kansas chose not to opt out.

Child support collection and disbursement is not merely a "money in/money out" enterprise. It is far more complicated than that, and anyone who tells you otherwise does not understand the importance and complexity of child support. Child support is most often court ordered through cases of divorce. However, child support orders also occur involving paternity determinations, protection from abuse, and state custody of children either through the child in need of care statutes or the juvenile offender statutes. Child support collection, distribution and enforcement requires an understanding of what is due and when. It requires an understanding of who pays the support, who receives it, if someone is paying current support only or if they are also paying on arrears. It requires an understanding that parents change custody and then instead of dad paying mom child support, mom may have to pay dad. In other cases, mom and dad may have to pay grandpa and grandma, or aunt and uncle. It requires an understanding that judgement balances get paid off and refunds sometimes have to occur. Children emancipate. It requires an understanding that support orders get increased sometimes, sometimes they get reduced. It requires an understanding that people change jobs, that employers change, that income withholding orders change, that income withholding orders have to be monitored closely and sometimes modified.

For the purpose of today's hearing, it is my intent to focus on what I see as the most serious issues involving the Kansas Payment Center. Specifically, I want to discuss four issues: (1) the amount of support payments being held in "suspense" by the KPC, (2) the posting errors made by the KPC, (3) the difficulty of understanding or trusting the payment record generated by the KPC, and (4) the loss of local control and trust in the handling of collection and the ability to

¹Tier Technologies, Inc., the company awarded the contract to "be" the Kansas Payment Center, had never distributed support monies before being awarded the Kansas contract.

enforce court orders for support. I will also propose a few possible solutions.

The first three issues reflect primarily on the failure thus far of the administrative procedures and on the lack of accountability for errors. The last issue reflects my real concern that enforcement of child support in Kansas will be made more difficult, or perhaps even impossible, due to the system's failure to create credible, objective, timely and detailed payment records.

(1) Support monies in suspense.

As of January 19, 2001, the Kansas Payment Center had over \$688,000 of support payments being held in "suspense," meaning that this money has been deposited yet is still sitting in a bank account earning interest for someone² while waiting for the Kansas Payment Center to "research" where it is supposed to go. Keep in mind, these are not monies that have been misposted to the wrong case or sent to the wrong person, this is support money that has nowhere to go because of missing or poor information. The list of payments in suspense is separately identified by the date the check or money order was processed by the KPC, the check or money order number, the payor (whether that be an individual or an employer), the amount of the check or money order, and if there was a court order number available that it listed as well. This suspense list includes monies received in October, when the KPC first became viable.

This is someone's child support. This is someone's maintenance. There are 3 to 6 KPC staff to research the suspense list. That is not nearly enough staff to be able to research where this money needs to go. We were advised at the end of October to send all research information to a specific email address of the research staff of the KPC. This past Friday, during a visit to the KPC, I was advised that because the research staff is so far behind that we should no longer utilize this means and should instead call the main customer service line - the one that everyone in the state has to use and, despite what is being said, still has problems with keeping callers, including me and my staff, on hold for unacceptable periods of time.

Support money placed in suspense for whatever reason appears to have a lower priority than monies which are more easily identified. I question the incentive of the Kansas Payment Center to get this researched and monies distributed. My office has repeatedly asked to have access to the suspense list in order to try to assist in a solution and to get support monies out to where they need to go. To date, that information has not been made available, and I have been told by the management of the KPC that whether or not this information will be provided is the decision of senior management of Tier Technologies, Inc. in California.

² Different answers have been given as to who is the beneficiary of interest earned on monies held in suspense.

If some child, mother or father in Johnson County has money in "suspense," my office should be permitted, indeed encouraged, to help identify the proper, legal recipient. The same is true for Reno County, Finney County and Pottawatomie County. Someone needs to be willing to admit a problem and accept our help.

(2) Posting errors

The support payments processed by the Kansas Payment Center are downloaded into our computer system on a nightly basis, so that we can see what monies have been posted to what cases, and so that our system can update the entire case as far as judgment balances, arrears, etc. Because of the excellent computer system maintained by my office, because of the dedicated staff I am honored to have, and because of numerous inquiries made by obligees and obligors, we are able to quickly identify posting errors. Those errors and ways to correct them have been provided repeatedly to the KPC research staff. In many, many cases, those same posting errors continue to occur, and we continue to advise over and over again of the errors. Frustration levels are already high and are rising, not falling, among my staff, the courts, the attorneys, the employers, the obligees and the obligors, especially when posting errors are recognized and remain unfixed.

Staff time in my office is being taken away from enforcement and is focusing on research. No one knows when a correction will be made - so when emails are sent and suggestions are made the cases have to be reviewed again and again to determine if the problem has been corrected. Staff's ability to trust their records has been undermined because of so many unknowns. Staff cannot be as aggressive or confident as they once were because of constant second-guessing of the Kansas Payment Center and its accuracy.

(3) Difficulty understanding or trusting the payment record generated by the Kansas Payment Center

I have provided for each of you some examples of the type of payment record generated by the KPC. This is what anyone can see on the public web site maintained by the KPC. These payment records are very obviously difficult to understand and difficult to read. The payment records are only a reflection of "money in/money out" and do not reflect the actual status of any case. Additionally, monies credited on a case such as unemployment compensation or income tax refunds that is attached by the State to pay support no longer appears anywhere on a payment record. This information was available before the implementation of the Kansas Payment Center. It is critically important, especially to the obligor parent who demands credit for this money paid, and equally important to the trustees and the courts attempting to enforce court orders. Without this information, the payment record again is incomplete and inaccurate. Requests have been made on numerous occasions to have this information provided. To date, it has not been.

In terms of trusting the payment records, given the number of posting errors, the amount of monies still in suspense, and information that is no longer even available when it should be, the level of trust that a payment record accurately reflects what has been paid and received on any case is virtually extinguished. I fear we may never regain that level of confidence.

(4) Loss of local control and trust in the handling of collection and the ability to enforce court orders without that control and trust

Prior to September 29, 2000, my office maintained local control over the collection, disbursement and enforcement of all cases where the judges of the Tenth Judicial District ordered child support and maintenance to be paid. When local control was maintained, we were able to provide the courts, the attorneys and the parties with consistently accurate payment records. Families, the courts and attorneys could rely on the strength of our staff and our computer system and our enforcement abilities and powers.

Because of posting errors made by the KPC, errors which happen again and again, because of technological 'glitches' that are being researched by the technical team in Arizona,³ because of monies paid but sitting in suspense, the payment records relied upon by the courts and the parties for enforcement purposes are seriously if not irretrievably damaged. As one hearing officer stated: "Beyond the fact that we have very angry parties appearing in court, our enforcement efforts have been sabotaged by the fact that all a person has to say is that he/she mailed in a payment - we have no proof otherwise. The parties who used to appreciate the Court Trustee's enforcement efforts are angry, and get even angrier when answers aren't forthcoming about the payments. It scares me that the child support agencies are moving backward in time instead of forward." The parties, the families, the courts, the attorneys and support staff are frustrated and discouraged that a system that was working well has been replaced with one that does not.

Possible solutions?

Since November of last year, at the request of several Court Trustees, there have been meetings between the management of the Kansas Payment Center, staff from the Office of Judicial Administration, staff of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Court Trustees, and Trustee staff to discuss improvements, problems, and solutions. Notes from several of those meetings are provided to the committee today. (It should be noted that staff of

³ Tier Technologies, Inc. is located in California. Their technical team is in Phoenix, Arizona. The KPC is located in Topeka, Kansas. Checks ready to be printed and mailed are first electronically transferred to New Jersey and then transferred to St. Louis, Missouri for printing and mailing.

SRS and OJA were working previously with Tier and the KPC. Several Court Trustees requested to be included in meetings so that they could help provide a solution to a growing crisis.)

Many of the problems and solutions lie in the improvement of the KPC computer system and its software applications. Serious questions exist as to whether their system can be improved or whether it is agreed that certain improvements need to take place. Many of the problems and solutions also lie in the training of the staff currently processing payments and researching payments held in suspense. As far as the staff of the KPC is concerned, it is clear they cannot perform their duties satisfactorily until they have a fuller understanding of child support, and also have a fuller understanding of the necessary interaction with the court system.

Some of my proposed solutions are as follows:

- * Provide the courts and the trustee offices with ongoing access to the suspense list
- * Permit the courts and the trustees with more access to information about payments processed. Allow them the ability to see photocopies of checks, both front and back, for example.
- * Enhance the secure web site so that more information is provided. While the Kansas Payment Center may not necessarily be a "case management system," the information it has available to it through the collection and distribution of checks seriously affects other systems that are case management systems, and impacts the enforcement for the entire state. Therefore, additional information for the courts is critical.
- * Provide more trained staff and separate telephone access for the courts to deal with questions, problems, and research. Right now, the courts have one designated individual at the KPC with whom to deal. The courts must access the customer service telephone line just like the obligees and obligors have to use. The wait time on hold is not acceptable to a court system which needs quick information in order to enforce court orders.
- * Extend the amount of time access to the web site is permitted. At the present time, only 20 minutes of access is provided at any one time. In addition, the KPC system there are only 270 users permitted at any given time on both the secure and the public website for the entire State of Kansas.

Conclusion

It is unlikely that a centralized payment center can ever develop or maintain the same passion for child support that individual County Trustee offices have traditionally demonstrated. However, that should not diminish the accountability we demand from the system or our collective efforts to improve it. My office stands ready to be a part of the solution to the issues presented to you today, so that children and families in Kansas have confidence in the collection, distribution and enforcement system of child support in Kansas.

ATTACHMENTS

COURT TRUSTEE STATUTE	TAB 1
FEDERAL LAW ON STATE DISBURSEMENT UNITS	TAB 2
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 154	TAB 3
KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER - PAYMENT RECORD (EXAMPLES)	TAB 4
INFORMATION SENT TO KPC RESEARCH (EXAMPLES)	TAB 5
INFORMATION SENT TO KPC RESEARCH REGARDING INCOME WITHHOLDING ISSUES	TAB 6
NOTES/CORRESPONDENCE FROM MEETINGS OF SRS, OJA, TRUSTEES, TIER TECHNOLOGIES	TAB 7
CUSTOMER COMPLAINT LETTERS (EXAMPLES)	TAB 8
ONE OBLIGEE'S EFFORTS	TAB 9
PRESS (EXAMPLES)	TAB 10

CASE ANNOTATIONS

1. Facts constituting unenforceable order, judgment, or decree in action brought on behalf of foreign country examined. Federal Republic of Germany v. Nelsen, 247 K. 461, 463, 799 P.2d 1038 (1990).

23-489 to 23-491.

History: L. 1970, ch. 132, §§ 39 to 41; Repealed, L. 1994, ch. 301, § 86; July 1, 1995.

ENFORCEMENT OF DUTIES OF SUPPORT

Attorney General's Opinions:

General provisions; home rule powers. 79-115.

23-492. Purpose of act. The purpose of this act is to improve the enforcement of duties of support.

History: L. 1972, ch. 123, § 1; March 23.

23-493. Definitions. (1) "Court" means the district court of this state.

(2) "Duty of support" includes any duty of support imposed by any court order, decree or judgment, whether interlocutory or final, whether incidental to a proceeding for divorce, separate maintenance or otherwise.

(3) "Support," as used in this section and K.S.A. 23-495 and 23-496, and amendments thereto, means child support, whether interlocutory or final, and maintenance.

(4) "Obligor" means any person owing a duty of support.

(5) "Obligee" means any person or entity to whom a duty of support is owed.

History: L. 1972, ch. 123, § 2; L. 1978, ch. 227, § 1; L. 1982, ch. 152, § 21; L. 1985, ch. 115, § 34; July 1.

Law Review and Bar Journal References:

"42 U.S.C. § 659 and the Kansas Order of Garnishment," James R. Russell, 48 J.B.A.K. 37, 45 (1979).

23-494. Court trustee; appointment.

The court may provide by rule adopted by the judge or judges of each of the judicial districts of Kansas for the establishment of the office of court trustee for the judicial district. The court trustee shall be a person licensed to practice law in the state of Kansas and shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the administrative judge of the judicial district.

History: L. 1972, ch. 123, § 3; L. 1985, ch. 115, § 35; July 1.

Attorney General's Opinions:

General provisions; home rule powers. 79-115.

23-495. Same; duties. The court trustee shall have the responsibility for collection of sup-

port from the obligor upon the written request of the obligee or upon the order of the court.

History: L. 1972, ch. 123, § 4; March 23.

23-496. Same; powers. (a) The court trustee shall be authorized and empowered to pursue all civil remedies which would be available to the obligee in establishing and enforcing payment of support.

(b) The court trustee may also file motions for an increase or a decrease of the amount of support on behalf of any child. Any such motion to modify the amount of support shall not be heard until notice has been given to the obligee, the obligor and their attorneys of record, if any.

(c) The court trustee shall have the following additional powers and duties upon approval of the administrative judge:

(1) To issue summonses, subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum to obligors, obligees and other witnesses who possess knowledge or books and records relating to enforcement of support to appear in the office of the trustee or before the district court for examination;

(2) to administer oaths and take sworn testimony on the record or by affidavit;

(3) to appoint special process servers as required to carry out the court trustee's responsibilities under this section; and

(4) to enter into stipulations, acknowledgments, agreements and journal entries, subject to approval of the court.

History: L. 1972, ch. 123, § 5; L. 1976, ch. 173, § 1; L. 1985, ch. 115, § 36; July 1.

Law Review and Bar Journal References:

"Kansas Enacts New Provisions for Child Support Enforcement—Mandatory Wage Withholding," Yvonne C. Anderson, Richard A. Forster, 25 W.L.J. 91, 105, 112, 115 (1985).

CASE ANNOTATIONS

1. Appeal from order initiated hereunder held final decision; 60-2102(a)(4) applied. Brown v. Tubbs, 2 K.A.2d 522, 582 P.2d 1165.

23-497. Same; expenses; compensation; court trustee operations fund, purposes and expenditures. To defray the expenses of operation of the court trustee's office, the court trustee is authorized to charge an amount, not to exceed 5% of the funds collected from obligors through such office, as determined necessary by the administrative judge as provided by this section. All such amounts shall be paid to the court trustee operations fund of the county where collected. There shall be created a court trustee operations

[Title Contents](#) [Previous Section](#) [Next Section](#)

COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF SUPPORT PAYMENTS

SEC. 454B. [42 U.S.C. 654b] (a) STATE DISBURSEMENT UNIT.--

(1) IN GENERAL.--In order for a State to meet the requirements of this section, the State agency must establish and operate a unit (which shall be known as the "State disbursement unit") for the collection and disbursement of payments under support orders--

(A) in all cases being enforced by the State pursuant to section 454(4); and

(B) in all cases not being enforced by the State under this part in which the support order is initially issued in the State on or after January 1, 1994, and in which the income of the noncustodial parent is subject to withholding pursuant to section 466(a)(8)(B).

(2) OPERATION.--The State disbursement unit shall be operated--

(A) directly by the State agency (or 2 or more State agencies under a regional cooperative agreement), or (to the extent appropriate) by a contractor responsible directly to the State agency; and

(B) except in cases described in paragraph (1)(B), in coordination with the automated system established by the State pursuant to section 454A.

(3) LINKING OF LOCAL DISBURSEMENT UNITS.--The State disbursement unit may be established by linking local disbursement units through an automated information network, subject to this section, if the Secretary agrees that the system will not costs more nor take more time to establish or operate than a centralized system. In addition, employers shall be given 1 location to which income withholding is sent.

(b) REQUIRED PROCEDURES.--The State disbursement unit shall use automated procedures, electronic processes, and computer-driven technology to the maximum extent feasible, efficient, and economical, for the collection and disbursement of support payments, including procedures--

(1) for receipt of payments from parents, employers, and other States, and for disbursements to custodial parents and other obligees, the State agency, and the agencies of other States;

(2) for accurate identification of payments;

(3) to ensure prompt disbursement of the custodial parent's share of any payment; and

(4) to furnish to any parent, upon request, timely information on the current status of support payments under an order requiring payments to be made by or to the parent, except that in cases described in subsection (a)(1)(B), the State disbursement unit shall not be required to convert and maintain in automated form records of payments kept pursuant to section 466(a)(8)(B)(iii) before the effective date of this section.

(c) TIMING OF DISBURSEMENTS.--

(1) IN GENERAL.--Except as provided in paragraph (2), the State disbursement unit shall distribute all amounts payable under section 457(a) within 2 business days after receipt from the employer or other source of periodic income, if sufficient information identifying the payee is provided. The date of collection for amounts collected and distributed under this part is the date of receipt by the State disbursement unit, except that if current support is withheld by an employer in the month when due and is received by the State disbursement unit in a month other than the month when due, the date of withholding may be deemed to be the date of collection.^[449]

(2) PERMISSIVE RETENTION OF ARREARAGES.--The State disbursement unit may delay the distribution of collections toward arrearages until the resolution of any timely appeal with

respect to such arrearages.

(d) BUSINESS DAY DEFINED.--As used in this section, the term "business day" means a day on which State offices are open for regular business.^[450]

(g) COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPORT PAYMENTS.--

(1) IN GENERAL.--The State shall use the automated system required by this section, to the maximum extent feasible, to assist and facilitate the collection and disbursement of support payments through the State disbursement unit operated under section 454B, through the performance of functions, including, at a minimum--

(A) transmission of orders and notices to employers (and other debtors) for the withholding of income--

(i) within 2 business days after receipt of notice of, and the income source subject to, such withholding from a court, another State, an employer, the Federal Parent Locator Service, or another source recognized by the State; and

(ii) using uniform formats prescribed by the Secretary;

(B) ongoing monitoring to promptly identify failures to make timely payment of support; and

(C) automatic use of enforcement procedures (including procedures authorized pursuant to section 466(c)) if payments are not timely made.

(2) BUSINESS DAY DEFINED.--As used in paragraph (1), the term "business day" means a day on which State offices are open for regular business.^[451]

(h) EXPEDITED ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.--The automated system required by this section shall be used, to the maximum extent feasible, to implement the expedited administrative procedures required by section 466(c).^[452]

[449] P.L. 105-33, §5549, added this sentence, effective as if included in the enactment of title III of P.L. 104-193, August 22, 1996.

[450] P.L. 104-193, §312(b), added §454B, to become effective October 1, 1998. See also, Vol. II, P.L. 104-193, §312(d).

[451] P.L. 104-193, §312(c), added subsection (g), to become effective October 1, 1998. See also, Vol. II, P.L. 104-193, §312(d).

[452] P.L. 104-193, §325(b), added subsection (h). For the effective date, see Vol. II, P.L. 104-193, §395.

Kansas Judicial Branch

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 154**

Re: Redirection of Court-ordered Support Payments to the Kansas Payment Center

Pursuant to the provisions of L. 2000, ch. 183, sec. 20(m), this order authorizes redirection of payments on all Kansas court orders for child support, spousal maintenance, and other support-related payments, including support payments made pursuant to income withholding orders, which are currently made to the Clerk of the District Court or the District Court Trustee, to the Kansas Payment Center, at P.O. Box 758599, Topeka, Kansas 66675-8599.

Redirection to the Kansas Payment Center will occur on the date set out in the Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines, which are attached to this order. The Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines shall contain policies and procedures which shall be followed to promote the efficient receipt and disbursement of support payments by the Kansas Payment Center.

The Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines may be updated as deemed necessary by the Judicial Administrator.

This order is effective through June 30, 2001.

BY ORDER OF THE COURT this ____ day of ____ 2000.

Kay McFarland, Chief Justice

Kansas Payment Center Procedural Guidelines

1. Beginning September 29, 2000, payments on existing, new, and modified child support, maintenance, and other support-related orders from all Kansas counties shall be paid to the Kansas Payment Center, at P.O. Box 758599, Topeka, Kansas 66675-8599.
2. Court-ordered support which is currently ordered excepted for good cause from payment through the Clerk of the District Court or the District Court Trustee shall not be required to be paid to the Kansas Payment Center.
3. Prior to September 29, 2000, the Kansas Payment Center shall send a redirect notice to each support payor and payee, and if there is an income withholding order in effect, to the employer. Each district court will have notice, by virtue of this order, of the September 29, 2000, redirection of payments to the Kansas Payment Center. Therefore, it is not required that each case file contain a copy of the Kansas Payment Center redirection notice. A copy of this order may be placed in each applicable case file, should a district so choose.
4. Employers withholding support payments for multiple individuals may submit to the Kansas Payment Center a single payment for each pay period, provided that the payment is for the total amount due on all Kansas income withholding orders issued to that employer. The payment must be accompanied by a detailed list itemizing the breakdown between court orders. The employee's social security number must be included, as well as the withholding date.

5. Each payment submitted to the Kansas Payment Center must include the court order number, which must begin with the two digit alpha character identifier for the county in which the order was entered. For example, a payment on a case from Shawnee County must be identified in the following format: SN99D 123456.
6. Support-related payments made pursuant to garnishment proceedings shall continue to be directed to the Clerk of the District Court. The Clerk shall forward the funds to the Kansas Payment Center immediately after receipt of the order to pay out, and shall specify the debt to which the payment shall apply.
7. Payments currently made to child support agencies in states other than Kansas shall continue to be made to those other states, and shall not be redirected to the Kansas Payment Center.
8. All new or modified non-IVD support orders entered on or after September 29, 2000, must be accompanied by a support order information sheet which will be developed by the Office of Judicial Administration and which will be available in the office of each Clerk of the District Court.
9. The official payment history for support payments made prior to September 29, 2000, shall continue to be maintained, as occurs currently, by the Clerk of the District Court or District Court Trustee.

For payments made following September 29, 2000, the official payment history shall be maintained by the Kansas Payment Center, and will be made available for requesting parties by the Clerk of the District Court, who will access the payment history from the electronic Kansas Payment Center database. Clerks' offices will certify information accessed from the Kansas Payment Center as a true and correct copy of information provided by the Kansas Payment Center. Parties will also be able to access payment information regarding their support cases from the Kansas Payment Center website.

10. Any local district court rules which contain support payment provisions contrary to those set out in this order are hereby repealed.

(9/00)



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 94C 010519


CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/2/2001	1191983	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$50.00		MN		
2	ALOC	1/2/2001	1164567	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2482	
3	ALOC	1/2/2001	1191984	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$49.25	MN		
4	DISB	1/2/2001	1191984	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$49.25)
5	PYMT	12/26/2000	1100443	FOROUGH, TAHEREH	\$50.00		CS		
6	ALOC	12/26/2000	73781	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2454	
7	ALOC	12/26/2000	1100442	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		\$49.25	CS		
8	DISB	12/26/2000	1100442	RAFIZADEH, ADIB			CS	50161220	(\$49.25)
9	MSPY	12/26/2000	94698	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		(\$49.25)	MN		
10	MSPY	12/26/2000	94697	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$50.00)	MN		
11	MSPY	12/26/2000	73781	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$0.75)	MN	2454	
12	PYMT	12/6/2000	846014	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$350.00		MN		
13	PYMT	12/6/2000	846014	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$100.00		MN		
14	ALOC	12/6/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	14134	
15	ALOC	12/6/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.25	FEE	14134	
16	ALOC	12/6/2000	422443	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2466	
17	ALOC	12/6/2000	846015	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$98.50	MN		
18	ALOC	12/6/2000	846015	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$344.75	MN		
19	DISB	12/6/2000	846015	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$443.25)
20	MSPY	12/6/2000	449362	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		(\$98.50)	MN		
21	MSPY	12/6/2000	449362	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$98.50	MN		
22	MSPY	12/6/2000	449363	ROE, NANCY		(\$98.50)	OT	50038598	
23	MSPY	12/6/2000	449361	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$100.00)	MN		
24	MSPY	12/6/2000	449361	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$100.00)	OT		
25	MSPY	12/6/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		(\$1.50)	FEE	14134	
26	MSPY	12/6/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		(\$1.50)	FEE	14134	
27	MSPY	12/6/2000	432862	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		(\$197.00)	MN		
28	MSPY	12/6/2000	432862	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$197.00	MN		
29	MSPY	12/6/2000	432863	ROE, NANCY		(\$49.25)	OT	50035732	
30	MSPY	12/6/2000	432861	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$200.00)	MN		
31	MSPY	12/6/2000	432861	RAFIZADEH, ADIB		(\$50.00)	OT		
32	MSPY	12/6/2000	422443	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		(\$0.75)	FEE	2466	
33	PYMT	12/1/2000	775445	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$50.00		MN		
34	ALOC	12/1/2000	765298	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2471	
35	ALOC	12/1/2000	775446	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$49.25	MN		
36	DISB	12/1/2000	775446	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$49.25)
37	PYMT	11/3/2000	449361	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$100.00		MN		
38	PYMT	11/3/2000	449361	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$100.00		OT		
39	ALOC	11/3/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.50	FEE	14134	
40	ALOC	11/3/2000	103267	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.50	FEE	14134	
41	ALOC	11/3/2000	449362	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$98.50	MN		
42	ALOC	11/3/2000	449363	ROE, NANCY		\$98.50	OT		
43	DISB	11/3/2000	449362	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$98.50)
44	DISB	11/3/2000	449363	ROE, NANCY			OT	50038598	(\$98.50)
45	PYMT	11/2/2000	432861	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$200.00		MN		
46	PYMT	11/2/2000	432861	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$50.00		OT		
47	ALOC	11/2/2000	422442	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$3.00	FEE	14194	
48	ALOC	11/2/2000	422443	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2466	
49	ALOC	11/2/2000	432862	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$197.00	MN		
50	ALOC	11/2/2000	432863	ROE, NANCY		\$49.25	OT		
51	DISB	11/2/2000	432862	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$197.00)
52	DISB	11/2/2000	432863	ROE, NANCY			OT	50035732	(\$49.25)
53	DISB	10/26/2000	94698	FOROUGH, TAHEREH			MN		(\$49.25)
54	RTRN	10/26/2000	94698	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		\$49.25	MN	13705	
55	PYMT	10/9/2000	94697	RAFIZADEH, ADIB	\$50.00		MN		
56	ALOC	10/9/2000	73781	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	2454	

57	ALOC	10/9/2000	94698	FOROUGH, TAHEREH	\$49.25	MN		
58	DTSB	10/9/2000	94698	FOROUGH, TAHEREH		MN	13705	(\$49.25)

7-16



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 99C 000814

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Aloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/12/2001	1358153	LUBBERTS, ARNITA	\$378.00		CS		
2	ALOC	1/12/2001	103618	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	346688	
3	ALOC	1/12/2001	285223	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	347290	
4	ALOC	1/12/2001	458088	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	347842	
5	ALOC	1/12/2001	1358152	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		\$372.33	CS		
6	DISB	1/12/2001	1358152	LUBBERTS, ALBERT			CS	50236703	(\$372.33)
7	MSPY	1/12/2001	305178	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		(\$125.73)	MN		
8	MSPY	1/12/2001	103618	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		(\$126.00)	MN		
9	MSPY	1/12/2001	103618	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		(\$0.27)	MN	346688	
10	MSPY	1/12/2001	449828	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		(\$126.00)	MN		
11	MSPY	1/12/2001	285223	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		(\$126.00)	MN		
12	MSPY	1/12/2001	560620	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		(\$124.11)	MN		
13	MSPY	1/12/2001	560619	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		(\$126.00)	MN		
14	MSPY	1/12/2001	458088	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		(\$1.89)	MN	347842	
15	PYMT	1/11/2001	1344877	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
16	ALOC	1/11/2001	1337832	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5632782	
17	ALOC	1/11/2001	1344878	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
18	DISB	1/11/2001	1344878	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
19	PYMT	1/8/2001	1291722	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
20	ALOC	1/8/2001	1266835	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5627208	
21	ALOC	1/8/2001	1291723	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
22	DISB	1/8/2001	1291723	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
23	PYMT	1/5/2001	1254886	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
24	ALOC	1/5/2001	1243729	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5618431	
25	ALOC	1/5/2001	1254887	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
26	DISB	1/5/2001	1254887	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
27	PYMT	12/29/2000	1153515	LUBBERTS, ARNITA	\$126.00		CS		
28	ALOC	12/29/2000	1143509	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.32	FEE	350221	
29	ALOC	12/29/2000	1143509	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.58	FEE	350221	
30	ALOC	12/29/2000	1153514	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		\$124.10	CS		
31	DISB	12/29/2000	1153514	LUBBERTS, ALBERT			CS	50178882	(\$124.10)
32	PYMT	12/21/2000	1050290	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
33	ALOC	12/21/2000	1042809	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5603182	
34	ALOC	12/21/2000	1050291	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
35	DISB	12/21/2000	1050291	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
36	PYMT	12/18/2000	1002018	LUBBERTS, ARNITA	\$126.00		CS		
37	ALOC	12/18/2000	978025	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	349636	
38	ALOC	12/18/2000	1002017	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		\$124.11	CS		
39	DISB	12/18/2000	1002017	LUBBERTS, ALBERT			CS	50133731	(\$124.11)
40	PYMT	12/14/2000	955260	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
41	ALOC	12/14/2000	949808	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5585413	
42	ALOC	12/14/2000	955261	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
43	DISB	12/14/2000	955261	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
44	PYMT	12/7/2000	860262	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
45	ALOC	12/7/2000	852767	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5572414	
46	ALOC	12/7/2000	860263	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
47	DISB	12/7/2000	860263	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
48	PYMT	12/1/2000	775825	LUBBERTS, ARNITA	\$126.00		CS		
49	ALOC	12/1/2000	765622	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	349036	
50	ALOC	12/1/2000	775824	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		\$124.11	CS		
51	DISB	12/1/2000	775824	LUBBERTS, ALBERT			CS	50086138	(\$124.11)
52	PYMT	11/30/2000	760290	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
53	ALOC	11/30/2000	760291	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$127.38	MN		
54	DISB	11/30/2000	760291	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$127.38)
55	PYMT	11/27/2000	713901	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
56	ALOC	11/27/2000	713902	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$127.38	MN		

7-18

57	DISB	11/27/2000	713902	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$127.38)
58	PYMT	11/17/2000	618122	LUBBERTS, ARNITA	\$126.00		CS		
59	ALOC	11/17/2000	608362	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	348500	
60	ALOC	11/17/2000	618121	LUBBERTS, ALBERT		\$124.11	CS		
61	DISB	11/17/2000	618121	LUBBERTS, ALBERT			CS	50063642	(\$124.11)
62	PYMT	11/16/2000	604463	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
63	ALOC	11/16/2000	596924	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.29	FEE	5530536	
64	ALOC	11/16/2000	604464	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$127.09	MN		
65	DISB	11/16/2000	604464	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$127.09)
66	PYMT	11/13/2000	560619	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$126.00		MN		
67	ALOC	11/13/2000	458088	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.89	FEE	347842	
68	ALOC	11/13/2000	560620	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$124.11	MN		
69	DISB	11/13/2000	560620	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$124.11)
70	PYMT	11/9/2000	523811	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
71	ALOC	11/9/2000	516561	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5518753	
72	ALOC	11/9/2000	523812	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
73	DISB	11/9/2000	523812	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
74	PYMT	11/3/2000	449827	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$253.38		MN		
75	ALOC	11/3/2000	439140	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5505306	
76	ALOC	11/3/2000	449828	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$251.47	MN		
77	DISB	11/3/2000	449828	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$251.47)
78	PYMT	10/26/2000	344767	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
79	ALOC	10/26/2000	344768	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$127.38	MN		
80	DISB	10/26/2000	344768	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$127.38)
81	PYMT	10/23/2000	305177	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$126.00		MN		
82	ALOC	10/23/2000	103618	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.27	FEE	346688	
83	ALOC	10/23/2000	305178	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.73	MN		
84	DISB	10/23/2000	305178	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.73)
85	PYMT	10/19/2000	265757	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
86	ALOC	10/19/2000	258099	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5478337	
87	ALOC	10/19/2000	265758	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
88	DISB	10/19/2000	265758	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN		(\$125.47)
89	PYMT	10/15/2000	205836	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
90	ALOC	10/15/2000	178748	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5462317	
91	ALOC	10/15/2000	205837	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
92	DISB	10/15/2000	205837	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN	3492	(\$125.47)
93	PYMT	10/9/2000	95528	LUBBERTS, ALBERT	\$127.38		MN		
94	ALOC	10/9/2000	74494	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.91	FEE	5448824	
95	ALOC	10/9/2000	95529	LUBBERTS, ARNITA		\$125.47	MN		
96	DISB	10/9/2000	95529	LUBBERTS, ARNITA			MN	14092	(\$125.47)

Zarger, Edith, DCT

From: Zarger, Edith, DCT
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2000 3:35 PM
Subject: KPC Research (E-mail)
Posting Error----2nd time

This is a Johnson County case & a Wyandotte County case

The money is switched again on these cases. Same as below

-----Original Message-----

From: Zarger, Edith, DCT
Sent: Friday, November 03, 2000 11:23 AM
To: KPC Research (E-mail)
Subject: Posting Error

This is a Johnson County case and a Wyandotte county case.

The JO # is 89C 005649, Anthony E Mika, pays \$346.16

The WY # is 96D 006126, James Mullins, pays \$150.00

They both work for the same POE, they submitted one check, with both payments, clearly marked and the amounts got switched when the posting was done.

Thanks

B & B INDUSTRIES, INC.
DBA IN-HOUSE PRINTING
1628 WEST 9TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, MO 64101

BANK MIDWEST
18-669-1010

DATE

4320

CHECK

10-02-00

AMOUNT

PAY
TO THE
ORDER OF

Kansas Payment Center

Four Hundred Ninety Six and 16/100 Dollars

*****496.16

James Mullins 512-70-6126 W4 960 000988-¹152¹²
Mika, Anthony E. 512-74-2266 Jo 89c 005649-³346¹⁶



⑈004320⑈ ⑆101006699⑆ 2400031948⑈

B & B INDUSTRIES, INC.

DBA IN-HOUSE PRINTING
1628 WEST 9TH STREET
KANSAS CITY, MO 64101

BANK MIDWEST
18-669 1010

DATE

4983

CHECK

11-02-00

AMOUNT

Kansas Payment Center

Four Hundred Ninety Six and 16/100 Dollars

*****496.16

PAY TO THE ORDER OF
James Mullins - 512-70-6126-Wy-96D 000988
Mika, Anthony E - 512-74-2266 Jo 89C 005649

Handwritten signature and scribbles

⑈004383⑈ ⑆101006699⑆ 2400031948⑈

FD Security Features Included Details on Back



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

7-22

County Name: WYANDOTTE

CO #: 96D 000988

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	11/3/2000	448025	MULLINS, JAMES	\$346.16		CS		
2	ALOC	11/3/2000	442793	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 29		\$7.50	FEE	4383	
3	ALOC	11/3/2000	442793	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 29		\$9.81	FEE	4383	
4	ALOC	11/3/2000	448026	MULLINS, TAMMY		\$328.85	CS		
5	DISB	11/3/2000	448026	MULLINS, TAMMY			CS	50038031	(\$328.85)
6	PYMT	10/9/2000	92294	MULLINS, JAMES	\$346.16		CS		
7	ALOC	10/9/2000	82205	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 29		\$6.00	FEE	4320	
8	ALOC	10/9/2000	82205	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 29		\$7.85	FEE	4320	
9	ALOC	10/9/2000	92295	MULLINS, TAMMY		\$332.31	CS		
10	DISB	10/9/2000	92295	MULLINS, TAMMY			CS	12625	(\$332.31)



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 89C 005649

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	11/3/2000	444059	MIKA, ANTHONY	\$150.00		CS		
2	ALOC	11/3/2000	438492	SRS		\$150.00	SRS	4383	
3	PYMT	10/9/2000	84686	MIKA, ANTHONY	\$150.00		CS		
4	ALOC	10/9/2000	73241	SRS		\$150.00	SRS	4320	

7-23

Zarger **ith, DCT**

From: Zarger, Edith, DCT
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2000 3:01 PM
To: KPC Research (E-mail)
Subject: Posting Error

This is a Johnson County Case:

99C14937, Larisa G Wiley & Laurence H Wiley

This is one of our A/B cases where both parties pay each other. Laurence's maintenance payments made 10/23 were sent back to him. There are 2 schedules showing, one for \$729.00 where Laurence pays maintenance and one for \$229.00 where Larisa pays child support.

He wants to know what he is to do with the checks. His # is 913-458-6399.

Thanks

7-25

KPC Court Order Details [Return Home](#) [Help](#)

Step 1: Review Details & Add Date *Check the details and enter the dates.*

County Name: Johnson

Court Order Number: 99C 014937

Directions: Fields marked with a red arrow (→) are required.

→ IV-D Code:

New Court Order Number:

→ Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY

Modification Date:

End Date:

Step 2: Select a Debt *Click on "Select" to choose a debt.*

Add New Debt

Select	Type	Amount	Frequency	Start Date	End Date
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maintenance	\$ 729.00	Monthly	10/01/2000	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Child Support	\$ 229.00	Monthly	05/01/2000	

Step 3: Enter Debt Details *Click on each tab (1-5) to enter details.*

Step 4: Submit

Submit Your Work

Obligation

Payor

Payee

3rd Party Payee

Children

→ Debt Type:

→ Enforcement Status:

→ Obligation Frequency:

Fee Exempt:

→ Obligation Amount:

Override Fee Percentage: %

Seasonal Flag:

URES/UIFSA (Interstate ID):

→ Start Date: MM/DD/YYYY

County Multiple Payor:

End Date:

KAECSES Multiple Payor: M. E. or blank

0017-EM OF TABLE HAS BEEN REACHED

SA1401I

TENTH DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE

PF11/PRINT 10/27/00

TRANSACTION SUMMARY

PF1/HELP PF2/M

PF3/HIST PF4/SCHX PF5/PO

CASE: 99C014937A

OBLIGOR: (R) SSN=452-04-1198

OBLIGEE: (P) SSN=435-96-8677

DATE: 09 01 00

WILEY, LARISA G

WILEY, LAURENCE H

DATE DUE SCHD

AMT DUE

DATE

RECEIPTS

DISTRIB

FEE

COMMENTS & NOTES

09/01/00

229.00

09/13

ARERS= 1145.00

09/13

BEFORE 10/1/00

09/13

CASE ACTIVE

09/13

DECREE DTE 072500

09/13

DIRECT PAY LETTER

09/29

DELINQUENT NOTICE

10/01/00

229.00

10/01

CA/B4= 1145.00

10/05

1030.50

DI *27397 R001 E

10/05

1030.50

0.00

DIRECT

10/23

229.00

CK 518599 R001 E

10/23

225.57

3.43

E

10/23

135.50

CK 518600 R001 E

10/23

133.48

2.02

E

11/01/00

229.00

S/p posted to "B" He still has the check

913-458-6399

SA1301I

TENTH DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
CASE HISTORY SUMMARY

PF11/PRINT 11/01/00
PF1/HELP PF2/MAIN
PF3/SCHX PF4/TRNX

CASE: 99C014937B

OBLIGOR: (P) SSN=435-96-8677
WILEY, LAURENCE H
8337 FARLEY
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66212

OBLIGEE: (R) SSN=452-04-1198
WILEY, LARISA G
11128 WEST 76TH TERR #10
SHAWNEE, KS 66214

DIVISION: 17

INFO: 9999-9999

DECREE TYPE	DIVORCE	REGION	CHILDREN	EMANC DATE
DECREE DATE	07/25/00	IV-D #		TOT RCPTS
COUNTY PERCENT	1.500%	1999 TOT RCPTS	0.00	RECPTS YTD
REG PAY START	10/01/00	REG PAY AMOUNT	729.00	UNDIST AMT
NEXT DUE DATE	11/01/00	PART STILL DUE	729.00	FREQ MONTHLY
BYPASS START	07/19/06	NUMBER OF PERIODS	99	DELINQ DATE
M =OBLIGEE				10/10/00
				LAST TRANS DT

TYP	AMOUNT	NOW DUE	ARREARS	-----
M	729.00	729.00	4374.00	ACTIVE
				DCT

4374.00

Sloan Kathleen, DCT

From: Zarger, Edith, DCT
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 10:29 AM
To: Sloan, Kathleen, DCT
subject: FW: Posting Error

-----Original Message-----

From: Zarger, Edith, DCT
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2000 10:25 AM
To: KPC Research (E-mail)
Subject: Posting Error

This is a Johnson County Case:

93C10099, Timothy Dixon & Esther Beutler.

The Employer, Anderson Erickson Dairy, has ADP do their payroll for them. ADP sent \$487.50, by Electronic Funds Transfer, but only \$244.00 got posted to the case.

What happened to the rest of the money?

Thanks

A+B Case

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Se Thursday, January 18, 2001 11:34 AM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: Rerun/Solution/misapplied

The information listed below was provided on 1-08-01 to aid in the correction of mispostings on this caes. However, the MSPY of ck No. 8207** and 8256** is in error. Therefore, they have been misposted again.

JO99C8605 1/08/01

In an attempt to correct these records I provide the following:

The following checks were remitted by David Morrison's employer Acme Floor to be distributed to Melissa Morrison

Check Number	Date KPC Posted	Amount
7999	10/30/00	\$ 50.31
8116	11/28/00	\$201.24
8207**	12/18/00	\$150.93
8256**	1/2/01	\$100.62
Total		\$503.10

KPC records should reflect disbursements paid to Melissa Morrison totaling \$503.10 through 1/5/01.

The following checks were remitted by Melissa Morrison's employer Reflection Painting to be distributed to David Morrison

2781	11/1/00	\$102.69
2844	11/9/00	\$102.69
2895	11/15/00	\$102.69
2951	11/22/00	\$102.69
3001	?	\$102.69
(check number 3001: cleared bank 11/30, check number is not reflected on public site-although, there is a disbursement w/o a check number at that time?)		
3062	12/6/00	\$102.69
3112	12/14/00	\$102.69
3164	12/21/00	\$102.69
3247	12/28/00	\$102.69
3302	01/04/01	\$102.69
Total		\$1,026.90

KPC records should reflect disbursements paid to David Morrison totaling \$1,026.90 through 1/5/01.

We have been advised not to rely on the payment record posted on your web site. Therefore, I am providing how the records and disbursements are reflecting on our system.

According to our records: You have posted \$666.45 to the schedule which reflects Melissa Morrison's obligation to David Morrison. As noted above the correct amount should be \$1,026.90 through 1/5/01.

7-31



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 99C 008605

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Aloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/12/2001	1359210	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$559.62		CS		
2	ALOC	1/12/2001	949831	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3112	
3	ALOC	1/12/2001	978103	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.26	FEE	8207	
4	ALOC	1/12/2001	1042837	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.66	FEE	3164	
5	ALOC	1/12/2001	1165484	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.51	FEE	8256	
6	ALOC	1/12/2001	1359211	MORRISON, DAVID		\$553.65	CS		
7	DISB	1/12/2001	1359211	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50237137	(\$553.65)
8	MSPY	1/12/2001	956439	MORRISON, MELISSA		(\$101.15)	MN		
9	MSPY	1/12/2001	956438	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$102.69)	MN		
10	MSPY	1/12/2001	949831	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$1.54)	MN	3112	
11	MSPY	1/12/2001	1007118	MORRISON, MELISSA		(\$148.67)	MN		
12	MSPY	1/12/2001	1007117	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$150.93)	MN		
13	MSPY	1/12/2001	978103	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$0.98)	MN	8207	
14	MSPY	1/12/2001	978103	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$1.28)	MN	8207	
15	MSPY	1/12/2001	1051889	MORRISON, MELISSA		(\$101.15)	MN		
16	MSPY	1/12/2001	1051888	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$102.69)	MN		
17	MSPY	1/12/2001	1042837	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$1.54)	MN	3164	
18	MSPY	1/12/2001	1137676	MORRISON, MELISSA		(\$102.03)	MN	50175489	
19	MSPY	1/12/2001	1137675	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$102.69)	MN		
20	MSPY	1/12/2001	1128228	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$0.66)	MN	3247	
21	MSPY	1/12/2001	1198883	MORRISON, MELISSA		(\$99.11)	MN	50188195	
22	MSPY	1/12/2001	1198882	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$100.62)	MN		
23	MSPY	1/12/2001	1165484	MORRISON, DAVID		(\$1.51)	MN	8256	
24	PYMT	1/11/2001	1346253	MORRISON, DAVID	(\$102.69)		MN		
25	ALOC	1/11/2001	1337858	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3357	
26	ALOC	1/11/2001	1346254	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
27	DISB	1/11/2001	1346254	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50233352	(\$101.15)
28	PYMT	1/8/2001	1297003	MORRISON, DAVID	\$50.31		MN		
29	ALOC	1/8/2001	1266928	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	8276	
30	ALOC	1/8/2001	1297004	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$49.56	MN		
31	DISB	1/8/2001	1297004	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50216074	(\$49.56)
32	PYMT	1/4/2001	1237298	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
33	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226810	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.01	FEE	3302	
34	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226810	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.53	FEE	3302	
35	ALOC	1/4/2001	1237299	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
36	DISB	1/4/2001	1237299	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50203198	(\$101.15)
37	PYMT	1/2/2001	1198882	MORRISON, DAVID	\$100.62		MN		
38	ALOC	1/2/2001	1165484	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.51	FEE	8256	
39	ALOC	1/2/2001	1198883	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$99.11	MN		
40	DISB	1/2/2001	1198883	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50188195	(\$99.11)
41	PYMT	12/28/2000	1137675	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
42	ALOC	12/28/2000	1128228	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.66	FEE	3247	
43	ALOC	12/28/2000	1137676	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$102.03	MN		
44	DISB	12/28/2000	1137676	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50175489	(\$102.03)
45	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051888	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
46	ALOC	12/21/2000	1042837	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3164	

7-32

47	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051889	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
48	DISB	12/21/2000	1051889	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK		MN		(\$101.15)
49	PYMT	12/18/2000	1007117	MORRISON, DAVID		\$150.93	MN		
50	ALOC	12/18/2000	978103	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	8207	
51	ALOC	12/18/2000	978103	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	8207	
52	ALOC	12/18/2000	1007118	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		
53	DISB	12/18/2000	1007118	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		(\$148.67)
54	PYMT	12/14/2000	956438	MORRISON, DAVID		\$102.69	MN		
55	ALOC	12/14/2000	949831	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	3112	
56	ALOC	12/14/2000	956439	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		
57	DISB	12/14/2000	956439	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		(\$101.15)
58	PYMT	12/6/2000	847750	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK	\$102.69	CS		
59	ALOC	12/6/2000	837041	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	3062	
60	ALOC	12/6/2000	847751	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
61	DISB	12/6/2000	847751	MORRISON, DAVID	OK		CS	50097475	(\$101.15)
62	PYMT	11/29/2000	744553	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK	\$102.69	CS		
63	ALOC	11/29/2000	744554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
64	DISB	11/29/2000	744554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50082264	(\$102.69)
65	PYMT	11/28/2000	733073	MORRISON, DAVID	OK	\$201.24	MN		
66	ALOC	11/28/2000	722454	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	8116	
67	ALOC	11/28/2000	722454	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	8116	
68	ALOC	11/28/2000	733074	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		
69	DISB	11/28/2000	733074	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		(\$198.22)
70	PYMT	11/22/2000	674073	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK	\$102.69	CS		
71	ALOC	11/22/2000	665208	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	2951	
72	ALOC	11/22/2000	674074	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
73	DISB	11/22/2000	674074	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50072018	(\$101.31)
74	PYMT	11/15/2000	593624	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK	\$102.69	CS		
75	ALOC	11/15/2000	582294	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	2895	
76	ALOC	11/15/2000	593625	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
77	DISB	11/15/2000	593625	MORRISON, DAVID	OK		CS	50060238	(\$101.15)
78	PYMT	11/9/2000	524998	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$102.69	CS		
79	ALOC	11/9/2000	516597	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	2844	
80	ALOC	11/9/2000	524999	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
81	DISB	11/9/2000	524999	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50050654	(\$101.15)
82	PYMT	11/1/2000	418553	MORRISON, MELISSA	OK	\$102.69	CS		
83	ALOC	11/1/2000	406619	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	2781	
84	ALOC	11/1/2000	418554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
85	DISB	11/1/2000	418554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50034043	(\$101.15)
86	PYMT	10/30/2000	386830	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$50.31	CS		
87	ALOC	10/30/2000	362005	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10			FEE	7999	
88	ALOC	10/30/2000	386831	MORRISON, DAVID			CS		
89	DISB	10/30/2000	386831	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50028457	(\$49.56)

Pittman, Cheryl, DCT

From: Pittman, Cheryl, DCT
Sent: Monday, January 08, 2001 3:01 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: solution JO99C8605

Importance: High

JO99C8605 1/08/01

In an attempt to correct these records I provide the following:

The following checks were remitted by David Morrison's employer Acme Floor to be distributed to Melissa Morrison

Check Number	Date KPC Posted	Amount
7999	10/30/00	\$ 50.31
8116	11/28/00	\$201.24
8207	12/18/00	\$150.93
8256	1/2/01	\$100.62
	Total	\$503.10

KPC records **should** reflect disbursements paid to Melissa Morrison totaling \$503.10 through 1/5/01.

The following checks were remitted by Melissa Morrison's employer Reflection Painting to be distributed to David Morrison

2781	11/1/00	\$102.69
2844	11/9/00	\$102.69
2895	11/15/00	\$102.69
2951	11/22/00	\$102.69
3001	?	\$102.69
(check number 3001: cleared bank 11/30, check number is not reflected on public site-although, there is a disbursement w/o a check number at that time?)		
3062	12/6/00	\$102.69
3112	12/14/00	\$102.69
3164	12/21/00	\$102.69
3247	12/28/00	\$102.69
3302	01/04/01	\$102.69
	Total	\$1,026.90

KPC records **should** reflect disbursements paid to David Morrison totaling \$1,026.90 through 1/5/01.

We have been advised not to rely on the payment record posted on your web site. Therefore, I am providing how the receipts and disbursements are reflecting on our system.

According to our records: You have posted \$666.45 to the schedule which reflects Melissa Morrison's obligation to David Morrison. As noted above the correct amount should be \$1,026.90 through 1/5/01.

According to our records: You have posted \$863.55 to the schedule which reflects David Morrison's obligation to Melissa Morrison. As noted above the correct amount should be \$503.10 through 1/5/01.

Both parties are distraught over the above posting errors. Please correct and advise.

Cheryl Pittman

102.69

50.31

pd by Melissa = A case
pd by David = B case

7-34



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 99C 008605

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/4/2001	1237298	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
2	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226810	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.01	FEE	3302	
3	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226810	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.53	FEE	3302	
4	ALOC	1/4/2001	1237299	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
5	DISB	1/4/2001	1237299	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50203198	(\$101.15)
6	PYMT	1/2/2001	1198882	MORRISON, DAVID	\$100.62		MN		
7	ALOC	1/2/2001	1165484	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.51	FEE	8256	
8	ALOC	1/2/2001	1198883	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$99.11	MN		
9	DISB	1/2/2001	1198883	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50188195	(\$99.11)
10	PYMT	12/28/2000	1137675	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
11	ALOC	12/28/2000	1128228	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.66	FEE	3247	
12	ALOC	12/28/2000	1137676	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$102.03	MN		
13	DISB	12/28/2000	1137676	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	50175489	(\$102.03)
14	PYMT	12/21/2000	1051888	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
15	ALOC	12/21/2000	1042837	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3164	
16	ALOC	12/21/2000	1051889	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
17	DISB	12/21/2000	1051889	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	?	(\$101.15)
18	PYMT	12/18/2000	1007117	MORRISON, DAVID	\$150.93		MN		
19	ALOC	12/18/2000	978103	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.98	FEE	8207	
20	ALOC	12/18/2000	978103	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.28	FEE	8207	
21	ALOC	12/18/2000	1007118	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$148.67	MN	?	
22	DISB	12/18/2000	1007118	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	?	(\$148.67)
23	PYMT	12/14/2000	956438	MORRISON, DAVID	\$102.69		MN		
24	ALOC	12/14/2000	949831	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3112	
25	ALOC	12/14/2000	956439	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$101.15	MN		
26	DISB	12/14/2000	956439	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN	?	(\$101.15)
27	PYMT	12/6/2000	847750	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
28	ALOC	12/6/2000	837041	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	3062	
29	ALOC	12/6/2000	847751	MORRISON, DAVID		\$101.15	CS		
30	DISB	12/6/2000	847751	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50097475	(\$101.15)
31	PYMT	11/29/2000	744553	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
32	ALOC	11/29/2000	744554	MORRISON, DAVID		\$102.69	CS		
33	DISB	11/29/2000	744554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50082264	(\$102.69)
34	PYMT	11/28/2000	733073	MORRISON, DAVID	\$201.24		MN		
35	ALOC	11/28/2000	722454	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.52	FEE	8116	
36	ALOC	11/28/2000	722454	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.50	FEE	8116	
37	ALOC	11/28/2000	733074	MORRISON, MELISSA		\$198.22	MN		
38	DISB	11/28/2000	733074	MORRISON, MELISSA			MN		(\$198.22)
39	PYMT	11/22/2000	674073	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
40	ALOC	11/22/2000	665208	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.38	FEE	2951	
41	ALOC	11/22/2000	674074	MORRISON, DAVID		\$101.31	CS		
42	DISB	11/22/2000	674074	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50072018	(\$101.31)
43	PYMT	11/15/2000	593624	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
44	ALOC	11/15/2000	582294	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	2895	
45	ALOC	11/15/2000	593625	MORRISON, DAVID		\$101.15	CS		
46	DISB	11/15/2000	593625	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50060238	(\$101.15)

wrong
ok
wrong
wrong
ok
wrong
ok
ok
ok

= ?
12/21, 12/18, 12/14 pd by David
11/29 pd by Melissa
11/05/2001

47	PYMT	11/9/2000	524998	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
48	ALOC	11/9/2000	516597	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	2844	
49	ALOC	11/9/2000	524999	MORRISON, DAVID		\$101.15	CS		
50	DISB	11/9/2000	524999	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50050654	(\$101.15)
51	PYMT	11/1/2000	418553	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$102.69		CS		
52	ALOC	11/1/2000	406619	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.54	FEE	2781	
53	ALOC	11/1/2000	418554	MORRISON, DAVID		\$101.15	CS		
54	DISB	11/1/2000	418554	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50034043	(\$101.15)
55	PYMT	10/30/2000	386830	MORRISON, MELISSA	\$50.31		CS		
56	ALOC	10/30/2000	362005	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.75	FEE	7999	
57	ALOC	10/30/2000	386831	MORRISON, DAVID		\$49.56	CS		
58	DISB	10/30/2000	386831	MORRISON, DAVID			CS	50028457	(\$49.56)

O.K.
O.K.

Wrong

pd # ~~1026.90~~ Melissa = ~~1026.90~~ ~~11/9/2000~~ \$1026.90
 David = \$503.10

Our records reflect since KPC
 Melissa has pd - 666.45
 David has pd - 763.55

7-35

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

1-8-01

To: kpresearch@tier.com
C: ksint@srskansas.org
Subject: misapplied

JO 99C 007618 Paul S. Hadley

payment of 11-27-00 for \$85.38 should be split:

\$62.30 goes to case No. JO 99C 007618

\$23.08 goes to case No. 99C 013741 Lisa Smith

and payment of 12-8-00 for \$85.38 should be split:

\$62.30 goes to case No. JO 99C 007618

\$23.08 goes to case No. 99C 013741 Lisa Smith

JO 96C 013554 A Barry D. Parrish

Payment of \$100.00 posted on 1-5-00 was paid by Sandy L. Parrish JO 96C 013554 c
and should be disbursed to Barry D. Parrish

JO 99C 008605 A Melissa S. Morrison

Payment posted on 10-30-00 for \$50.31 was paid by David Morrison on JO 99C 008605 B

and should be disbursed to Melissa Morrison.

JO 99C 008605 B David M. Morrison

Postings of 12-14-00, 12-21-00, and 1-4-01 for \$102.69 each (total of \$410.76) were
paid by Melissa S. Morrison JO 99c 008605 A and should be disbursed to David M.
Morrison.

WY 90D 002978 Danny J. Beebe

Payment of 11-27-00 for \$720.46 should be split:

\$365.08 belongs to WY 90D 002978

\$355.38 belongs to 00C 000926

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Friday, December 29, 2000 12:25 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: misapplied/ rerun/ mail

1st inquiry on 11-20-00

JO 99C 008605^B two payors

employer: Acme Floor Company ck# 7999 for \$50.31 posted on 10-30-00

this pmt paid by David Morrison to be distributed to Melissa S. Morrison

And--employer: Reflection Printing ck # 3112 for \$\$102.69 posted on 12-14-00 and ck # 3164 that was posted on 12-21-00. These were paid by Melissa Morrison to be distributed to David Morrison

Melissa Morrison says she hasn't received any payments. Her address is:

767 South Keeler Apt 226
Olathe Ks 66061

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

To: kpresearch@tier.com
Subject: misapplied

NOV 20 10 9: 52

JO 99C 008605 A Melissa S. Morrison/ David M. Morrison
employer: Acme Floor Company ck# 7999 for \$50.31 posted on 10-30-00
this pmt belongs to B Case from David M. Morrison/ to Melissa S. Morrison

JO 89C 006249 Gregory K. Lee/ Marianna M. Lee
employer: Mid Cities Motor Freight ck No. 9335 for \$23.10 misposted on 10-26-00
belongs to case No. JO 99C 000322

No Payment: 3 payments are missing for JO99C 000322
same employer as above ck # 9397 for \$23.20 mailed 10-2-00
ck # 9474 for \$46.20 mailed 10-12-00
ck # 9580 for \$46.20 mailed on 10-26-00

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
ant: Friday, January 19, 2001 3:42 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: misapplied

1st inquiry 11-2-00

JO87C 006368 Robert E. Henley/ Lisa R. Nelson

employer: Commanche Place Apts.

Also misposting on 10-30-00 of \$242.30 should be split:

\$126.92 of this belongs on JO 96C 016907

\$115.38 goes to JO 87C 006368.

****Additional Information**

The correction is in error. \$ should be split between the two cases not all applied to JO 96C 005538

Previously reported on 11-14-00 and 12-6-00

JO 96C 005540 Scott G. McVey/Renee L. Fitchett

posting of 10-4-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

posting of 10-25-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

Also: postings of 11-8-00 and 11-22-00 same situation.

**another misposting on 1-16-01 for \$169.00 should be split as above.

inquiry 11-9-00 and 12-20-00

JO 97C 005318 William R. Wagner/Nancy J. Wagner

employer: Window Flair Draperies says \$100 posting on 11-7-00 is not from them.

may be a misposting.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2000 10:42 AM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'; Michelle Reeve (E-mail)
Subject: misapplied/rerun

The following was sent on 11-4-00 and again on 11-28-00.

The correction is in error. \$ should be split between the two cases not all applied to JO 96C 005538

Previously reported on 11-14-00

JO 96C 005540 Scott G. McVey/Renee L. Fitchett

posting of 10-4-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

posting of 10-25-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

Also: postings of 11-8-00 and 11-22-00 same situation.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2000 2:12 PM
to: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Subject: rerun

Previously reported on 11-14-00

JO 96C 005540 Scott G. McVey/Renee L. Fitchett

posting of 10-4-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

posting of 10-25-00 for \$169.37 should be split as follows:

\$77.07 belongs to JO 96C 005540

and \$92.30 belongs on JO 96C 005538

Also: postings of 11-8-00 and 11-22-00 same situation.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 4:42 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: missapplied

JO 96C 000493 David c. Goernandt/Linda S. Leckberg
employer did not send the posting of 11-6-00 for \$325.50

JO 96C 005928 Kirk D. Collier/Teresa J. Smith
employer: Storage USA posting on 10-10-00, 10-31-00 and 11-8-00 of \$547.44 each.
\$310.67 of each of these three payments (total of \$932.01) belongs to case
no. JO 90C 009194 Kirk collier/ Kelli L. Shartzter

JO 99C 00814 A Albert c. Lubberts/ Arnita L. Lubberts
three cks in the amount of \$126 each posted on 10-23-00, 11-3-00, and 11-13-00
belong to JO 99C 000814 B

JO 96C 005540 Scott G. mcVey/ Renee L. Fitchett
employer: Midland Painting 3 cks posted 10-4-00, 10-25-00, and 11-8-00
for \$169.37 each.
\$92.30 of each check belongs to case No. JO 96C 005538 Scott McVey/ Angela Ice.

7-43



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 96C 005540

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/16/2001	1383983	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
2	ALOC	1/16/2001	1368562	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3070	
3	PYMT	1/4/2001	1231022	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$77.07		CS		
4	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226579	SRS		\$77.07	SRS	3062	
5	PYMT	12/29/2000	1148597	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$246.44		CS		
6	ALOC	12/29/2000	664984	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3041	
7	ALOC	12/29/2000	836852	SRS		\$77.07	SRS	3046	
8	MSPY	12/28/2000	841755	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
9	MSPY	12/28/2000	669091	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
10	PYMT	12/27/2000	1118007	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$508.11		CS		
11	ALOC	12/27/2000	35171	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3016	
12	ALOC	12/27/2000	324938	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3026	
13	ALOC	12/27/2000	503837	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3030	
14	PYMT	12/21/2000	1046500	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$77.07		CS		
15	ALOC	12/21/2000	1042615	SRS		\$77.07	SRS	3052	
16	PYMT	12/16/2000	841755	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
17	ALOC	12/16/2000	836852	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3046	
18	MSPY	11/29/2000	38781	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
19	MSPY	11/29/2000	330560	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
20	MSPY	11/29/2000	508361	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
21	PYMT	11/22/2000	669091	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
22	ALOC	11/22/2000	664984	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3041	
23	PYMT	11/8/2000	508361	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
24	ALOC	11/8/2000	503837	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3030	
25	PYMT	10/25/2000	330560	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
26	ALOC	10/25/2000	324938	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3026	
27	PYMT	10/4/2000	38781	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$169.37		CS		
28	ALOC	10/4/2000	35171	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3016	

7-44



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 96C 005538

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/4/2001	1231021	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$92.30		CS		
2	ALOC	1/4/2001	1226578	SRS		\$92.30	SRS	3062	
3	PYMT	12/29/2000	1148596	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$92.30		CS		
4	ALOC	12/29/2000	836852	SRS		\$92.30	SRS	3046	
5	MSPY	12/27/2000	35171	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
6	MSPY	12/27/2000	324938	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
7	MSPY	12/27/2000	503837	MCVEY, SCOTT		(\$169.37)	CS		
8	PYMT	12/21/2000	1046499	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$92.30		CS		
9	ALOC	12/21/2000	1042614	SRS		\$92.30	SRS	3052	
10	PYMT	11/29/2000	739217	MCVEY, SCOTT	\$508.11		CS		
11	ALOC	11/29/2000	35171	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3016	
12	ALOC	11/29/2000	324938	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3026	
13	ALOC	11/29/2000	503837	SRS		\$169.37	SRS	3030	

wrong -

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2001 4:54 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksin@srskansas.org'
Subject: misapplied

JO 00C 003516 Bich Hoang

employer: Gear for Sports

payment posted on 1-5-01 for \$1153 is not from the employer

Don't believe this payment belongs to this case.

JO 95 006292 Don Allio

Also (3) payment posted 11-13-00 should be split as follows:

\$2426.50 belongs to JO95C 006292

\$721.10 belongs to JO 95C 009951

\$\$315.75 belongs to JO 91C 011196

"Problem continues"

1st inquiry 11-7-00, 12-1-00, and 12-19-00

JO 97C 009197 A and B Cases Pamela L. Lang/ Brian Lang

Payor-Pamela Lang Payee-Brian Lang

Problem continues also misposting on 11-6-00, 11-20-00, 12-11-00, and 12-18-00

\$149 is being paid by Pamela to Brian

Also add posting of 1-8-01 for \$149.00

Additional Information

(1st inquiry 10-20-00, and 10-26-00)

JO 94C 001006 B Gerald R. Humbert/Lynn M. Godding

employer Schmalbach Lubeca sent ck # 146914 mailed on 9-29-00 total for \$474.57.

check included other cases \$69.23 goes to this case.

also: ck no 148362 sent 10-13-00, total ck amount \$359.19

\$86.53 belongs to JO 94C 001006 B

Other cases were posted from these checks. However, pmts missing on JO 94C 001006.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
ent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 10:15 AM
.o: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: rerun

1st inquiry 11-7-00 2nd 12-1-00

JO 97C 009197 A and B Cases Pamela L. Lang/ Brian Lang

Pamela made payment for \$149.00 10-20-00 and 11-2-00

both have been misposted as being paid by Brian.

Payor-Pamela Lang Payee-Brian Lang

Problem continues also misposting on 11-6-00, 11-20-00, 12-11-00, and 12-18-00

\$149 is being paid by Pamela to Brian

1st inquiry 11-28-00

JO 93C 012271 Lael D. Gilliland/Dusty McCord

posting of 11-22-00 for \$109.21 should be split as follows:

\$11.59 belongs to JO 93C 012271

\$97.62 belongs to JO 99C 008741 (case no correction) Craig/ Calloway/Flora Calloway

Check no 345490 posted on 11-22-00 was posted wrong as indicated above. However, this same check number was again posted on 12-8-00 but for \$150.92.

How can the same check be posted twice for different amounts?????

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2000 3:34 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: misapplied

1st inquiry 11-7-00

JO 97C 009197 Pamela L. Lang/ Brian Lang

Pamela made payment for \$149.00 10-20-00 and 11-2-00

both have been misposted as being paid by Brian.

Payor-Pamela Lang Payee-Brian Lang

Stan gh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2000 4:44 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Subject: inquiries

1st inquiry sent 10-18-00

92C 014449 B Michael T. STappert/Deborah d. Rothwell

posting for \$1398.00 of 10-16-00 is correct.

97C 009197 A Brian C. Lang/ Pamela L. Lang

postings of 10-20-00, and 11-2-00 for \$149.00 each belongs

to 97C 009197 B Pamela L. Lang/ Brian C Lang

93C 003547 Gerald A. Henderson, Jr./ Tina M. Campbell

This case should have received \$51.23 of each posting on 10-20-00 and 10-31-00

The other \$46.16 of 10-20-00 and 10-31-00 belongs on Jefferson co. OOD 000031

95C 008741 A Johns E. Hill/Roxanne Barry

employer: Wagner Auto Body

10-2-00 ck # 48680 \$63.46 cleared 10-11-00
10-6-00 ck # 48707 \$63.46 cleared 10-16-00
10-17-00 ck #48820 \$63.46 cleared 10-23-00
10/25-00 ck #48868 \$63.46 cleared 10-27-00
10-31-00 ck #48902 \$63.46

Schedule activated so payments may now be posted.

94C 002031 Thomas Anthony Fonseca/ Angela Rothwell

Employer: Avid Outdoor Ck No. 23035 of 9-29-00 for \$794.25

listed four cases split as follows:

90C 00227 for \$174.25
98C 010134 for \$127.00
95C 008983 for \$155.00
94C 002031 for \$338.00

However all \$794.25 was posted to 94C 002031 in error.

7-49



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a New Search](#)

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 97C 009197

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Aloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/17/2001	1419543	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23		MN		
2	ALOC	1/17/2001	1414853	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.03	FEE	125780	
3	ALOC	1/17/2001	1414853	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.79	FEE	125780	
4	ALOC	1/17/2001	1419590	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.41	MN		
5	DISB	1/17/2001	1419590	LANG, PAMELA			MN	50253404	(\$127.41)
6	PYMT	1/8/2001	1279627	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00		MN		
7	ALOC	1/8/2001	1266519	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	106850	
8	ALOC	1/8/2001	1279750	LANG, PAMELA		\$146.76	MN		
9	DISB	1/8/2001	1279750	LANG, PAMELA			MN	50211371	(\$146.76)
10	PYMT	1/5/2001	1249298	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23		MN		
11	ALOC	1/5/2001	1243567	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.94	FEE	124505	
12	ALOC	1/5/2001	1249356	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.29	MN		
13	DISB	1/5/2001	1249356	LANG, PAMELA			MN	50205766	(\$127.29)
14	PYMT	12/28/2000	1132156	LANG, PAMELA	\$298.00		CS		
15	ALOC	12/28/2000	271653	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	95668	
16	ALOC	12/28/2000	120694	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	93685	
17	ALOC	12/28/2000	1132115	LANG, BRIAN		\$293.52	CS		
18	DISB	12/28/2000	1132115	LANG, BRIAN			CS	50173889	(\$293.52)
19	MSPY	12/28/2000	275565	LANG, PAMELA		(\$146.76)	MN		
20	MSPY	12/28/2000	275517	LANG, BRIAN		(\$149.00)	MN		
21	MSPY	12/28/2000	271653	LANG, BRIAN		(\$2.24)	MN	95668	
22	MSPY	12/28/2000	426768	SRS		(\$149.00)	SRS		
23	MSPY	12/28/2000	427967	LANG, BRIAN		(\$149.00)	CS		
24	PYMT	12/20/2000	1032203	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23		MN		
25	ALOC	12/20/2000	1032250	LANG, PAMELA		\$129.23	MN		
26	DISB	12/20/2000	1032250	LANG, PAMELA			MN		(\$129.23)
27	PYMT	12/18/2000	989995	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00		MN		
28	ALOC	12/18/2000	977703	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.03	FEE	104206	
29	ALOC	12/18/2000	977703	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.79	FEE	104206	
30	ALOC	12/18/2000	990097	LANG, PAMELA		\$147.18	MN		
31	DISB	12/18/2000	990097	LANG, PAMELA			MN		(\$147.18)
32	PYMT	12/11/2000	894653	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00		MN		
33	ALOC	12/11/2000	882797	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	101928	
34	ALOC	12/11/2000	894762	LANG, PAMELA		\$146.76	MN		
35	DISB	12/11/2000	894762	LANG, PAMELA			MN		(\$146.76)
36	PYMT	12/5/2000	827923	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23		MN		
37	ALOC	12/5/2000	823713	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.94	FEE	121155	
38	ALOC	12/5/2000	827976	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.29	MN		
39	DISB	12/5/2000	827976	LANG, PAMELA			MN		(\$127.29)
40	PYMT	11/22/2000	669128	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23		MN		
41	ALOC	11/22/2000	669194	LANG, PAMELA		\$129.23	MN		
42	DISB	11/22/2000	669194	LANG, PAMELA			MN		(\$129.23)
43	PYMT	11/20/2000	636732	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00		MN		
44	ALOC	11/20/2000	625035	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.03	FEE	100205	
45	ALOC	11/20/2000	625035	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.79	FEE	100205	
46	ALOC	11/20/2000	636857	LANG, PAMELA		\$147.18	MN		

05-1

47	DISB	11/20/2000	636857	LANG, PAMELA					
48	DISB	11/15/2000	192339	LANG, PAMELA					(\$147.18)
49	DISB	11/15/2000	275565	LANG, PAMELA					(\$127.29)
50	DISB	11/15/2000	295152	LANG, PAMELA					(\$146.76)
51	RTRN	11/15/2000	295152	LANG, PAMELA					(\$127.41)
52	RTRN	11/15/2000	275565	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.41	MN	50013224	
53	RTRN	11/15/2000	192339	LANG, PAMELA		\$146.76	MN	50011557	
54	PYMT	11/9/2000	520198	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23	\$127.29	MN	135	
55	ALOC	11/9/2000	516465	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.94	FEE	118559	
56	ALOC	11/9/2000	520256	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.29	MN		
57	DISB	11/9/2000	520256	LANG, PAMELA					
58	PYMT	11/6/2000	470283	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00			50049355	(\$127.29)
59	ALOC	11/6/2000	457794	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	97889	
60	ALOC	11/6/2000	470397	LANG, PAMELA		\$146.76	MN		
61	DISB	11/6/2000	470397	LANG, PAMELA					
62	PYMT	11/2/2000	427967	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00			50040149	(\$146.76)
63	ALOC	11/2/2000	426768	SRS		\$149.00	CS		
64	DISB	11/2/2000	426768	SRS					
65	PYMT	10/25/2000	330591	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23				(\$149.00)
66	ALOC	10/25/2000	330629	LANG, PAMELA		\$129.23	MN		
67	DISB	10/25/2000	330629	LANG, PAMELA					
68	PYMT	10/23/2000	295022	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23			50019515	(\$129.23)
69	ALOC	10/23/2000	284951	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.03	FEE	69102674	
70	ALOC	10/23/2000	284951	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.79	FEE	69102674	
71	ALOC	10/23/2000	295152	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.41	MN		
72	DISB	10/23/2000	295152	LANG, PAMELA					
73	PYMT	10/20/2000	275517	LANG, BRIAN	\$149.00			50233687	(\$127.41)
74	ALOC	10/20/2000	271653	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.24	FEE	95668	
75	ALOC	10/20/2000	275565	LANG, PAMELA		\$146.76	MN		
76	DISB	10/20/2000	275565	LANG, PAMELA					
77	PYMT	10/15/2000	192206	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23			50233673	(\$146.76)
78	ALOC	10/15/2000	178409	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.94	FEE	115465	
79	ALOC	10/15/2000	192339	LANG, PAMELA		\$127.29	MN		
80	DISB	10/15/2000	192339	LANG, PAMELA					
81	PYMT	10/9/2000	85063	LANG, BRIAN	\$129.23			50233603	(\$127.29)
82	ALOC	10/9/2000	74221	SRS		\$129.23	CS	114059	

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
sent: Friday, January 05, 2001 1:35 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'; Tonya Brunson (E-mail)
Subject: misapplied/ new info

1st inquiry 11-14-00

JO 96C 005928 Kirk D. Collier/Teresa J. Smith

employer: Storage USA posting on 10-10-00, 10-31-00 and 11-8-00 of \$547.44 each.

additional mispostings on 11-21-00, 11-22-00, 12-4-00, and 12-18-00

\$310.67 of each of these payments belongs to case
no. JO 90C 009194 Kirk collier/ Kelli L. Shartzter

It appears that reversals have been done for 6 mispostings all except 11-21-00.

Additionally, on jo 90C 009194 posting of 12-26-00 should be \$621.34 each,
(2@ \$310.67)

Also posting of 12-26-00 should be \$621.34 each, (2@ \$310.67)

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2000 4:42 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: missapplied

JO 96C 000493 David c. Goernandt/Linda S. Leckberg
employer did not send the posting of 11-6-00 for \$325.50

JO 96C 005928 Kirk D. Collier/Teresa J. Smith
employer: Storage USA posting on 10-10-00, 10-31-00 and 11-8-00 of \$547.44 each.
\$310.67 of each of these three payments (total of \$932.01) belongs to case
no. JO 90C 009194 Kirk collier/ Kelli L. Shartzter

JO 99C 00814 A Albert c. Lubberts/ Arnita L. Lubberts
three cks in the amount of \$126 each posted on 10-23-00, 11-3-00, and 11-13-00
belong to JO 99C 000814 B

JO 96C 005540 Scott G. mcVey/ Renee L. Fitchett
employer: Midland Painting 3 cks posted 10-4-00, 10-25-00, and 11-8-00
for \$169.37 each.
\$92.30 of each check belongs to case No. JO 96C 005538 Scott McVey/ Angela Ice.



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start


County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 96C 005928

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	PYMT	1/18/2001	1435922	COLLIER, KIRK	\$236.77		CS	
2	ALOC	1/18/2001	1431935	SRS		\$236.77	SRS	433610
3	PYMT	1/2/2001	1178638	COLLIER, KIRK	\$236.77		CS	
4	ALOC	1/2/2001	1164851	SRS		\$236.77	SRS	431512
5	MSPY	12/26/2000	668965	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
6	MSPY	12/26/2000	799702	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
7	MSPY	12/26/2000	989591	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
8	PYMT	12/18/2000	989591	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
9	ALOC	12/18/2000	977489	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	429364
10	PYMT	12/4/2000	799702	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
11	ALOC	12/4/2000	784870	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	426320
12	PYMT	11/22/2000	668965	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
13	ALOC	11/22/2000	664986	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	423990
14	PYMT	11/21/2000	657511	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
15	ALOC	11/21/2000	103389	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	414872
16	MSPY	11/21/2000	109074	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
17	MSPY	11/21/2000	395630	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
18	MSPY	11/21/2000	508263	COLLIER, KIRK		(\$547.44)	CS	
19	PYMT	11/8/2000	508263	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
20	ALOC	11/8/2000	503844	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	421059
21	PYMT	10/31/2000	395630	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
22	ALOC	10/31/2000	390446	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	419531
23	PYMT	10/10/2000	109074	COLLIER, KIRK	\$547.44		CS	
24	ALOC	10/10/2000	103389	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	414872
25	PYMT	10/6/2000	61734	COLLIER, KIRK	\$236.77		CS	
26	ALOC	10/6/2000	57271	SRS		\$236.77	SRS	412539



Payment Record Results

[How to Interpret Results](#)

[Start a](#)

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 90C 009194

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	PYMT	1/18/2001	1435921	COLLIER, KIRK	\$310.67		CS	
2	ALOC	1/18/2001	1431670	SRS		\$310.67	SRS	433610
3	PYMT	1/2/2001	1178637	COLLIER, KIRK	\$310.67		CS	
4	ALOC	1/2/2001	1164023	SRS		\$310.67	SRS	431512
5	PYMT	12/26/2000	1089869	COLLIER, KIRK	\$1094.88		CS	
6	ALOC	12/26/2000	784870	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	426320
7	ALOC	12/26/2000	977489	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	429364
8	PYMT	11/21/2000	657510	COLLIER, KIRK	\$1094.88		CS	
9	ALOC	11/21/2000	390446	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	419531
10	ALOC	11/21/2000	503844	SRS		\$547.44	SRS	421059
11	PYMT	10/6/2000	61733	COLLIER, KIRK	\$310.67		CS	
12	ALOC	10/6/2000	56842	SRS		\$310.67	SRS	412540

*should be
4 @ 310 ⁶⁷ each*

wrong

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2001 10:32 AM
To: 'KPCRESEARCH@TIER.COM'
Cc: 'KSINT@SRSKANSAS.ORG'
Subject: MISAPPLIED REFUND

FIRST INQUIRY SENT 12-11-00

JO 96C 000894 B Sherrie Tate/ Ronald A. Byers

All \$\$ on hold paid by Sherrie Tate should be refunded to Sherrie Tate.

THE REVERSAL WAS DONE ON 1-2-01 FROM SHERRIE AS THE PAYOR, HOWEVER IT WAS TO BE RETURNED TO SHERRIE AS A REFUND NOT POSTED AS A PAYMENT FROM RONALD. NOW RONALD HAS BEEN GIVEN CREDIT FOR SOMETHING HE DID NOT PAY.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2000 10:20 AM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: refund

JO 96C 000894 B Sherrie Tate/ Ronald A. Byers

All \$\$ on hold paid by Sherrie Tate should be refunded to Sherrie Tate.

7-57



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a New Search

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 96C 000894

CO Type: NIVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Aloc	Type	ID#	Amt Disb
1	PYMT	1/11/2001	1344676	BYERS, RONALD	\$240.92		CS		
2	ALOC	1/11/2001	1337658	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.92	FEE	5632782	
3	ALOC	1/11/2001	1346322	TATE, SHERRIE		\$240.00	CS		
4	DISB	1/11/2001	1346322	TATE, SHERRIE			CS	50233375	(\$240.00)
5	PYMT	1/8/2001	1291036	BYERS, RONALD	\$97.67		CS		
6	ALOC	1/8/2001	1266235	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.47	FEE	5627208	
7	ALOC	1/8/2001	1297241	TATE, SHERRIE		\$96.20	CS		
8	DISB	1/8/2001	1297241	TATE, SHERRIE			CS	50216175	(\$96.20)
9	PYMT	1/5/2001	1254543	BYERS, RONALD	\$240.92		CS		
10	ALOC	1/5/2001	1243434	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$3.61	FEE	5618431	
11	ALOC	1/5/2001	1257584	TATE, SHERRIE		\$237.31	CS		
12	DISB	1/5/2001	1257584	TATE, SHERRIE			CS	50208157	(\$237.31)
13	PYMT	1/2/2001	1192242	BYERS, RONALD	\$138.46		CS		
14	ALOC	1/2/2001	596695	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.08	FEE	24207847	
15	ALOC	1/2/2001	1199131	TATE, SHERRIE		\$136.38	CS		
16	DISB	1/2/2001	1199131	TATE, SHERRIE			CS	50188301	(\$136.38)
17	MSPY	1/2/2001	604177	BYERS, RONALD		(\$136.39)	CS		
18	MSPY	1/2/2001	604176	BYERS, SHERRIE		(\$138.46)	CS		
19	MSPY	1/2/2001	596695	BYERS, SHERRIE		(\$1.67)	CS	24207847	
20	MSPY	1/2/2001	596695	BYERS, SHERRIE		(\$0.40)	CS	24207847	
21	PYMT	11/27/2000	713030	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$98.09		CS		
22	ALOC	11/27/2000	681611	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.47	FEE	24218352	
23	ALOC	11/27/2000	713031	BYERS, RONALD		\$96.62	CS		
24	DISB	11/27/2000	713031	BYERS, RONALD			CS		(\$96.62)
25	PYMT	11/16/2000	604176	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$138.46		CS		
26	ALOC	11/16/2000	596695	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.67	FEE	24207847	
27	ALOC	11/16/2000	596695	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.40	FEE	24207847	
28	ALOC	11/16/2000	604177	BYERS, RONALD		\$136.39	CS		
29	DISB	11/16/2000	604177	BYERS, RONALD			CS		(\$136.39)
30	PYMT	11/3/2000	449480	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$250.00		CS		
31	PYMT	11/3/2000	449480	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$13.46		CS		
32	PYMT	11/3/2000	449480	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$13.46		CS		
33	ALOC	11/3/2000	257900	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$1.67	FEE	72418414	
34	ALOC	11/3/2000	257900	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$0.20	FEE	72418414	
35	ALOC	11/3/2000	438873	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.08	FEE	72419798	
36	ALOC	11/3/2000	449481	BYERS, RONALD		\$13.26	CS		
37	ALOC	11/3/2000	449481	BYERS, RONALD		\$13.46	CS		
38	ALOC	11/3/2000	449481	BYERS, RONALD		\$246.25	CS		
39	DISB	11/3/2000	449481	BYERS, RONALD			CS		(\$272.97)
40	PYMT	10/24/2000	321024	BYERS, SHERRIE	\$138.46		CS		
41	ALOC	10/24/2000	57230	CT Trustee Fee, Jud Dist# 10		\$2.08	FEE	72417184	
42	ALOC	10/24/2000	321025	BYERS, RONALD		\$136.38	CS		
43	DISB	10/24/2000	321025	BYERS, RONALD			CS		(\$136.38)

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2001 4:46 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'
Subject: missapplied

JO 93C 000183 Lorenzo Rothschild/ Audrey

inquiry 10-19-00 10-27-00, and 12-6-00

Note: 1-19-01 Payments were reversed as mspy on 12-17-00, however nothing has been reapplied to either case

The attempt at correcting this misposting is incorrect. \$141.54 of this ck # 35948 should apply to the Wyandotte case WY 93D 001799 and \$206.31 applies to JO 93C 000183

Galaxy Sales: ** ck #35948 10-10-00 \$349.85 should be posted as follows:

\$206.31 goes to case JO93C 000183

\$141.54 goes to WY93D 001799

** ck # 35755 goes to case No. JO93C 00183

Additional problem on these two cases

Also: ck No 36139 \$152.08 posted on 10-26-00

\$80.31 to JO 93C 000183

\$71.77 to WY 93D 001799

and ck No 36441 \$152.08 should each be split:

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
ent: Wednesday, December 06, 2000 12:14 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Cc: 'ksint@srskansas.org'; Catherine Hodges (E-mail)
Subject: missapplied/correction

JO 93C 000183 Lorenzo Rothschild/ Audrey

1st inquiry 10-19-00 again on 10-27-00

The attempt at correcting this misposting is incorrect. \$141.54 of this ck # 35948 should apply to the Wyandotte case WY 93D 001799 and \$206.31 applies to JO 93C 000183

Galaxy Sales: ** ck #35948 10-10-00 \$349.85 should be posted as follows:

\$206.31 goes to case JO93C 000183

\$141.54 goes to WY93D 001799

** ck # 35755 goes to case No. JO93C 00183

Additional problem on these two cases

Also: ck No 36139 \$152.08 posted on 10-26-00

\$80.31 to JO 93C 000183

\$71.77 to WY 93D 001799

and ck No 36441 \$152.08 should each be split:

\$80.31 to JO 93C 000183

\$71.77 to WY 93D 001799

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2000 4:57 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Subject: inquiries

89C 008708 Vince Currin/Jodi M. Hillman
employer: sprint on 9-29-00 ck #2568013 \$188.77 goes to this case
on 10-13-00 ck #2620580 \$188.77 goes to this case
Schedule has been fixed so you should be able to post now.

(1st inquiry 10-19-00)

98C 013813 Edward L. Hight, III/Patricia A. Hight
emcployer: UMKC ck#103335 \$380 of this ck can now be posted to this case
because schedule has been corrected.

98C 001461 A and B cases Tanya L. Pennington/Michael J. Ralph
employer: City of Prairie Village sent ck #51241 for \$129.69 (INCORRECT POSTING)
This check should have been posted to the B case Tanya=payor/
Michael/Payee

93c13741 Terry E. Croskey/Mary Croskey
Please make sure Hold if off of this case.

90C 012165 Major Standley/Christina R. Talley
employer: Lock Warehouse Inc. ck#11471 dated 10-4-00 for total of \$544.35 of which
\$313 belongs to this case.

(1ST INQUIRY 10-19-00)

96c 012438 John C. Menzel Jr./Laura A. Kaehler
Employer: State of Ks. ck #022630 \$369.46 can be posted now. Schedul has been
fixed.

(1st inquiry 10-19-00)

1 *Armando Ratchchil*
sov. new pg 7-60

Galaxy Sales: ** ck #35948 10-10-00 \$349.85 should be posted as follows:

\$206.31 goes to case JO93C 00183 Lorenzo Rothschild/Audrey Harris

\$141.54 goes to WY93D 001799

** ck # 35755 goes to case No. JO93C 00183

TWO CASES

Employer: Tires Plus

Payments were switched between these two cases:

Ck # 125121, 1250894, and 1238899

\$53.30 from each check belongs on 99C 011154 Tommy L. Smith/Brenda k.

Hale

and \$46.15 from each check belongs on 98C 003210 Tommy L. Smith/Melody

C. Smith

(1st inquiry sent 19=0-18-00)

91C 010464 Dennis Whiteside/Kristine M. Iske

employer now gives difference ck #'s

9-22-00 ck # 1000012102 for \$400

10-20-00 ck # 1000010641 for \$150.00

We have fixed this schedule so posting is now possible.

Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT

From: Stambaugh, Virginia, DCT
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 3:54 PM
To: 'kpcresearch@tier.com'
Subject: inquiries

93C 000183 Lorenzo Rothschild/Audrey Harris

On 10-10-00 employer: Galaxy Sales, sent ck #35948 for \$349.85 of which \$206.31 should have been posted to this case.

also sent a ck on 9-22-00 for \$68.77

95C 011292 Sorin I Traistaru/Angela M. Traistaru

on 1-9-00 employer: Inland Paperboard, sent ck #2042472 for \$81.00

Not posted to case.

95C 009951 Randy G. Hawkins/Sheryl A

McDonalds Service Center sent ck #30195416 in the amount of \$721.10

ck has cleared the bank, but is not posted on this case.


94C 001006 B Gerald R. Humbert/Lynn M. Godding

employer: Schmalbach Lubeca sent ck mailed on 9-29-00 for \$69.23 and on 10-13-00 mailed a check for \$86.53. Nothing posted to this case.

96c 00894 B sherrie T. byers/Ronald A. Byers

employer: US courts/Administrative Offices sent on 10-13-00 two checks in the amount of \$138.46 each. Nothing posted to the case.

Inquiry 12-6-00



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a

County Name: JOHNSON

CO #: 93C 000183

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	PYMT	1/16/2001	1383708	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$80.31		CS	
2	ALOC	1/16/2001	1367957	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	37111
3	PYMT	1/11/2001	1341397	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$80.31		CS	
4	ALOC	1/11/2001	1337523	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	37032
5	PYMT	1/8/2001	1279330	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$80.31		CS	
6	ALOC	1/8/2001	1265796	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	37000
7	MSPY	12/27/2000	341399	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO		(\$152.08)	CS	
8	MSPY	12/27/2000	613006	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO		(\$152.08)	CS	
9	MSPY	12/27/2000	657550	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO		(\$349.85)	CS	
10	PYMT	12/26/2000	1089980	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$160.62		CS	
11	ALOC	12/26/2000	1077555	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36896
12	ALOC	12/26/2000	1077556	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36896
13	PYMT	12/11/2000	894362	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$160.62		CS	
14	ALOC	12/11/2000	882106	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36704
15	ALOC	12/11/2000	882107	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36750
16	PYMT	12/4/2000	799827	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$160.62		CS	
17	ALOC	12/4/2000	784255	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36618
18	ALOC	12/4/2000	784256	SRS		\$80.31	SRS	36618
19	PYMT	11/21/2000	657550	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$349.85		CS	
20	ALOC	11/21/2000	188397	SRS		\$349.85	SRS	35948
21	PYMT	11/17/2000	613006	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$152.08		CS	
22	ALOC	11/17/2000	607916	SRS		\$152.08	SRS	36441
23	PYMT	11/15/2000	587271	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$68.77		CS	
24	ALOC	11/15/2000	7084	SRS		\$68.77	SRS	35755
25	PYMT	11/6/2000	470000	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$68.77		CS	
26	ALOC	11/6/2000	457131	SRS		\$68.77	SRS	36303
27	PYMT	10/26/2000	341399	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$152.08		CS	
28	ALOC	10/26/2000	337929	SRS		\$152.08	SRS	36139

Inquiry 12-6-00

Backed out
but not split properly
w/93D 1799



Payment Record Results

You may need to scroll to the right to see all of the results.

How to Interpret Results

Start a

County Name: WYANDOTTE

CO #: 93D 001799

CO Type: IVD

Date Range:

Seq #	Event	Date	Trans#	Payor/Payee	Amt Pd	Amt Alloc	Type	ID#
1	PYMT	1/16/2001	1383707	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
2	ALOC	1/16/2001	1379926	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	37111
3	PYMT	1/11/2001	1341396	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
4	ALOC	1/11/2001	1340413	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	37032
5	PYMT	1/8/2001	1279329	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
6	ALOC	1/8/2001	1275971	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	37000
7	PYMT	12/26/2000	1089981	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$143.54		CS	
8	ALOC	12/26/2000	1086743	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36896
9	ALOC	12/26/2000	1086744	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36896
10	PYMT	12/11/2000	894361	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$143.54		CS	
11	ALOC	12/11/2000	891199	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36750
12	ALOC	12/11/2000	891200	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36704
13	PYMT	12/4/2000	799826	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
14	ALOC	12/4/2000	796144	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36618
15	MSPY	11/21/2000	191916	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO		(\$349.85)	CS	
16	MSPY	11/15/2000	7526	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO		(\$68.77)	CS	
17	PYMT	11/6/2000	470001	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
18	ALOC	11/6/2000	466913	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	36303
19	PYMT	10/15/2000	191916	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$349.85		CS	
20	ALOC	10/15/2000	188397	SRS		\$349.85	SRS	35948
21	PYMT	10/12/2000	146069	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$71.77		CS	
22	ALOC	10/12/2000	144647	SRS		\$71.77	SRS	35912
23	PYMT	9/28/2000	7526	ROTHSCHILD, LORENZO	\$68.77		CS	
24	ALOC	9/28/2000	7084	SRS		\$68.77	SRS	35755

Banked out 349.85 here
 all put on 93C183
 not split properly
 71.77
 71.77
 1425.4

January 4, 2001
Urban Trustee Meeting/Operational Issues
Lawrence, Kansas

Steve Patterson, SRS
Evelyn Parker, SRS
Roy Keeton, KPC
Tedd Sandstrom, DG Programmer
Kathleen Sloan, JO Ct Trustee
Lorrie Bezinque, JO SRS
Joe Flanigan, JO Programmer

Monica Remillard, SRS
Virginia Taylor, OJA
Susan Kang, DG Ct Trustee
Karen Taylor, DG County
Ruth Pfeifer, JO Office Mgr
Edie Zarger, JO County

The following topics were discussed in an effort to clarify procedures and enhance the understanding of operational procedures at the Kansas Payment Center. Currently there is no follow-up meeting scheduled.

PROCEDURES

- ◆ NIVD addresses are to ALWAYS be in writing to the KPC or Court/Court Trustee Office.
- ◆ If debt not on KPC system and discovered through customer service; information is forwarded to Jane Vinette, KPC Court Order Entry Lead Worker, to make contact with court if necessary and obtain needed information to correct database.
- ◆ Training within the KPC. Shadowing w/experienced processors. Once money is identified on the suspense report (Unidentified Report) and is due to a posting error; this is returned to that processor. Same process for misapplied postings.
- ◆ Why is there no postmark on payee's envelope? *BULK RATE/FIRST CLASS does not have a postmark.*
- ◆ Lost Check procedure: 10 days after check is issued an affidavit can be completed. KPC researches to verify if check has cleared. If so an image is provided to client. If this check is forged, UMB bank investigates; new check is cut. If this check is outstanding; stop pay and reissue is completed.
- ◆ ADDRESS & PAYMENT FILES NOT SHOWING ON WEB 1/4/01. *This has been corrected(1/8/01).*

PAY HISTORY'S

- ◆ Check # (of payor) not appearing on pay history PYMT line (if Trustee Fee deducted, check # does appear)
- ◆ EFT # not appearing on pay history *1/9/01 EFT # will begin with "E".*
- ◆ Pay History should reflect when money is released from Hold or when an Emergency Check is written.
- ◆ Pay History should reflect refunds to payor due to overpayment through income withholding.

- ◆ Refunds from SRS will show as MSPY or RFND, depending on the circumstance, on pay history's.

ENHANCEMENTS

- ◆ Trustee Fee Report needs date on each page and page #. Can these be put on FTP and/or e-mailed?
- ◆ Address File: If an address is end dated at the KPC, can this information be input onto the address file? Court Trustee's need information if address is not good; they will seek new address when notified.
- ◆ Web enhancement: UPDATE DATE needs to be reflected on the Web for all changes made to each specific court order.
- ◆ Can a hold be put on an account via the urban interface?

VIRGINIA TO DO'S

- ◆ Jamie Corkhill forwarded completed Problem Reports to Chief SRS Officers; Trustee's would like a copy of this list also.
- ◆ Court Order Status Change Report (daily report) last received was dated 11/17. This is a must to keep urban court order records accurate through the interface.

ROY TO DO'S

- ◆ HOLD's these can be put on an account AFTER the first payment has been processed on each court order #. *Roy will provide procedures to accomplish this task.*
- ◆ REFUNDS After instructions are received from the Court of specific refunds; notification of a hold; KPC will make refund adjustment that must reflect on the pay history. *Roy will provide procedures to accomplish this task.* Does the refund need a debt to perform this task (re: case closed; debts inactive)?
- ◆ Forward addresses: Does the St Louis printing/postal service "kick out" if forwarding address is noted? *Roy to verify*
- ◆ kpcresearch@TIER.com not getting answered. Within these e-mails the exact adjustments are provided stating where the money went and how it should be posted correctly. *Roy is aware of backlog and is in the processing of getting approval to hire additional personnel to deplete this backlog.*

MONICA TO DO'S

- ◆ Who is responsible for over collections/misapplied monies? Is it stated in the contract? *Monica to research.*
- ◆ Requirements of check longevity? What's in the contract? *Monica to research.*

Jo. Co. District Court Trustee concerns/questions for the 12/12/00 payment record meeting and for the Operations meeting when held.

Payment record questions:

Pay records are VERY important to our office. Without accurate payment histories we can not do any enforcement. It is next to impossible in court when obvious posting errors are not corrected and they have been brought to the KPC's attention. Posting errors must be corrected immediately upon detection to maintain the integrity of payment histories.

How DO we read the payment records?

Will there be a simplified form of payment record for the public as discussed in the web meeting held 11/28/00 ?

Why is a disbursement line shown on the pay histories, but the money not sent out?

How are adjustments being shown? MSPY? When are they being applied to the payment records? Is there a way to show when a mis-posted payment has been moved to the correct case? 98C 001210, 11/7/00 payment moved to 11/7/00 payment on 00C 002766.

What is a memo? How do we know what a memo refers to? Does it correct an error? If so, does whatever they fixed get to our records in the data extract? JO76C 128590

What do the ID numbers mean? We have verified check numbers employers and sometimes that is what they are. However, other transactions show a much longer ID number. What is the difference? So the longer transaction numbers show when KPC does something and the check numbers otherwise?

Why are there so many postings for 1 check? Why 3 fees on the 11/28 payment on JO94C 004255? Or JO85C 002012, the 11/29 posting. Why 6 transactions? .

When KPC sends money to SRS incorrectly, then SRS sends it back to KPC, how can we tell that the money being sent back is the same money and not a new payment? JO 97C 006736, 10/9, 16 & 31 payments sent to SRS. SRS sent it back on 11/16/00, but shows as like a new payment. What does the memo mean there?

How can we tell when EFT money has been deposited? There is no ID number on the pay record. JO85C 001133. When a correction is made to an EFT deposit do we get notified so that our payment records are correct? JO85C 001133

We have addressed this question with Roy Keeton already, but would like some further explanation of it. How can money be direct deposited into an account and then withdrawn, and nothing shows on the payment history? How does this error/fix occur? JO97C 012226

Operations questions:

We understand about staff training issues and startup problems, but, why can't we get any consistent help or answers from the KPC office?

How is posting done? What do they see when posting? What training do they get before they begin posting?

If specific instructions are necessary for posting of money, how do we relate that information to the KPC and ensure it will be followed? Example: A final payment on an Income Withholding Order where part of the money goes to the Payee and part should be refunded to the Payor.

If a Payor gets paid ahead, can money be refunded? Or if a case is closed, does KPC refund the money to the Payor? Example 94C 009240

If money is misposted does KPC recover that money from the payee? Or withhold the next payment to make it up? Or is it KPC's loss?

Are payee checks being forwarded?

What do the customer service people tell the public when a case does not have everything needed to get money posted & paid out? (Ex: missing a debt or an address) What steps do they take to ensure the problem is solved?

What happens when money is posted to a case and it is more than what is due? Does KPC go and get the money back from Payee? An example of this type of problem is: JO98C 011607. This is an SRS case and we know the money did not go to the Payee, but if it wasn't IV-D it would have. A non IV-D case that this happened on is: JO89C 009515.

How do addresses become "blank" other than when we ask money be put on hold? Is it when checks are returned? JO97C 014788. Can we be notified when an address is blank/mail is returned to KPC so that we can provide one?

Is there a way for us to know when an address was last changed?

We need to close a case (JO99C 017082) that has a posting error on it. We have e-mailed twice to have it corrected with no response. Why?

Why does it take so long to have posting errors addressed/responded to ---- IF we even get a response?

Why do we not get corrections/adjustments from posting errors being fixed?

How does one check get mailed out, then some checks held and another sent out? And why do the ones being held not get sent out? JO95C 002972. Or are they mailed out and does not show a ID number?

How do we get a payment(s) released? Simply putting in the address is not getting the job done.

If we needed a copy of check that was paid into KPC, how would we get it? How long would it take? Is there way for us to find out who sent the check in? The Payor or POE? This can sometimes tell us if the Payor has quit his job or not.

ekz 12/6/00

Programming & KPC issues

- 1) Tier posts more money to a lump-sum obligation (our 1-time judgement schedules) than the obligation amount. They also post more money to our judgements with a monthly obligation than is left on the non-accruing obligation because they do not keep balances.
- 2) When a case is IV-D, Blended or a Partial Term, the SRS part needs to have **NO** debt ID so that when money goes to SRS it does not apply to our debt. Example JO95C 009339 & JO93C 005149.
- 3) Have to get the debt set off's and unemployment intercept data sent to us to keep our pay records current. Example JO98C 007087
- 4) Money coming for another state all being posted to Allen County. The data not coming to our case. Example JO98C 007087
- 5) Tier expects that the extract file will be sent by 5:00 pm CST. That is too early. We would like 5:30 pm CST at the earliest.
- 6) Future begin dates on schedules should show on the KPC web site.
- 7) Posting issues: A/B cases, multiple cases with one obligor and multiple cases on 1 check. Money returned from SRS shows like a new payment on their payment record. Posting to multiple schedules. (Maintenance & Child Support) How/when are adjustments being applied? (Examples (return) JO97C 006736, (A/B) JO99C 000814 (multiple schedules) JO99C 006148. (adjustment) JO99C 010428.
- 8) We are receiving adjustments for transactions which we did not receive. This only occurs on adjustments for transactions where SRS was the recipient. Example JO94C 006385
- 9) Another Virginia Taylor. She is **GREAT**, but, she can't do it all. We need a contact person that deals with only with the urban counties.
- 10) We have closed cases, that show on the KPC active case listing that have been closed for some reason. KPC can not them open, we know there is money up there to post. 2 examples are JO91C 012913 & JO98C 004433, but I'm sure there are more.
- 11) Why do multiple transactions show when the data information is sent to DCT from KPC, when only 1 check was posted. Example JO99C 010428 11/13/00 payment-we show 2 payments.
- 12) More timely responses from KPC on posting errors and correction of them.

Web related issues:

- 1) More reliable! Less down time and notification sent when it is down and back up.
- 2) Better navigation
- 3) Longer than 20 minutes work time
- 4) More information available to us (eg: Debt ID #)
- 5) Training on web and reading payment histories.
- 6) Web page needs to be updated daily and dated.

Sloan, Kathleen, DCT

From: Virginia Taylor [taylorv@kscourts.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2000 3:53 PM
Subject: Clarification to Procedural Changes

Hello Again,

Several questions have arisen from the "Procedural Changes" e-mail I sent earlier this week. This is an attempt to further clarify my intent.

1) In reference to the IVD cases that have changed status to NIVD, NIVA or Blended. There are only a few of these cases. Currently I am aware of 4 - 5 per week across the entire state. Odds would predict that most of these requests will be to the Urban Courts. The intent was to inform each of you that you may be getting requests from Jane (Court Order Entry @ KPC) for information on a IVD case. I simply wanted you to be aware of this may come to you and to ask you to please cooperate with her.

2) Log Sheets The intent is to determine if each court is still forwarding many, many checks to the KPC and also receipting lots of cash. To do this, I had asked Melissa Wells (OJA Personnel) to assist in the tally. A summary of next week's work will be sufficient.

3) Kpcresearch@TIER.com e-mail address. Several remarks have stated no response is coming from the e-mails. This is the mechanism that KPC has established for communication between the courts and SRS for any misdirected, misapplied, returned checks or missing checks. Please continue using this address.

My voice mail is full most of the time, my e-mails are numerous and my will to funnel money through the KPC to payees is my main goal. To accomplish this goal I have turned my focus to procedural issues and enhancements of communication. The progress is slow and I will try to inform you of changes as they occur. I will continue to work between the courts and KPC along with SRS to get this system stable. Please work with Jane and continue sending problems to the e-mail address of kpcresearch @TIER.com.

A fact of this project is most everyone (Courts, SRS, KPC staff) is frustrated with the progress made. By continuing together this statewide federal mandated system will prevail. Painful as it seems, Kansas' centralized payment center will work efficiently and timely with everyone's cooperation. Thank you for patience and time.

Virginia Taylor
OJA On-Site @ KPC
Court Liason

Joan, Kathleen, DCT

From: Virginia Taylor [taylorv@kscourts.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2000 7:18 PM
To: Schwartzh@kscourts.org; RKeeton@TIER.com
Cc: bertrand@kscourts.org; PorterK@kscourts.org; JXLC@srskansas.org
Subject: Urban Extract Meeting Results



Urban Extract Mtg.doc

Howard and Roy,

Attached is a document that outlines the discussion, attendance and resolution of the meeting held in Johnson County on November 9th. There are a few remaining issues that I'm awaiting an answer from Paul McNally, TIER Technologies. The unanswered issues are most of the items in #6 regarding requested schedules. I have an e-mail to Paul requesting these times and will forward his comments upon receipt.

I also have contacted Douglas County for a follow-up meeting. It is tentatively scheduled for November 28th from 9:30 to 12:30. I will confirm this date and time within the week.

Thank you
Virginia Taylor
OJA On-Site @ KPC

Urban Extract Meeting Results November 9, 2000

A meeting was held at the Johnson County Court Trustee Office, Olathe, Kansas with the purpose of defining the KPC extract process. The following were present:

Steve Patterson, SRS
Monica Remillard, SRS
Virginia Taylor, OJA
Joe Flanigan, JO Co Programmer
Edie Zarger, JO Co
Cheryl Pittman, JO Co
Susan Kang, DG Co Crt Trustee
Tedd Sandstrom, DG Co Programmer
Paul Chapple, TIER Technologies (KPC)

Evelyn Parker, SRS
Frank Golos, SRS
Kathleen Sloan, JO Co Crt Trustee
Ruth Pfeifer, JO Co Office Mgr
Diane Linder, JO Co
Lorrie Bezinque, JO Co SRS
Karen Taylor, DG Co Office Mgr
Sally Henry, SN Co Programmer

The following items were discussed and agreed upon by all persons present.

- Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county Debt IDs:
 1. Johnson is unique.
 2. Shawnee will add SN to the end of their Debt IDs to make them unique.
 3. Douglas will remain as is.

- Items needed from Paul Chapple:
 1. Provide Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county programmers with query of Debts, on KPC Database, without a Debt ID. Look at Court Orders that are in NIVD, NIVA, or Blended status. *Per TIER, this is completed and an e-mail will go to the programmers with the query attached. (11/14)*
 2. Provide Shawnee County with query of Debts where SN is not at the end of Debt ID. *Per TIER, this will be completed and sent to Sally (11/15)*
 3. Provide Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county programmers with a query of End Dated Court Orders. *Per TIER, this is completed and an e-mail will go the programmers with the query attached. (11/13)*
 4. On a daily basis, provide Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county programmers with the control reports from the extract jobs. This should include a total processed, total accepted and total failed. *Per TIER, this will be put in place and an e-mail will be sent to each programmer. (11/14)*
 5. Provide Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county programmers with the error text file (UR1ERR MM-DD-CCYY.TXT) from the daily extract jobs. *Shawnee County currently receives this file, Johnson and Douglas files will be made available (11/14)*

Urban Extract Meeting Results November 9, 2000

6. Provide Shawnee, Johnson, and Douglas county programmers with a schedule of the following:
 - a) Time Tier expects to receive Extract files. 5:00 p.m. CST daily. If the file is not ready at 5:00 p.m. CST there is a possibility it will be overwritten by the following day's file and never processed.
 - b) Time Payment files will be available.
 - c) Time the error file/exception reports will be available.
 - d) Times when the FTP site is unavailable.
 - e) Schedule of when Web is refreshed.
- WEB Issues identified for a future Web Meeting (Virginia will contact Paul McNally about scheduling a meeting):
1. Need to be able to see Debt ID on the Web.
 2. The Web needs to reflect the last refresh date.
 3. Need to be able to stay on longer than 20 minutes.
 4. Need message from the server to notify users when web is scheduled to be down or has gone down, and estimated time to come up.
- Notes to Roy (Virginia will bring these items up to Roy):
1. Still having issues with money not be posted as instructed on the check. For example \$100 Maintenance written on the check. Money applied to Child Support.
 2. Still having issues with money being misposted to the wrong court order.
- Training (Virginia and KPC)
1. Web Training (including ability to read pay histories) to Johnson, Shawnee, and Douglas County on using the Web for enhancements lacking in the extract. (Addition of SSN, End Dates to Debts, Address Changes, etc.)
- When money is transferred to SRS, there should not be a Debt ID in the Payment file. *This currently should not be reflected on the pay history.*

Sloan, Kathleen, DCT

From: Virginia Taylor [taylorv@kscourts.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2000 2:17 PM
Subject: Procedural Details

1) KPC Posting Questions/Errors - In order to improve efficiency in responding to KPC payment inquiries, the KPC has set up one e-mail address for all KPC payment-related inquiries. Please send KPC payment questions to the following e-mail address:

kpcresearch@tier.com

Please provide pertinent details about the problem in a very basic format.

Incorrect Case # Correct Case#

Payor Payor
Payee Payee

Amount of check

Check # (if known)

Employer (if applicable)

Any other information that is necessary to make adjustments.

This e-mail address is NOT to be given to the public. This address is a mechanism to ensure that the time of the research staff is dedicated specifically to researching problem cases.

Thank you all for answering the difficult phone calls we each have received. Please try to obtain the information we need to get the money directed to the correct payees and know this will be a good thing for the courts once the start-up issues have been addressed.

2) Case Numbers on Forwarded Payments - Please verify that case numbers are on all payments that you are forwarding to the KPC, particularly on money orders.

3) State of Kansas Payments - The State of Kansas is not going to redirect state payments until they receive a redirect letter from the KPC. If you have some of the payments that still need to have redirect letters, you will receive a letter from the Dept. of Administration with the next payment which explains the policy. Please continue forwarding the State of Kansas payments to the KPC. The KPC will then generate the required redirect letter to the State of Kansas.

4) Federal Express to Forward Payments to the KPC - If Federal Express pickup is not convenient for your court location, you may continue to forward payments through the U.S. Mail. SRS wanted to provide the option to use Federal Express for those courts that have slow mail delivery or are still receiving a large number of payments.

Virginia Taylor
OJA Court Liaison Kansas Payment Center
785-267-4695

October 9, 2000

Debbie
Director
Kansas Payment Center
P.O. Box 758599
Topeka, KS 66675

RE: KPC#: 00237582
Thurber v. Pressgrove 99C005945
Thurber v. Thurber 94C007763

Dear Ms. Debbie:

This letter to make you aware that I am very upset and disgusted with this new system that has been set up for child support payments. Your web site indicates that this is a very convenient and efficient way to process child support payments. I disagree entirely, when I can't even get someone on the phone to talk with me regarding my accounts with your office. I don't know how other mothers feel about this new system but I really do not like it, and had I been given the opportunity to vote on this, I would have voted against it, that's for certain.

My children are going without any support since this new system started. I have two cases in Johnson County and I am not comfortable with having another City (Topeka) handle my children's child support accounts.

Since this system has started, I am not able to get anyone on the phone to speak with me and get any of my questions answered regarding my cases. This was not the case in Johnson County. I always was able to get someone to talk to me or my called was returned by someone at the Trustee's office. I expect that kind of treatment in your office. If your office cannot handle the volume of calls, then your office should not have embarked on such an adventure.

I went to your website and noted that a payment was received on October 2, 2000. I did not receive this payment until Saturday, October 7, 2000. It took 6 days for this support money to arrive in my mail box. This will simply not do for my children. When I finally got through to someone there, the person was very nasty and not very helpful on the phone. She acted as if it was my problem that I had even called to inquire about my children's money. I was not able to get her name but if this is the way your office handles their business, then I would like to take my business somewhere else.

I also applied for the direct deposit. I still have not heard from anyone in your office regarding this matter as to either if you have received the application or simply a courtesy mailing or phone call to let me know that it has been received, and that my request is being processed. Johnson County Trustee's office always took that extra step to make us feel assured that we mattered and most importantly that our children mattered to them. It seems clear to me that all that matters to your office is to get the money and get paid of f of my children's support. May be hold on to the money for a little while and live of the interest. Your office gives the impression that you do not want to talk to us or simply answer our questions, that we should just go to the web site. Your web site **is not that** informational. If we were getting our questions answered by the web site, do you think we would be wasting our valuable time in writing to you or calling your office?

I hate to think that my tax money or my children's money is going to such an unorganized entity. My children deserve better than that.

If you would please take the time to answer my questions, my children, as well as myself would really appreciate it.

1. I have one kpc # for both of my cases. Why is this? It is confusing to me to see where the money came from. Your hotline does not even give a detailed summary of the money received and what has not been paid. For example, if \$129.56 was received on 10/2 then how much is still owed for the month of October? How much is left for previous month that he did not pay? I need that information so that if I want to call the Trustee's office and commence some type of enforcement then I would have the numbers correctly.
2. Direct Deposit. How does it work. Have you guys received my application? When will it start? Your office simply needs to work and improve the turnaround time in your office when the money is received.
3. I want names and numbers of managers, in your office, that I can call and talk to and not be put on hold for 20 minutes or longer. I don't even know your last name. Surely this is not a way to run any kind of business when there is no communication or no open lines for communication. I want the names and numbers of people and departments. If I have a question about my direct deposit I want to have a name and a number of someone in that department that I can talk to. Your so called informational web site does not disclose this information.

You may think that I am being a little difficult or demanding. But what your office has failed to notice or realize is that this is my children's support. This money goes to feed them, clothe them, pay for the lunch tickets at school. This money goes to pay for their expenses like day care and after school activities, as well as recreational activities and I am sure that if you

Letter to Kansas Payment Center

October 9, 2000

Page 3

were sitting in my shoes you would be feeling just as frustrated and angry as I am right now. If you have children of your own and you depend on this support to make their lives complete and make a difference in their lives then you know what I am talking about. My children need this money and having it all go to one place especially out of town when it takes three times the turn around time for us to receive the funds, what good is that? Is that really good for the children?

I am curious to know who in your office was thinking of the kid's well being when you decided to make these changes in their lives?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gladymar Thurber". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Gladymar Thurber

cc: File
Kathleen Sloan, District Court Trustee

FILED
00 DEC 15 AM 9:59

December 14, 2000

10th Judicial District
District Court Trustee
P.O. Box 760
Olathe, KS 66051-0760

RE: Recipient – Denise Behrman
Payor: Craig Fee
Court Order #: JO96C-008530
IVR Case #: 199608530
KPC Pin #: 00239875

To whom it may concern:

This letter is in regards to child support payments for the above named individual. We have been having trouble with receiving payments in a timely manner. To date, we have only received roughly \$6,400 of support for this year. But the court agreement is for \$600 a month or \$7,200 a year. That still leaves \$800 of payments to be made in only 2 weeks of time. You should have our correct address, but I will provide it in case of any confusion there.

14726 Hardy Street
Overland Park, KS 66223

Ever since the payment process was changed to this "Kansas Payment Center" we have experienced problems with receiving checks timely and have literally waited on the line 30 minutes to try to talk to someone regarding our case. Please check on our case and request payment from the employer, if necessary, to clean up our account and submit us a check as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at (816) 968-1918. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Very truly yours,



Scott Behrman

District Court Trustee
P.O. Box 760
Olathe, Ks 66051-760

Child Support. Case No. 199914937A
Maint. Case No. 199914937B


Dear District Court Trustee,

This is to inform you that since the Kansas Payment Center can't seem to get my and my ex-wife(Larisa G. Wiley) accounts in order, resulting in payments being credited to the wrong account and the fact that your office has sent KPC three e-mails regarding this "mess up" in our accounts, I will not be sending in my maint. payment for my ex-wife. This mess up in accounts has caused us considerable financial hardships. I have also been informed by your office that this is a common occurrence and that several other peoples accounts are "messed up".

Larisa G. Wiley(my ex-wife) has informed me that she has sent you a letter stating the same about her child support payments to me.

Until this is fixed my ex-wife and I will be making payments , by check, to each other. Please fix this "mess up" so we may begin using this service the way it was intended to be used.

Sincerely,




Laurence H. Wiley

Cc James Lusk(Attorney)
Cc Larisa G. Wiley(ex-wife)

FILED
DISTRICT COURT TRUSTEE
00 NOV 22 AM 8:19

Kids In the County Count (KICC)



- Problems with the Kansas Payment Center?
- **YOU ARE NOT ALONE!!**
- I want to coordinate issues for Johnson County and the surrounding area.
- I intend to share this information with those who can help us: State Representatives, Congressmen, the Governor, SRS employees, Director of Child Support Enforcement employees .

Please write to: KICC

P.O. Box 356

Olathe KS 66051-0356

Sponsored by: Bert Nash
SUMMIT ATTEND. MAKE A DIFFERENCE.
 Building A Better Community. [CLICK HERE](#) for details.



LAWRENCE
JOURNAL-WORLD
 Lawrence, Kansas

front page • city/local • state/regional • entertainment
 sports • opinion • advertising • business/tech • classifieds

Friday, Jan 12, 2001 10:36 am
 28° Today: High Clouds Moving
 In Late. Winds S, Bec. SE 5-15.

site index • search:

Kansas Legislature

Child-support system comes under legislative scrutiny

The Associated Press
 FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 2001

TOPEKA — Legislators will investigate the processing of child support checks, even as the state's top social services official insisted the system is working.

The House and Senate
 Judiciary committees
 scheduled a joint hearing for
 Jan. 22 to question Janet
 Schalansky, secretary of social and rehabilitation services.

- **MORE**
- www.ink.org/public/legislative.com
- www.srskansas.org

Senate Chairman John Vratil announced the meeting to colleagues just hours after Schalansky told reporters only a small percentage of child-support payments aren't being processed correctly.

Tier Technologies Inc., a private contractor, has processed child-support payments for SRS at the Kansas Payment Center in Topeka since Sept. 29. SRS acknowledged a processing backlog in October.

Legislators say they continue to get calls from constituents whose checks arrive late or not at all.

"There's still problems," said Rep. Ruby Gilbert, D-Wichita.

Before Sept. 29, district courts and SRS handled the payments, but the state changed its system to comply with a federal law requiring states to centralize processing of child-support payments.

Schalansky said that during the past 60 days, only 2 percent to 3 percent of payments have been handled in other than a routine manner. She said that percentage has been dropping since the center opened.

The center processes about 300,000 payments each month, meaning between 6,000 and 9,000 aren't being handled in a routine manner.


"We think the Payment Center is working correctly," she said. "We still have a few problems, but that's the nature of the program."

Schalansky said she remains concerned about the small percentage not routinely processed.

"If you're waiting for a check, 30 days seems like a long time," she told reporters.


Vratil, R-Leawood, offered a different assessment: "We had a good system of child support until this year," he said. "Now we've got a botched-up system."

House Minority Leader Jim Garner, D-Coffeyville, said SRS officials didn't do enough preparation.



Features

- [Eagles on the Kaw](#)
 - [College Bowls](#)
 - [The Magonline](#)
 - [In the Phog: Tulsa](#)
 - [Gift Guide](#)
 - [Obituaries](#)
 - [Society news](#)
 - [Weather](#)
 - [Columnists](#)
 - [Flashback](#)
-
- [Reader reaction forum](#)
 - [Photo viewer](#)
 - [Police scanner](#)
 - [Mass. Street web cam](#)
-
- [Contact us](#)
 - [Corrections](#)
 - [Subscribe](#)
 - [Archives/back issues](#)
 - [Video help](#)




- **Lawrence Journal-World**
- **Sunflower Cablevision**
- **KUSports.com**
- **The Marketplace**
- **The Mag Online**

"This thing was just kind of slapped together," Garner said.

More in [State/Regional](#)
More in [Kansas Legislature](#)

[E-mail this story](#)
[Printer-friendly version](#)
[Reader forum](#)
[Front page](#)




- [Front page](#) • [City/Local](#) • [State/Regional](#) • [World/Nation](#)
- [Sports](#) • [Opinion](#) • [Arts & Living](#) • [Business/Tech](#) • [Classifieds](#)
- [Contact us](#) • [Archives/back issues](#)

Copyright © 2001, the Lawrence Journal-World. All rights reserved. Please see our full [copyright notice](#) and [privacy policy](#).

We welcome your [suggestions and comments](#). Check here for [updates and announcements](#). Remember, there's much more in print. Take the Journal-World with you by [subscribing](#) today!

KANSAS LEGISLATURE



this site sponsored
KOC
INDUSTRIE

Navigation

[News](#) | [Columns](#) | [Bill Tracking Tools](#) | [Archives](#) | [Calendar](#) | [Multi](#)

Last modified at 12:55 a.m. on Friday, January 12, 2001



The Basics

- ▶ [Homepage](#)
- ▶ [Recent Archive](#)
- ▶ [Daily Order of Business](#)
- ▶ [Calendar](#)
- ▶ [Q&A With 5 Key Players](#)
- ▶ [How to Lobby a Legislator](#)
- ▶ [Basic Budget Info & Overview](#)
- ▶ [9 Most Powerful People in the Dome](#)

- ▶ [State of the State](#)
- ▶ [Find Your Legislator](#)

Multimedia

- ▶ [The Latest](#)
- ▶ [Cedar Crest](#)
- ▶ [Virtual Statehouse](#)
- ▶ [Capitol Video Tour](#)
- ▶ [Capitol Restoration](#)
- ▶ [State of the State](#)
- ▶ [Look at the Leadership](#)
- ▶ [Message Boards](#)

Legislative Tools

- ▶ [Full Text of Bills](#)
- ▶ [Single Bill Track](#)
- ▶ [Journal Search](#)
- ▶ [Committee Minutes](#)
- ▶ [Basic Budget Info & Overview](#)

House

- ▶ [House Roster](#)
- ▶ [Committees/Schedules](#)
- ▶ [Committee Members](#)
- ▶ [Status/Agenda](#)
- ▶ [Bios](#)
- ▶ [Current Happenings](#)
- ▶ [Live RealAudio](#)

Senate

- ▶ [Senate Roster](#)
- ▶ [Committees/Schedules](#)
- ▶ [Committee Members](#)
- ▶ [Agenda](#)
- ▶ [Status](#)
- ▶ [Bios](#)
- ▶ [Current Happenings](#)
- ▶ [Live RealAudio](#)

Campaign Finance

- ▶ [Search Campaign Data](#)
- ▶ [Statutes](#)
- ▶ [Kansas Statutes](#)

Center won't be sanctioned

By **CHRIS GRENZ**
The Capital-Journal

Following a report that said problems at the state's child support payment center have been mostly fixed, no action will be taken against the private firm that operates the center.

The federal Welfare Reform Act of 1996 mandated that all states set up centralized child support centers by October 2000. The Kansas Payment Center began accepting support payments Sept. 29, taking over from the district court clerks in all 105 Kansas counties.


The Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, the state agency that oversees the payment center, contracted with California-based Tier Technologies Inc. to run the center. At the end of October, it was evident that serious problems existed, when 2,400 parents didn't receive their child support checks.

In a report to the Legislative Post Audit Committee late last month, SRS Secretary Janet Schalansky said the systematic problems had been corrected. Even though the center receives about 6,200 calls each day, the average time callers remain on hold was reduced from 40 minutes to two minutes, Schalansky wrote. And the number of families not receiving payments fell from 10 to 12 percent to about 2 to 3 percent.

Audio interview

Janet Schalansky, secretary of Social Resource Services
• Won't be satisfied until the system runs more effectively

To listen to the RealAudio content, you need the RealPlayer.



The child support payment system has improved, says SRS Secretary Janet Schalansky.

Chris Ochsner/The Capital-Journal

"We're not going to be satisfied in our work with Tier Technologies until we can reduce that as much as possible," she said. "I think it's unrealistic to think we'll be at zero, but we want to work with those individual families to resolve whatever is the reason for their delays as quickly as possible."

Useful Info

Here's where you the really practical how to request a document, where how to take a tou [Click Here](#)

Quick Hits

Get a quick overv what happened at Statehouse. [Yesterday](#)

Virtual Statehouse

Experience the his Kansas Statehouse just a click of you [Click here](#)

Restoratio Archives

Get all of our vide story archives of t ongoing restoratio Kansas capitol bu [Click Here](#)

Legislator Biographi

Get biographies o the elected legisla officials in Kansas detailed info and p [Click Here for th](#) [Click Here for th](#) [Senate](#)

Capitol Video Tour

Get an up-close a personal tour of th Statehouse in our video tour section



Jim Robertson, chief of child support enforcement for SRS, said the contract between the state and Tier

Technology requires a certain level of performance. But because the problems have been taken care of, the company won't be subject to penalties.

"Generally speaking, the vast majority of the checks coming in are going out without problems," Robertson said. "We still are having complaints from that 2 to 3 percent, but things have definitely improved. The vast, vast majority are going through."

Mary Sheldon, an associate professor of English at Washburn University, was frustrated when her child support checks didn't arrive on time. She had to dip into her savings to cover for the missing money.

"After the initial problems were dealt with, things have been very efficient," she said. "I received all payments in a timely manner."

Rep. John Ballou, R-Gardner, a member of the post audit committee who asked for the report from SRS, said SRS will continue to update the committee monthly.

"I'm satisfied they're working to correct the problems. I'm not going to say they've got everything corrected," he said. "This is luckily not one of those cases of a problem where nobody is doing anything about it. SRS is actually addressing the problem. It's a nice change to have problems and get them taken care of."

(Capital-Journal staff reporter Roger Myers contributed to this report.)

[e-mail this story to a friend](#)

[Discuss this article](#)


All contents © Copyright 2001 Morris Digital Works and The Topeka Capital-Journal. Please read our [Privacy Policy](#). | To learn more us, [go here](#). | [Contact us](#). [Advertise](#) with us in print or online.

here



Get active in local and federal gover Sign a petition, w letter, make a diff [Click here](#)

KANSAS LEGISLATURE



this site sponsored
KOC
INDUSTRIES

Navigation

[News](#) | [Columns](#) | [Bill Tracking Tools](#) | [Archives](#) | [Calendar](#) | [Multi](#)

Last modified at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, January 12, 2001



The Basics

- † [Homepage](#)
- † [Recent Archive](#)
- † [Daily Order of Business](#)
- † [Calendar](#)
- † [Q&A With 5 Key Players](#)
- † [How to Lobby a Legislator](#)
- † [Basic Budget Info & Overview](#)
- † [9 Most Powerful People in the Dome](#)
- † [State of the State](#)
- † [Find Your Legislator](#)

Multimedia

- † [The Latest](#)
- † [Cedar Crest](#)
- † [Virtual Statehouse](#)
- † [Capitol Video Tour](#)
- † [Capitol Restoration](#)
- † [State of the State](#)
- † [Look at the Leadership](#)
- † [Message Boards](#)

Legislative Tools

- † [Full Text of Bills](#)
- † [Single Bill Track](#)
- † [Journal Search](#)
- † [Committee Minutes](#)
- † [Basic Budget Info & Overview](#)

House

- † [House Roster](#)
- † [Committees/Schedules](#)
- † [Committee Members](#)
- † [Status/Agenda](#)
- † [Bios](#)
- † [Current Happenings](#)
- † [Live RealAudio](#)

Senate

- † [Senate Roster](#)
- † [Committees/Schedules](#)
- † [Committee Members](#)
- † [Agenda](#)
- † [Status](#)
- † [Bios](#)
- † [Current Happenings](#)
- † [Live RealAudio](#)

Campaign Finance

- † [Search Campaign Data](#)
- † [Statutes](#)
- † [Kansas Statutes](#)

Check wasn't in the mail

By **CHRIS GRENZ**
The Capital-Journal

It took the better part of three months to straighten everything out, but Cynthia Montgomery has finally received her checks from the state's centralized child support payment office.

But it is the Olathe woman's 18-year-old daughter and 1-year-old granddaughter whom Montgomery is worried about.

"She had to give up her health insurance at work. She couldn't afford it because she didn't receive her child support checks," Montgomery said. "This is a system that does the opposite of what they say it should do. This 'supporting kids' is a joke. The folks who are without this money for months on end have no way to make up for that money."

A crisis erupted in October when 2,400 families who depend on child support checks didn't receive their payments from the Kansas Payment Center, the state's new centralized processing center that opened in September. Blaming the backlog on startup problems, officials scrambled to address the concerns.

Within days, officials at the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, the state agency that oversees the payment center, announced they had eliminated the backlog and were processing new checks on the day they arrived. A recent report to a legislative committee gave the center a passing grade. But parents across the region have given the center mixed reviews.



Marie Mack is a single mother who was so frustrated with the inability of the Kansas Payment Center to route child support checks to her that she quit using it. Officials and many parents, however, agree that the problems have gotten better.

Jenny Sparks/The Capital-Journal

Quick Hits

Get a quick overview what happened at Statehouse. [Yesterday](#)

Virtual Statehouse

Experience the history of the Kansas Statehouse just a click of your mouse. [Click here](#)

Restoration Archives

Get all of our video story archives of the ongoing restoration of the Kansas capitol building. [Click Here](#)

Legislature Biographies

Get biographies of the elected legislators in Kansas. Detailed info and photos. [Click Here for the Senate](#)

Capitol Video Tour

Get an up-close, personal tour of the Statehouse in our video tour section. [Click here](#)



Get active in local and federal government. Sign a petition, write a letter.

Working out the kinks

The processing center is a clearing house for child support payments, processing about 300,000 transactions monthly. Its creation was a key component of the federal 1996 Welfare Reform Act. The idea was to streamline the process of sending and receiving child support.

Real Audio

letter, make a diff
Click here

Janet Schalansky,
secretary of Social
Resource Services

- Won't be satisfied until the system runs more effectively

But when parents angrily said it wasn't working, the chairwoman of the Legislative Post Audit Committee, Sen. Lana Oleen, R-Manhattan, sent a letter to SRS Secretary Janet Schalansky demanding answers. Late last month, Schalansky replied that the issues raised had been resolved.

Most notably, the number of "unidentified" checks that are delayed because of a lack of information -- keeping parents from receiving a child support check -- has decreased from 10 to 12 percent to about 2 to 3 percent. The national average is about 6 percent.

"We think the payment center is working correctly," Schalansky said in a meeting with reporters Thursday. "The system folks will tell you 2 is OK. But if you're one of that 2 percent, you're experiencing difficulty and we want to help with that as much as possible. We'll never be satisfied as long as someone's in that unidentified pile."

After reading the report, Oleen said she was pleased with the low number of unidentified checks. The post audit committee won't take action against the payment center, she said.

For information

A toll-free hot line remains active for parents who haven't received checks -- (877) 572-5722.

The Kansas Pay Center's Web address is www.kspaycenter.com.

"Now, we understand 3 percent is still a problem, but overall, as compared to the rest of the country, we're doing pretty darn good," Oleen said. "But we can do better. We've still got some kinks to work out."

Frustrations in checkin Montgomery's situation, she spent hours on the phone trying to straighten out where her checks were. The center's Web site said the check was in the mail, but none showed up.

"It's a devastating effect," she said. "At any one time, they were holding over \$1,000 of mine. And you can't get anybody's attention until it's 15 to 30 days late."

Montgomery, 41, receives child support for her 10-year-old son. She finally received the October check at the end of December. But her older daughter and her granddaughter no longer have health insurance because they didn't receive the payments the baby's father made. That makes Montgomery furious.

"It's a horrible system," Montgomery said. "If it was happening to you, you would think this is criminal. We want this system gone. It's not a system that is reliable or trustworthy."

Marie Mack, a law librarian at Washburn University, became so frustrated with the system that she gave up on it.

"We've just refused to use it," said Mack, who now receives a check directly from her ex-husband. "They made me angry. When it didn't work, he just gave me a check."

In Sabetha, Frances McGraw, 68, is raising her 15-year-old granddaughter. She is supposed to receive checks from the girl's mother and father, but McGraw ran into problems as recently as last month when one check never arrived.

"In my mind, for now, I've had to write it off because I couldn't take the stress anymore. You can only battle so long," McGraw said of the missing check. "But it was money that was needed — especially at the holidays."

Still, McGraw said with the exception of the missing check, the system has gotten smoother.

"On a scale of one to five, they're about a 3 1/2," she said. "Finally the checks did start coming. They're coming in a timely manner, but it's sporadic. You can't depend on a specific date."

Robert Peterson, who owns a welding business in Fairview, was angry when his three children received only about half the payments he mailed them a couple months ago.

"It was frustrating because I made the payments and they weren't getting them," he said. "Basically, it makes me look like a dead-beat dad, and I'm not."

But now the situation is better, he said.

"I believe we've gotten everything taken care of," he said. "Until something else comes up, I'm satisfied."

Chris Grenz can be reached at

(785) 295-1190 or cgrenz@cjonline.com.

e-mail this story to a friend

Discuss this article

All contents © Copyright 2001 Morris Digital Works and The Topeka Capital-Journal.
Please read our **Privacy Policy**. | To learn more us, **go here**. | **Contact us**.
Advertise with us in print or online.

CLICK HERE TO MEET SOMEONE SPECIAL!

Topeka News

The Topeka Capital-Journal

Getting Around

Last modified at 2:03 a.m. on Tuesday, October 17, 2000

News

Sports

Features

Marketplace

CJ Info & Help

SRS official says backlog of checks eliminated

Some clients say they haven't received child support checks despite assurances.

By **ROGER MYERS**
The Capital-Journal

Saying the crisis has passed, officials of the state's social welfare agency reported Monday that they have eliminated a large backlog of unmailed child support checks and are now processing checks as they arrive at the new Kansas Payment Center.

But they acknowledged that as many as 1,800 parents who depend on child support still may not have received their checks at the expected time, primarily because not all the information needed to identify the sender and recipient accompanied the support check.

Janet Schalansky, secretary of the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, acknowledged during a news conference Monday afternoon in her office that three emergency payment vouchers had to be made to parents over the weekend because their child support checks hadn't arrived at the expected time.

Jim Robertson, chief of child support enforcement for SRS, said he thought all three of the individual payments were for medical reasons.

The federal Welfare Reform Act, passed in 1996, mandated that all the states set up centralized child support centers by October 2000. The Kansas Payment Center began accepting support payments Sept. 29, taking over that duty from the district court clerk offices in all of Kansas' 105 counties. The KPC is expected to process 1.9 million transactions a year, totaling \$350 million, or about 158,000 transactions a month, totaling about \$30 million.

Schalansky said a massive effort by SRS, the Office of Judicial Administration and Tier Technologies Inc., Walnut Creek, Calif., the private contractor that runs the Kansas Payment Center, sent out payments totaling \$2.8 million to about 16,000 child support recipients during the weekend.



Janet Schalansky, secretary of the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, spoke during a news conference Monday afternoon at the Docking State Office building about problems faced by the Kansas Payment Center that resulted in the delayed mailing of child support payments to families.

David Eulitt/The Capital-Journal

Breaking News

Updated @ 08:07 a.m.
Bush, Gore Face Off In Debate

[Social Security Benefits Face Growth](#)

[Albright Meets With Syria President](#)

[Kostunica Wins Montenegro Promise](#)

[Mo. Swears In New Governor](#)

Community Ntl Bank

For a relationship you can bank on.

- [Home](#)
- [Credit Application](#)
- [Mortgage Calculator](#)
- [Commercial Accounts](#)
- [Savings Accounts](#)
- [Checking Accounts](#)



Sheriff's Dept.

Archive of the investigation

Personally Speaking

- [Login](#)
- [Join](#)
- [Browse](#)
- [AutoMatch](#)
- [Articles](#)
- [Photos](#)

"By the close of business Saturday, we were processing support checks that arrived Saturday," Schalansky said. "And we're handling Monday's checks as they arrive. And that's where you want to be on any given day."

On Friday, Candy Shively, SRS deputy secretary, estimated that about 2,400 parents hadn't received their support checks on time because the checks didn't have enough identifying information. She said Monday that the number had been reduced by about 25 percent, leaving about 1,800 people who still haven't received their checks.

Adding to the difficulties, Schalansky said, technical problems befell the Kansas Payment Center telephone system about mid-morning Monday and lasted through about mid-afternoon, preventing callers to the KPC from talking to a real person.

"It's not affecting the processing of support checks," Schalansky said of the technical problems. "But it's very unfortunate for the folks who were expecting to get a call answered immediately, and by a person."

Schalansky said that during the weekend about 30 extra people from SRS, 30 from the Office of Judicial Administration and 20 from the contractor answered about 5,000 calls about delayed support checks.

Even though the contractor was processing support checks as they arrived and had reduced the backlog of unidentified checks, problems with delayed child support payments continued.

Mary Sheldon, an associate professor of English at Washburn University, called The Topeka Capital-Journal and reported that SRS owed her not just her October child support payment, but her September payment as well.

Sheldon said she called the toll-free telephone number SRS had publicized during a news conference Friday and was disconnected twice. She said she also logged onto the Kansas Payment Center's Web site and was informed the KPC didn't have any information about her or the payments she was owed.

"I had to take money out of my savings in order to pay my bills," Sheldon said. "But I'm thinking about all the women who are not in my situation, who are not university professors, and don't have any savings to dip into."

Sheldon said she has been divorced 10 years, and her ex-husband has never missed a support payment for her daughter, who is 12.

Frances McGraw, of Sabetha, also called The Capital-Journal and said she hadn't received the child support she receives as the guardian for her granddaughter.

McGraw said she talked to an SRS supervisor in Manhattan, who advised her that the employer sending in the support checks probably didn't include sufficient information to identify where the check should be sent.

"That's a bunch of baloney," McGraw said.

She said she had talked to the payroll person at the company where the father of her grandchild works, and he said he had faithfully sent child support payments to the Kansas Payment Center weekly because the father gets paid every week.

"The employer provided all the information," McGraw said. "The payment center is illegally withholding my child support check. I think that's criminal."

"The state owes me \$298, and Bill Graves owes me a check right now," she said.

Yellow Pages

New Search

Go!

Search Washburn University

- Archive
- Classifieds
- Stocks
- Yellow Pages
- Web
- TV Programs

GO

FreeMail @Topeka.net

Sign up now for your FREE web-based e-mail account.

Username

Password

LOGIN

CREATE ACCOUNT

Schalansky urged those who still have questions about their support payments, or who couldn't get through to the payment center Monday, to call the KPC toll-free number at (877) 572-5722 or consult the KPC Web site at www.kspaycenter.com. She said the center is observing extended hours through the remainder of this week, and people can call the toll-free number from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Roger Myers can be reached at

(785) 296-3005 or rmyers@cjonline.com.



Copyright © 2000 The Topeka Capital-Journal/CJ Online. All rights reserved.

GO DEEP.	
-----------------	--

[Topeka News](#) • [Weather](#) • [Sports](#) • [Classifieds](#) • [iShopTopeka](#) • [TV Listings](#) • [AP Wire News](#)

Change delays turnaround in child support

● CHANGE/ from Page A1

(that) every state have a central agency for child support," said Kathleen Sloan, Johnson County District Court trustee.

The KPC, based in Topeka, now handles all child-support payments across the state.

The KPC, owned by Tier Technologies of California, entered a bid and received the state contract more than a year ago. Its responsibility is to distribute the checks to the appropriate people.

However, enforcement of child-support payments remains in the county's control.

"It's strictly money in, money out," Sloan said. "(KPC doesn't) do any enforcement."

According to the KPC Web site, "The State of Kansas has implemented a new payment-processing system in response to both federal law changes and a desire to enhance efficiency."

Until this month, the county's trustee office controlled receiving and issuing child-support payments. Parents who paid child support would send a check to the trustee's office, and the check would be processed and sent out to the appropriate recipient within 24 hours.

"This office has always gotten checks out within 24 hours," Sloan said.

The problem that Edwards and many others face is the KPC's inefficiency, she said.

As of Thursday, she still hadn't received her child-support payment, which had been expected Oct. 3.

The *Daily News* made numerous attempts to contact a KPC representative Thursday.

However, after receiving several busy signals and waiting 13 minutes on hold, the customer-service representative provided a phone

number of an official who could speak on the agency's behalf — but the number was incorrect.

Subsequent phone calls were met only by busy signals.

"There's got to be tons of people like this," Edwards said.

Meanwhile, federal law dictates a quicker turnaround.

"The federal law says they have to have those payments out within 48 hours," Sloan said.

Edwards said she has called the KPC on several occasions; however, she has received little information regarding when the check will arrive.

"They claim that they're up to date, but they can't possibly be," Sloan said.

The Johnson County District Court trustee's office has been inundated with phone calls, inquiring about the status of child-support payments.

"We're getting hundreds of

phone calls right now and so is the KPC, but good luck trying to get through to them," Sloan said.

Edwards waited more than 30 minutes on hold before she spoke with a KPC representative, she said.

"Basically, they'll say anything to get you off the phone," she added. "When so many of these people depend on this money to live, it's not fair."

According to Sloan, the county's trustee office processed \$68 million in child support and maintenance in 1999.

Handing over control to the KPC and handling all the current phone calls on the KPC's inefficiency is difficult, according to Sloan.

"It's like watching someone drown, with your hands tied behind your back," she said.

Change delays turnaround in child support

PATRICK J. POWERS
Daily News Reporter

Sherry Edwards is used to receiving her child-support payment the third day of every month.

But this month, she's still waiting — and it's not because the child's father hasn't sent the check.

Sept. 29, the Johnson County District Court trustee's office relinquished its control of processing the 16,000 active child-support cases in Johnson County to the Kansas Payment Center.

"The payment center is a result of a 1996 federal law that mandates

See CHANGE, Page A4

7-93

is flags
sh ad-
Kline
struct-
ried to
order
a mis-
or his
a fail-
aring
isde-
end-
that
ainst
oper
per-
with
eing
ang
er-
lice

and residents say.

Five street-gang shootings were reported between Oct. 31 and Nov. 24 in the city's northeast neighborhoods. Arrests have been made in one incident, the Nov. 5 killing of Taurus Hampton, 17. Charges have been filed in the Nov. 23 shooting of Lucas D. Wade.

Police Sgt. John Speer said officers were investigating the three other shootings involving suspected gang activity, including the Nov. 1 death of Johnnie Baker, 35.

Despite the recent surge, police say, the shootings are nowhere near the gang activity the city saw in the 1990s.

Capt. Robert Lee said only four of Wichita's 23 homicides were thought to be linked to gangs. In 1993, 23 of 57 homicides were gang-related. Drive-by activity is down as well, with 36 shootings this year, compared with a high of 130 in 1996.

Child-support pay reviewed by Kansas

By JOHN L. PETERSON
The Kansas City Star

TOPEKA — The Legislative Post Audit Committee on Friday asked for detailed information about the operation of the Kansas Payment Center, the central clearinghouse for child-support payments.

Rep. John Ballou, a Gardner Republican, asked the committee to request the information from the state Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, which contracts for the operation of the center.

Since it began operations late in September, the center has had difficulties distributing some support payments. Officials said lack of adequate infor-

mation prevented them from directing the checks to the proper person.

Ballou said he was not interested in placing blame for the delays but rather wanted to find out what problems the center currently was facing "so people can get money due them."

The committee approved a letter that will be sent to Janet Schallansky. A response is to be ready for the committee at its Jan. 3 meeting.

At last report, payments still were pending in about 1,400 cases.

To reach John L. Peterson, Kansas government and politics reporter, call (785) 354-1388 or send e-mail to jppeterson@kcstar.com



VALERIE BONTRAGER/The Daily News

s a powerball ticket from the computer Wednesday. RIGHT: Mike Kalb, a house painter, chooses his own num-
short Stop on Santa Fe. Odds of winning Wednesday's \$130 million jackpot were 1 in 80 million.

gn seeks n homes

tion program, Sarasio said.

The children are older because of the lengthy legal process to sever a parent's legal rights, Sarasio said.

If a child is taken away from a parent at birth, the parent has one year to reunify with the child, Sarasio said. The process goes through the courts to sever the parent's rights and the decision may then be appealed.

"By the time the child's ready to be adopted, they're not infants," she said.

However, most cases of abuse or neglect aren't discovered until the child is old enough to enter school or day-care, Sarasio said.

People wishing to adopt a child may be married, single

See ADOPTION, Page A6

Organization demands answers about late child-support payments

PATRICK J. POWERS

Daily News Reporter

When Robyn Sidwell failed to receive her child-support payments from the Kansas Payment Center she went to the media, her state representative, U.S. representative, U.S. Senators and Gov. Bill Graves.

She wanted answers. What she got was the two late payments she was expecting.

"I don't think it went through the normal channels," Sidwell said. "I think they cut the check in Topeka and sent the check from Topeka just to shut me up."

Most checks from the KPC are processed and sent from St. Louis, Sidwell said.

Until Sept. 29, the 16,000 active child-support cases in Johnson

County were handled by the Johnson County District Court trustee's office.

However, a 1996 federal mandate said all child-support payments should be collected and distributed on a statewide basis, creating the KPC.

The KPC, based in Topeka, now handles 158,000 active child-support cases from across the state.

"This is just a big system," said Stacey Herman, public information officer for the Kansas Social and Rehabilitation Services Department in Topeka. "There's never going to be a month where everybody's happy."

Though Sidwell has received her check, she said she will con-

See ORGANIZATION, Page A6

Adoption campaign seeks

● ADOPTION/ from Page A1

or in a same-sex relationship, she said.

"A loving family is still a family, regardless," Sarasio said. "People don't have to own their own home, or have a lot of money. There's all different kinds of people for all different kinds of kids."

The only fees a person wishing to adopt a child from the program must provide are the legal fees of finalizing the adoption.

A person wishing to adopt a child from the program will meet with a representative and then be referred to a social worker. The social worker will help the prospective parent through the adoption process, Sarasio said.

Background checks are conducted on prospective parents and a Model Approach to Partnerships in Parenting (MAPP) class must be taken.

The MAPP class meets for three hours each week for 10 weeks. The class is provided by KCSL and class times are worked around

schedules for convenience, Sarasio said.

Social workers will conduct a home study to evaluate the prospective parent, and an application for adoption also must be filled out.

A child is placed in a home with a prospective family for six months before the adoption process is begun, Sarasio said.

"We want to make sure the match is good for the parent and the child," she said.

The legal process of finalizing the adoption may take up to one year, Sarasio said.

"The longest process is through the courts," she said.

After the finalization of the adoption, support from KCSL is provided to the new family for 18 months, Sarasio said.

The families social worker will continue to help the family adjust and other services including support groups, mentoring programs for older children and training services are offered.

After the 18 months following the adoption, KCSL will continue to refer and provide information to the families, she said.

"(KCSL) would never leave a family high and dry," Sarasio said.

Sibling groups also are placed in the program and Sarasio said the groups are kept together.

"It is a very rare circumstance in which we break a family up," she said.

Since the programs start in July, Sarasio said the response has been good.

"The social workers are overloaded trying to get people approved for the adoption," she said.

However, there are still children in need of families, Sarasio added.

Those wishing for more information on the Coming Home Kansas program may call Sarasio at 397-7657.

Desiree Koudele can be reached at dkoudele@joconews.com

Organization demands answers about late child-support payments

● ORGANIZATION/ from Page A1

continue to pressure the KPC for answers as to why there are so many problems.

To coordinate issues for Johnson County, she has established Kids In the County Count, an organization dedicated to getting answers and money from the KPC.

Johnson County residents with complaints or concerns can send them to KICC at P.O. Box 356, Olathe, Kan., 66051-0356.

Sidwell will collect the complaints and forward them to the appropriate state representatives, congressmen, the governor and

state child-support agencies.

John Ballou, 43rd District state representative, has agreed to present Sidwell's concerns to the state's post-audit review meeting Friday.

The post-audit review committee is a standing state committee comprised of three state senators and five state representatives. The committee is responsible for auditing state agencies.

"We're trying to clear up some of the problems and get some answers," Ballou said.

Sidwell is not the first to contact Ballou about problems with the KPC.

"I've had a couple of calls," he said. "I just decided maybe it's time to take a look to see if it's a big problem or if the problems are isolated."

"We hope to put a little pressure on that committee to move forward and get some answers," Sidwell said.

Ballou said the committee probably would not commit to performing an audit of the KPC, but he expects the committee to draft a formal letter of concern to send to the agency.

Patrick J. Powers can be reached at ppowers@joconews.com

THE OLATHE DAILY NEWS

State panel asks KPC questions

Patrick J. Powers
Daily News Reporter

The Kansas legislative post-audit committee sent a letter of questions to the Kansas Payment Center Monday in search of some answers.

Problems with the KPC were brought to John Ballou, 43rd District state representative, during the past few months by a number of his constituents. In turn, Ballou took those concerns to the Kansas legislative post-audit committee Friday.

"I've had a couple of calls," Ballou said last Wednesday. "I just decided maybe it's time to take a look to see if it's a big problem or if the problems are isolated."

The post-audit committee, comprised of three state senators and five state representatives, audits the budgets of state agencies. The committee's letter of questions was sent to Janet Schalansky, secretary of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. SRS oversees the operation of the KPC.

The KPC, based in Topeka, handles all child support payments across the state. Until September, child-support payments in Johnson County were handled by the Johnson County District Court Trustee's office. Problems with the KPC arose when people failed to receive child-support payments for months at a time, even after the payments had been made by the payee of child support.

The legislative post-audit committee drafted a letter Friday to send to the KPC asking a series of questions regarding the service they provide.

"We asked that they put in writing an answer to all those questions," Ballou said. "If not we'll ask some more questions and dig a little harder."

The committee's letter does not signify an audit of SRS or the KPC, it is simply a formal request for information, said Post-Auditor Bard Hinton.

"This is not unusual," Hinton said. "What I expect is to get information. One of our requests is the information be sent by Jan. 3."

Jan. 3 is the next scheduled meeting of the legislative post-audit committee.

Questions in the committee's letter include:

- How many phone calls does the department receive per day, on average, inquiring about child-support payments? How many case workers are available to answer phone calls?
- What is the suspense file for the child-support enforcement system and how is it operated?
- If a payment or the information that accompanies it is incomplete or wrong, does the department contact the district court from which that payment was received?
- If cases become inactive, does the department remit undistributed support payments back to the district courts that originally sent them in?
- Has there been an increase in administrative costs, and who bears those costs?
- Does the KPC keep the interest earned on money that sits idle?

While the legislative post-audit committee waits for answers from SRS, the state is offering emergency services to persons who have yet to receive child-support payments for the past weeks.

"We can get them a check immediately and take care of problems with any utility company or creditor," Ballou said.

AHN Kathleen
Floan

State's woes persist in tracking down child-support recipients

By SARAH KESSINGER
Harris News Service

TOPEKA - Child-support payments routed through a new state center are moving out to parents more quickly this month, a state official says, but more than 1,000 payments remain in limbo.

Social and Rehabilitation Services Secretary Janet Schalansky said payments are processed in one day at the new Kansas Payment Center, which opened in Topeka in September.

Still, problems remain with child support checks, money transfers and cash that arrives without names of senders and intended recipients.

"We've even gotten \$800 in cash in an envelope with no information," Schalansky said.

As of this week, the agency had 1,382 unidentified payments worth \$245,931 that are more than a week old.

The secretary said that in cases where payments were delayed, the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services has provided emergency support funds to custodial parents with urgent needs. She said 75 emergency checks have gone out so far.

Lawmakers say they're still taking calls from unhappy constituents involved in the system, which was a federal requirement under welfare reform. Previously, district court clerks handled payments at the county level.

"We can thank our federal friends for this," said Sen. Steve Morris, chairman of the Transition Oversight Committee set up by SRS, shaking his head. "But to SRS' credit, every one of those cases I've called about, they've instantly taken action on them."

Because of the center's rocky start, Schalansky said the agency is reviewing a corrective action plan from Tier

'We can thank our federal friends for this. But to SRS' credit, every one of those cases I've called about, they've instantly taken action on them.'

- Steve Morris, chairman of the Transition Oversight Committee

Technologies, the private firm contracted to run the center. She's pleased with their reaction to the unexpected workload.

"Tier agreed to 'beef up' KPC staffing from 45 to 75, with experts flown in from other states and additional permanent and temporary hiring," Schalansky said. "Tier increased the number of phone lines coming to KPC from 50 to 72."

Since Sept. 29, the center has processed 222,547 checks totaling \$41.4 million for custodial parents and children.

Yet complaints about the payment center's busy phone line and slow mail continue to flow in.

A phone call to the payment center Friday left a reporter on hold for 15 minutes.

On mailing of checks, Schalansky said the center electronically sends payments to a distribution center in St. Louis, where Tier receives a discounted mailing rate. The checks are mailed back to parents in Kansas via first-class mail. The secretary said SRS is in the process of doing test mailings to see how long it takes.

Schalansky told Morris' committee Thursday to refer constituents to the payment center's toll-free line, 1-877-572-5722, or to call her office at 785-298-3271.

"We'll try to track it down," she said.

4687

7-97

Great Bend Tribune

24 Pages five Sections Vol. 125, No. 95

SUNDAY, December 3, 2000

\$1²⁵

ONGOING SERIES

Child-support payments hit snag at state

By LINDA KENYON
Tribune Staff Writer
(lkenyon@gtribune.com)

The situation is improving, but it is still far from perfect.

Kansas changed its method of collecting child support, maintenance and other support-related payments Sept. 29. The change was a response to a federal mandate requiring each state to set up a state-wide system.

Prior to the change, each county's district court processed child-support payments.

The district court would record the amount collected and send the payment on to the recipient.

Payment is now sent to Kansas

Payment Center in Topeka. The checks or money orders are deposited into state accounts and checks issued by the state are mailed to those receiving child support. Paying by cash is no longer an option.

People on both sides of the payment system are reporting ongoing problems. Checks are not being cashed in a timely way and they are also not being mailed out on time. This presents problems for the person who is paying child support and the person receiving it.

People are not accustomed to sending payments off," said Dorothy Doonan, clerk of the Barton County District Court. "It's meant learning something new."

“It was awful when they first started.”

Dorothy Doonan
clerk of the court

The Kansas Payment Center, operated by Tier Technologies Inc., also had to learn how the system worked. “It was awful when they first started this,” said Doonan. “They didn’t have enough people hired up there. It was overwhelming.” KPC has since increased its workforce 45 to 75 and increased

the number of phone lines coming into the center.

Payment needs to be sent with the sender’s social security number, court-order number including the county identifier and the Personal Identification Number issued on the redirect notice sent to the payor.

Payment is also available through income withholding by employers or direct deposit.

Doonan said the problem was aggravated by the amount of cases placed in the system at one time.

“They were slow to get information logged on,” she said. “There was a lot of work before their cut-off date. There was tons of work here. It was a big, huge project.”

People can check on the status of

their support payments by calling the payment center’s toll-free line, (877) 572-5722 or checking its web site, www.kspaycenter.com.

However, repeated telephone calls to the center resulted in busy signals or being placed on hold for more than five minutes. Some people have reported being on hold for 20 minutes and then being disconnected.

Doonan said the situation has improved in the local district court office.

“I’m glad it’s slowing down. I think they’re working it out. Maybe they’ve got the bugs worked out.”

This is the first of a series on Kansas Payment Center. The next story will be from the center’s point of view.

K A R E N L . G R I F F I T H S

17th Judicial District Court Trustee

P O Box 70, Norton, Kansas 67654-0070

785-877-2946

785-877-3456 (fax)



**TESTIMONY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEES ON JUDICIARY
OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, JANUARY 22ND, 2001**

I act as the Court Trustee for enforcement and modification of child support for the 17th Judicial District. This district is made up of Norton, Graham, Phillips, Decatur, Smith and Osborne Counties in Kansas. This district of 6 rural counties has a total case load of about 1300 cases. In this case load I handle Trustee cases and contract with SRS for enforcement of what is referred to as IV-D Support (Title IV-D of the Social Security Act). This testimony in no way expresses the opinion of SRS, and is strictly my personal testimony regarding the Kansas Payment Center, its issues and concerns.

Essentially there are three systems of enforcement of support in Kansas:

1. IV-D Support and Enforcement
2. Court Trustee Enforcement
3. Private Enforcement.

My office enforces and reviews cases for modification of child support for those cases referred to me under contract with SRS (IV-D) Support and all cases assigned to me by the Court, and which have not been exempted from the Court Trustee Program. The fee for the Court Trustee Enforcement in my district is 4%. A similar fee of 4% is charged in IV-D assigned cases that are not being provided other SRS programs. Those parties that have opted not to be in the Court Trustee Program, and for whom the Court has allowed to opt out of the program, are charged no fee and would be responsible privately for the enforcement and modification of their own orders.

The issues and problems presented today surround the federally mandated Kansas Payment Center which began service essentially September 1, 2000. The state met the federal deadline of having a Central Payment Center in place and thus avoided future federal penalties. Prior to September 1, 2000, most Clerk of the Court were receiving the child support, recording the payment, forwarding the payments to SRS, on IV-D assigned cases, or to the custodial parent, on Trustee and non-assigned cases. After September 1, 2000 all payors of child support were asked to forward their payments to the Kansas Payment Center at a PO Box in Topeka. Custodial parents were then to receive their payments from this Payment Center either by a check or by direct deposit. As a practical matter, most child support payments are now being processed and sent to the Kansas Payment Center. Of the six courts that I deal with in Western Kansas, the Clerks acknowledge that they may average 0 to 4 payments per day that are still directed to the court's address. The first hurdle of a central payment center appears to have been accomplished. Although, the clerks of court would take the job back, if asked, the nightmare of rerouting payments would create another 5 months of misdirected payments.

The second issue is the application of payments to the case. Currently and typically in my caseload, 85 - 95% of the payments are being applied to the correct cases. The difficulty arises in 5 - 15% of cases where the payment has been made by the employer or the non-custodial parent, but no record is shown of the payment on the Web Site or at KPC when they are called. The most difficult case for us and the most frequent problematic issue is that case where the clerk of court has received the payment in her office, she has logged it on the daily log sheet and forwarded the payment and the log to KPC. These are the payments we find that are typically placed in the unidentified field by KPC and not applied to the appropriate case. These payments are taken in by KPC, deposited into their account, and for whatever reason, the worker or scanner cannot coordinate the name and case number or one of the three identifiers (Name, Case#, Social Security Number) the payment is left in this "unidentified" account. We do not receive a listing of "unidentified" payments and therefore cannot attempt to connect the payment to the case. Our first indication that there are unidentified payments may be when the Custodial Parent, the Payor or the employer calls us and asks for our help in finding

where the money went to. We find that these unidentified payments most often occur on checks forwarded from clerks offices (the log information does not appear to stay with the check), on multiple employee payments on IWO's from one employer and from government checks.

This issue of unidentified payments occurs on a daily basis in our office. We then call Tier Technology (KPC) and ask for assistance in locating this money. We have always had friendly and helpful operators. We have not always located the money, though, and we still have many cases out there where the money has been sent in, endorsed and cashed, and still not located. The money is most easily located if you have the case name, number and the check number from the payor.

The third problem arises with how the money is recorded and disbursed. Our records as to the payment of child support come directly from the records that Tier makes available to us and the Clerk of Court on the Internet. If these records are not correct or if their system is down, we have no way to verify when and from whom payments were made. Trustees and courts count on these records when reviewing the payment of child support, when determining child support arrears and when reviewing ticklers set by office staff to check on payments. A priority of this state contract should be to provide adequate records. There is nothing worse than taking a record to court and showing the court the payments recorded by Tier and having the Payor bring copies of canceled checks showing one, two or three additional payments made, sent to KPC, cashed by Tier, but not recorded on the payment history. In addition, I am informed by Clerks of Court, who do have access to the input of information on child support cases, such as the initial amount or modified amount of the court order, change of names and addresses, that these information changes do not take place immediately. This creates a problem as the non-custodial parent may want to make a payment as soon as the order is entered. If the case information cannot be entered immediately on the KPC system, then when the check arrives, Tier will not have the information to connect the payment to the case and the money will sit in "unidentified" until someone figures it out.

A fourth issue is the lack of adequate reporting that the Trustee's Offices are receiving in order to track payments by absent parents and in order to track the trustee fees on cases. We have been working with OJA in modifying the reports so that the actual date of the payment and the amount, as well as the fee withheld, will be included on the Trustee Report. When the Clerks of Court provided the payment location, my office received a monthly report from each clerk as to all child support received

in each county. These reports would include Trustee child support, iv-d assigned support and private, non-iv and non trustee cases. We then could track total collections for each county and judicial district and track trends for purposes of adjusting case loads and job assignments in the Trustees Offices. Such a report is lacking at this time, and make tracking total collections for a year, or a month, nigh on impossible. The only way to perform it now is to take the fee received each week and figure backwards.

A final issue may only be an issue to those district that are far to the west of St. Louis. Currently the checks for child support are cut by Tier and mailed in a drop from St. Louis. In the past, when the IV-D checks were cut by SRS and when checks were mailed by Tier from Topeka, the checks arrived to the custodial parent, one to two days after they were recorded on KPC and could be seen on the system. Since inception of the mailing from St. Louis, the checks in my district take approximately 6 to 7 days to arrive at the mailbox of the custodial parent. The custodial parent can track this because they can go to the KPC Website and see that the money has been received by Tier, that it has been recorded and that it shows it has been sent out.

My proposal is not to revoke the Tier contract, start anew and expect different results, but to work on the problems that remain with the present system. I would suggest more active participation by the Trustee's Offices who enforce support. Allow these offices access to information KPC on "unidentified" cases. Allow these offices access to update case information, including names, addresses, and case identifiers, which could also be shared with the clerks of court. Make sure that data entered is immediately changed on the KPC system. I would also suggest more complete reporting to each county as to money actually collected. An accurate tracking method is vital to the future of child support collections. A mailing system that would assure quicker arrival in western, Kansas would also benefit families and children.

LEE A. FISHER
785-623-4515
785-628-8106(fax)



23rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 660
HAYS, KS 67601

COURT TRUSTEE

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEES ON JUDICIARY OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, JANUARY 22, 2001

At the end of September, 2000, the State of Kansas changed the way it processes child support payments. As we all know, the clerks of the district courts were responsible for recording those payments, and maintaining proper payment histories. Federal Welfare Reform Legislation changed that procedure however, and now each state has a centralized payment clearing house to record and process those payments. The Kansas Payment Center (KPC) operated by Tier Technologies now has these responsibilities in Kansas. With any major change such as this, there are bound to be problems and glitches in the new system. I have had the opportunity to personally observe the problems and progress made in improving operations and customer service regarding the KPC.

I want to outline some of the problem areas that I have encountered, and at the outset I would point out that I have seen vast improvement in most of these areas:

1. Payment Turn Around Time. This has been an area that in the beginning we saw many problems with. Many custodial parents were and some still are experiencing delays with receiving their support. However, as I understand it, additional staff at the KPC have been added to help

address this problem and the turn around time for receiving the payment and sending it on to the custodial parent has been reduced. I think improvement in this area is still needed, but Tier has appeared responsive to this critical issue.

2. Posting Payments to the Proper Case. I have experienced cases where an individual payor has more than one child support case. The problem here has been that the wrong custodial parent received all or part of some support amount that another custodial parent with the same obligor was entitled to. In checking with the employer of the non-custodial parent, my office was advised that the check to the KPC was sent with information clearly identifying the two separate case numbers and the breakdown of how the payment should be applied. Again, however, I found the KPC staff to be responsive in recognizing and correcting the mistake.

3. Court Trustee Reports. The reports that the Court Trustee offices receive need to be revamped, so that they show more than the amount and name of the payor. We need to know the dates of the payments, and case numbers so that our offices can track these payments better, without having to go to the KPC website on each case to check and monitor payments. As I understand it, Tier recognizes that this improvement is needed and is working toward an enhanced payment report that provides the trustee offices with more of the information we need.

4. Finding lost payments. Initially, there were problems with locating lost payments. However, this has greatly improved, and I have found the KPC staff to be courteous and helpful in assisting my office when this has come up. KPC staff have responded to these inquiries in an ever more timely fashion.

Continued improvement and cooperation between SRS, OJA and the Kansas Payment Center is needed to address the remaining concerns that various customers, agencies and the legislature are having. This will help foster public confidence in the KPC. I am extremely optimistic that Tier can accommodate the requests for enhancements and improved efficiency. It is imperative that we all work together toward this common goal. I'm hearing that custodial parents are beginning to ask courts to allow direct payments, and thus bypassing the KPC. This will create a nightmare for them, my office and the courts if this happens in my opinion. Enforcement efforts will be complicated if the courts begin allowing this to happen.

Federal Welfare Reform is responsible for the way we now conduct business. This is the way we are required to do things. The legislature obviously needs to hear about problems and issues regarding the KPC that affect so many people. Personally, I remain committed to working with the public, the courts, OJA, SRS and the KPC to make this system work and work well. Of course there are going to be imperfections. I can't imagine a new way of doing business that affects so many, without some sort of problem. However, I remain confident that Tier Technologies and the KPC can continue to implement the appropriate modifications to their system. There were some advantages to having child support payments made to the Clerks of the Court. However, that system wasn't flawless either. I encourage the legislature to continue to be supportive of the KPC. I'm sure that measures exist that can be implemented to ensure compliance with the standards and expectations that the public, courts and legislatures have, and those measures should be used if needed. The focus needs to remain on what we can all do to make the system work, and work well. If we accomplish this, then we will have benefitted those who rely on us the most; the children of the State of Kansas.

Thank you.

**TESTIMONY OF ANNE MCDONALD
COURT TRUSTEE, 29TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

**BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
SEN. JOHN VRATIL, CHAIR**

January 22, 2001

CONCERNING THE KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER

The Court Trustee Office in Wyandotte County has been enforcing child support for twenty years. In our county, the Clerk's Office handled the payments. We had an excellent relationship with them and together, we were able to get a substantial amount of support collected and distributed. We were also able to get daily reports on case and payment status from our mainframe, which helped us stay on top of the cases.

I understand that since Kansas did not seek a waiver, federal laws require the establishment of a central payment center for the processing of IV-D and Income Withholding cases.

The Kansas Payment Center has been in operation approximately three and one-half months. Here are the most important and/or most frequent problems we have encountered:

1. **INFORMATION NOT EASILY ACCESSIBLE**
 - Website often down
 - Phones busy or long wait on hold
 - Payment records difficult to decipher
2. **UNRESPONSIVE**
 - When we send an email to Tier Technologies about problem cases, we almost never receive a reply. Some cases get fixed; others do not
3. **DATA BASE INCORRECT**
 - Corrections entered through the web not corrected on the KPC database, or there is a delay of several days. We are now totally dependent on the Trustee fee to fund our office. So it is vital that the KPC records show when we are in the case
 - Same problem with correcting addresses

From the little I know about the process, I believe that the initial error was waiting too long to begin the bid and design process for the Payment Center. This was compounded by the decision to include all cases right from the beginning of the operation.