DCSS P3 PROGRAM
CASE CLOSURE WORKGROUP
JULY 24, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY

A. GENERAL

On Monday, July 24, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Case Closure Workgroup held its first official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☑ BROWN, MARTIN – DCSS ANALYST
- ☑ FLORES, ED – DCSS ANALYST (CO-LEADER)
- ☑ GALLAGHER, SHARI – SMALL COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE (SCRIBE)
- ☑ GERSHENZON, LEORA – ADVOCATE REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ HILL, DENISE – FTB REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ JACOBS, JENNIFER – ADVOCATE REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ MARTINEZ, JUAN – FTB REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ MEYERSTEIN, MICHAEL – MEDIUM COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ TODD, ELIZABETH – LARGE COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ TOWNSELY, JORIE – MEDIUM COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ SNIDER, MELANIE – ADVOCATE REPRESENTATIVE
- ☑ WELLS, DALE – JUDICIAL COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
- ❑ WOMACK, VELMA – LARGE COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE (CO-LEADER)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☑ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Shari Gallagher at *sgallagher@mlode.com*

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Ed Flores opened the discussion with a review of our prior meeting. We then reviewed the responses from counties to our case closure survey. We had about 28 counties respond and provide information. We then spent the majority of the meeting reviewing every federal regulation and completing a matrix (see attached) that addressed how the regulations impact the family, the incentives, automation, staffing, training and facilities. We then discussed local practices and their impact on all of the same issues.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

Begin building the Case Closure Matrix.

D. DISCUSSION ISSUE

We reviewed the responses from counties to our case closure survey. We had about 28 counties respond and provide information.

We then spent the majority of the meeting reviewing every federal regulation and completing a matrix (see attached) that addressed how the regulations impact the family, the incentives, automation, staffing, training and facilities. We then discussed local practices and their impact on all of the same issues.

E. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- Jorrie will bring back statistics showing how many cases fall into the criteria of (b)1 (no court order for current support and balance is under $500). This was to provide a benchmark for a medium sized county.
- Each county representative in the group will determine local percentage of cases that don't have SSN for the NCP.
- Group will define "Non-Cooperation" for non-welfare custodial parents for case closure. B(11)
- Group will define dilligent efforts to determine putative father, which will enable us to define policy for all counties to follow. B(3)
- Group will define dilligent efforts to determine biological father. B(4)
- Group will expand efforts of dilligent efforts to locate NCP. This relates to soft case closure. B(4)(1)
- Group needs to define "name". Federal regulations state if you have a name you have to keep the case opened. We need to define that a full name is needed (i.e., both first and last). Another soft case closure issue. B(4)(2)
- Group will establish guidelines for CP locate efforts. B(10)
- Group will define Non-Cooperation. B(11)
- Group will establish timeframes for response and involving Central Registry to act as intermediary and OSCE. B(12)
- Group will define cross reference record retention requirements (D)
- Group will recommend cleanup legislation for federal performance incentives vs case closure (i.e., soft case closure)

F. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

- Incarcerated NCPS
- Deceased NCPS
- Dedicated locate staff
- Good Cause parameters
- Undistributed collections
- CP non-cooperation

G. ATTACHMENTS

None