FAX Transmitted Memorandum

TO: Cynthia Rice Special Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy FAX: 202-456-7431	FROM: David Gray Ross Commissioner Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement Administration for Children & Families Dept. of Health & Human Services 370 L'Enfant Promenade, S. W. Washington, DC 20447 FAX Phone: 202-401-3450 Office Phone: 202-401-9370

Date/Time: February 6, 1998, 11:15 AM

SUBJECT: Federal Licenses

Number of Pages including this page: 8

COMMENTS:

Here 'Tis

David

----- end of memo -----

File: fax_ross.doc

To: Internet[cynthia_a._rice@oa.eop.gov]
Cc: John Monahan@OAS@ACF.WDC
Melissa Skolfield@ASPA@OS.DC,Lauren Griffin@ASL@OS.DC
Bcc: Stephen Grant@OCSE.OASP.SP@ACF.WDC,Paul Legler
Nicholas H Soppa
From: David G Ross@OCSE.OD@ACF.WDC
Subject: Federal Licenses
Date: Friday, February 6, 1998 10:45:34 EST
Attach: LICENSES
Certify: Y
Priority: Normal
Defer until:
Expires:
Forwarded by:

As you requested, attached is a list of federal licenses that might be subject to either suspension or denial. Much more work needs to be done by the legal staff of the various agencies and departments before we could actually ask the President to promulgate an executive order.

The listing if a result of searaches of the U.S. Code,. Code of Federal Regulations, and other resources. While many of the ninety-two licenses listed are archane and unlikely to prove effective as enforcement tools, this is at least an appropriate starting point for discussions with other federal agencies to identify federal powers which might be used to encourage compliance with child support orders.

Thank you. David Gray Ross. 202 401 9369.

Cynthia A. Rice 02/12/98 03:03:17 PM

Record Type: Record

To: dross @ acf.dhhs.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY
cc:
bcc: Records Management
Subject: Re: Re: Federal Licenses

Thank you, Judge. Can you get me something in writing re: what Virginia has done and what results they have had -- or give me a name and number to call? I want to know, can we credible say this has "worked" in Virginia?
dross @ acf.dhhs.gov

dross @ acf.dhhs.gov
02/11/98 06:19:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice

cc:
Subject: Re: Re: Federal Licenses

We have talked about it and decided that, absent legislation - similar to what we have in the law regarding state license revocation, booting cannot be mandated by regulation. As you may know, the State of Virginia has begun a very aggressive program of booting and the State Director there tells me that it has been very successful. I have asked the editor of our Child Support Report that goes to employees across the nation, to feature the Virginia project in an article. We also do a best practices manual. If the results continue to be beneficial, we will include it in a future edition. It might be worthwhile, however, for the President to mention it in some future child support radio address. Hope this helps. David Ross.

Cynthia A. Rice 02/12/98 03:00:54 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
cc:
bcc: Records Management
Subject: Re: child support/booting cars

Yes -- we require states to have the authority to suspend licenses, but they decide when to apply it, which is what I think we should do for booting cars. Generally, as you know, states report that they get funds by threatening to revoke licenses -- they rarely actually have to follow through and actually suspend them -- but requiring the state to have the procedure gives the child support agency a new tool to collect overdue funds.

Let me get more information on Virginia's car booting program to make sure we can credibly say "this works."

Current law re: licenses reads as follows: states must have "procedures under which the State has (and uses in appropriate cases) authority to withhold or suspend, or to restrict the use of driver's licenses, professional and occupational licenses, and recreational licenses of individuals owing overdue support or failing, after receiving appropriate notice, to comply with subpoenas or warrants relating to paternity or child support proceedings"

Bruce N. Reed

Bruce N. Reed
02/12/98 01:30:10 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
cc:
Subject: Re: child support/booting cars

On drivers licenses, we mandate that they have legislation to give themselves the option to do it, right? Is that what we'd do here?

Secretary finds affords comparable rights to child support creditors; and

"(2) procedures under which, in any case in which the State knows of a transfer by a child support debtor with respect to which such a prima facie case is established, the State must—

"(A) seek to void such transfer; or

"(B) obtain a settlement in the best interests of the child support creditor.".

SEC. 365. WORK REQUIREMENT FOR PERSONS OWING PAST-DUE CHILD SUPPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 466(a) (42 U.S.C. 666(a)), as amended by sections 315, 317, and 323 of this Act, is amended by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(15) PROCEDURES TO ENSURE THAT PERSONS OWING PAST-DUE SUPPORT WORK OR HAVE A PLAN FOR PAYMENT OF SUCH SUPPORT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Procedures under which the State has the authority, in any case in which an individual owes past-due support with respect to a child receiving assistance under a State program funded under part A, to issue an order or to request that a court or an administrative process established pursuant to State law issue an order that requires the individual to—

"(i) pay such support in accordance with a plan approved by the court, or, at the option of the State, a plan approved by the State agency administering the State program under this part; or

"(ii) if the individual is subject to such a plan and is not incapacitated, participate in such work activities (as defined in section 407(d)) as the court, or, at the option of the State, the State agency administering the State program under this part, deems appropriate.

"(B) PAST-DUE SUPPORT DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'past-due support' means the amount of a delinquency, determined under a court order, or an order of an administrative process established under State law, for support and maintenance of a child, or of a child and the parent with whom the child is living.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The flush paragraph at the end of section 466(a) (42 U.S.C. 666(a)) is amended by striking "and (7)" and inserting "(7), and (15)".

SEC. 366. DEFINITION OF SUPPORT ORDER.

Section 453 (42 U.S.C. 653) as amended by sections 316 and 345(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(p) SUPPORT ORDER DEFINED.—As used in this part, the term 'support order' means a judgment, decree, or order, whether temporary, final, or subject to modification, issued by a court or an administrative agency of competent jurisdiction, for the support and maintenance of a child, including a child who has attained the age of majority under the law of the issuing State, or a child and the parent with whom the child is living, which provides for monetary support, health care, arrearages, or reimbursement, and which may include related costs and fees, interest and penalties, income withholding, attorneys' fees, and other relief.".

SEC. 367. REPORTING ARREARAGES TO CREDIT BUREAUS.

Section 466(a)(7) (42 U.S.C. 666(a)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) REPORTING ARREARAGES TO CREDIT BUREAUS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Procedures (subject to safeguards pursuant to subparagraph (B)) requiring the State to report periodically to consumer reporting agencies (as defined in section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(f)) the name of any noncustodial parent who is delinquent in the payment of support, and the amount of overdue support owed by such parent.

"(B) SAFEGUARDS.—Procedures ensuring that, in carrying out subparagraph (A), information with respect to a noncustodial parent is reported—

"(i) only after such parent has been afforded all due process required under State law, including notice and a reasonable opportunity to contest the accuracy of such information; and

"(ii) only to an entity that has furnished evidence satisfactory to the State that the entity is a consumer reporting agency (as so defined).".

SEC. 368. LIENS.

Section 466(a)(4) (42 U.S.C. 666(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) LIENS.—Procedures under which—

"(A) liens arise by operation of law against real and personal property for amounts of overdue support owed by a noncustodial parent who resides or owns property in the State; and

"(B) the State accords full faith and credit to liens described in subparagraph (A) arising in another State, when the State agency, party, or other entity seeking to enforce such a lien complies with the procedural rules relating to recording or serving liens that arise within the State, except that such rules may not require judicial notice or hearing prior to the enforcement of such a lien.".

SEC. 369. STATE LAW AUTHORIZING SUSPENSION OF LICENSES.

Section 466(a) (42 U.S.C. 666(a)), as amended by sections 315, 317, 323, and 365 of this Act, is amended by inserting after paragraph (15) the following:

"(16) AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD OR SUSPEND LICENSES.—Procedures under which the State has (and uses in appropriate cases) authority to withhold or suspend, or to restrict the use of driver's licenses, professional and occupational licenses, and recreational licenses of individuals owing overdue support or failing, after receiving appropriate notice, to comply with subpoenas or warrants relating to paternity or child support proceedings.".

SEC. 370. DENIAL OF PASSPORTS FOR NONPAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT.

(a) HHS CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE.—

dross @ acf.dhhs.gov
02/10/98 03:23:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice

cc:
Subject: Re: Can you tell me the name and number of who put together the

Sure. He is a lawyer named Stephen Grant. He is our International Officer and his telephone number is 202 260 5943.

PS - I am working on the other two issues.

Cynthia A. Rice 02/08/98 02:24:07 PM

Record Type: Record

To: dross @ acf.dhhs.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Re: Federal Licenses

Also, I have been asked whether it be possible for the federal government, through regulation, to require states to "boot" the cars of owners who owe child support, the way state and local governments boot cars of people who owe traffic tickets? I wonder if there's a way to interpret section 368 of PL 104-193 regarding liens or section 369 regarding licenses to do this? This was suggested at a high level meeting, and we will be expected to report back.

dross @ acf.dhhs.gov

dross @ acf.dhhs.gov
02/06/98 10:45:00 AM

Record Type: Record

To: cynthia a. rice
cc:
Subject: Federal Licenses

As you requested, attached is a list of federal licenses that might be subject to either suspension or denial. Much more work needs to be done by the legal staff of the various agencies and departments before we could actually ask the President to promulgate an executive order.

The listing if a result of searaches of the U.S. Code,. Code of Federal Regulations, and other resources. While many of the ninety-two licenses listed are archane and unlikely to prove effective as enforcement tools, this is at least an appropriate starting point for discussions with other federal agencies to identify federal powers which might be used to encourage compliance with child support orders.

Thank you. David Gray Ross. 202 401 9369.

LEGISLATIVE IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

LIENS

Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA)
Public Law 104-193, Section 368

Draft: 11/8/96
Workgroup:
Dennis Minkler (212) 264-8913
Vince Herberholt (206) 615-2252 x3043
Jeff Ball (202) 401-5427

DRAFT

A. Description of Provision

Under the PRWORA of 1996, States must have procedures under which:

(a) liens arise by operation of law against real or personal property for amounts of overdue support owed by a noncustodial parent who resides or owns property in the State; and

(b) the State accords full faith and credit to liens arising in another State, when the State agency, party, or other entity seeking to enforce such a lien complies with the procedural rules relating to recording or serving liens that arise within the State, except that such rules may not require judicial notice or hearing prior to enforcement of such a lien.

Effective Date: This provision is effective October 1, 1996 unless State legislation is needed to implement it. In the latter case, States have a grace period of until the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of the Act, with each year of a two-year legislative session deemed as a separate regular session.

B. Variation Among States

Because the lien requirements in the PRWORA are new, there are few, if any, State laws that provide examples of the new provisions.

State laws on the intrastate use of liens vary widely and this diversity will have an impact on implementation of § 368 of the PRWORA. For example, some States require that a certain dollar amount of debt, or dollar amount of property equity must exist before a child support lien can be imposed. Other States only permit the child support lien to be imposed on titled property. States such as Connecticut and North Dakota have administrative guidelines that clarify when it is useful to place liens on nonvehicular property. State procedures for actually imposing a lien are also very diverse. In some States, liens take effect when, a judgment, decree or order

establishing a support order is entered; in others when the clerk of the court enters a copy, abstract or cross-reference of the order on a lien registry, or transmits information to a Statewide central registry. Some States have specific laws for child support liens that allow incremental growth of the amount of the encumbrance when each support payment becomes past-due by operation of law. In some States, priority for each installment's lien is based on the date it was imposed or added to the original lien.

In some States, such as New Jersey, automation plays an important role in imposing and executing liens. In a seven month period, New Jersey collected over $750,000 through a automated judgment system that real estate title companies and attorneys use to discover outstanding debts of obligors who are attempting to buy, sell or refinance property. Liens are filed centrally, and title searchers and real estate attorneys from any jurisdiction in the State only need to conduct their searches in the Superior Court Clerk's Office in Trenton. An added benefit is that the automated filing system has conserved valuable clerical and court time previously used to obtain and process fixed money judgments.

C. Rationale

Liens are legal claims used to secure compliance with unpaid judgments. The lien process under PRWORA is a powerful enforcement tool because it prevents the obligor from selling property and pocketing proceeds without first satisfying unpaid child support. The defaulting parent also must consider the potential threat of a forced sale unless the underlying child support debt is paid. Because the lien arises by operation of law, there is no additional step that must be taken to place the lien on the property, such as reducing the past due amount to judgment. The new law confers the authority to transfer the lien to property located in other States for the same value as that on in-State property, and the second State must recognize the reach of the first State's lien on the property of the defaulting parent located in the second State.

D. Critical Elements to Consider When Drafting Lien Legislation

What is a lien? A lien restricts the property owner's ability to transfer property and retain all of the proceeds from the transfer. It is intended to prevent the transfer of property if the owner has outstanding debts against it that have been duly recorded or noted. In some cases the transfer cannot take place without the lienholder's approval (the property and its lien are transferred). Liens are usually based on the timing of the filing of the lien, giving the lienholder a superior claim to those who file liens afterwards. Occasionally, a lienholder will seek a forced sale of the property to satisfy the lien.

How does this lien arise and what does it cover? A lien that arises by operation of law means that a lien attaches as soon as child support becomes past due. The lien encumbrance amount equals the amount of the judgment, i.e., the past-due child

support amount. The lien is against real land, or personal property such as cars, boats, stocks and bonds, lottery proceeds, lawsuit judgments, or insurance settlements.

Whose property is covered? The lien attaches to property owned by a noncustodial parent who resides or owns property in the State. Practically speaking, liens are most effective when titled property is encumbered; where notice of the lien is apparent to purchasers through an open registry; or when they can be applied through automated methods on lump sum assets or proceeds.

What is full faith and credit regarding liens? Liens that lawfully arise in one State are to be recognized in another State, for the same encumbrance value as the lien has in the State of origin.

E. Talking Points

Liens work best when they pressure the delinquent obligor to pay off the debt. The goal of the lien process, similar to license restriction and revocation, is to encourage obligors to pay child support, not to take away property. Actual execution of the lien can be avoided by payment of child support arrearage.

The expanded use of liens is an excellent way to increase collections from obligors who are self-employed, working "under the table" for cash, or working for companies that do not report wages to the State Employment Security Agency.

The use of asset information obtained from Project 1099 has helped many States to effectively increase the use of liens.

F. What to Anticipate During the Legislative Process

Every State already has procedures for establishing and executing on liens, it is not envisioned that the new requirements will meet with significant opposition. The less centralized or automated a State's lien network, the more opposition the provision is likely to face, because it will require more State resources to implement it. States however, may take this opportunity to identify legal and procedural barriers that currently exist in the use of liens as an enforcement tool and enact legislation to overcome these barriers.

G. News Articles/Sample Press Releases

Interstate Commission Report section on liens, please see attached.

H. Cost/Benefit Analysis Ideas

The new law provides that liens arise by operation of law, so the cost of using liens should decrease. The costs related to perfecting and serving notice of the lien need to be considered however.

I. Impacted Groups (Non-Governmental)

Father's Groups
Bar Associations
Judicial Societies
Real estate industry
Title companies

J. Government Agencies Affected

IV-D Agencies
Courts
County Clerk's/Title offices

K. Contacts

OCSE:	Dennis Minkler	(212) 264-8913
	Jeff Ball	(202) 401-5427

February 8, 1998

NOTE TO BEN CURRIE:

FROM: CYNTHIA RICE

SUBJ: CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Here is more information about what I'd like you to get from the law library:

1) Attached is a list of licenses granted by the federal government to individuals.

a) Are there licenses missing from this list?

b) How many people have these licenses?

c) Would we, through regulation, be able to deny these licenses to people who owe child support, or would a legislative change be required?

2) Would it be possible for the federal government, through regulation, to require states to "boot" cars of owners who owe child support, perhaps through an interpretation of section 368 of PL 104-193 regarding liens or section 369 regarding licenses? (See attached for statutory language.)

1/29/90

Va. Falsely Threatens 2,300 In Mistake on Child Support

By R.H. Melton
Washington Post Staff Writer

RICHMOND, Jan. 28—Virginia is reporting a dramatic surge in child-support collections but has had to apologize to more than 2,000 parents for misidentifying them as deliquent, state officials said today.

Since beginning a crackdown on non-custodial parents who have fallen behind on their child-support payments, the state has forced new payments from 15,000 people, for a total of nearly $15 million. Parents pay about $286 million in support to 541,000 Virginia children annually.

But since the crackdown began in June, the state erroneously has identified 2,300 parents as delinquent and sent them notices revoking their hunting and fishing licenses, if they had one.

After Nathaniel L. "Nick" Young Jr., the state's top child-support enforcement official, heard several complaints about the error last month, he apologized in a letter to those incorrectly identified as delinquent.

Young said today the the problem was caused by a computer programming error; 37,400 other parents were properly notified of their license revocations.

One father who was incorrectly identified as being delinquent was Ronald E. Wright, of Columbia, S.C., according to his former wife.

Robyn Stallman, of Fairfax, said today that Wright consistently paid $200 a month for about 16 years to help support their daughter, Becky, until she turned 18 last spring. He has since helped his daughter with her college tuition in Northern Virginia, Stallman said.

"It was a pain in the neck for him for almost a year, getting all the documents together," Stallman said. "It's ironic—you hear about deadbeat dads all the time, but he wasn't one."

Wright, whose case was first publicized in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, could not be reached for comment today. He had told the newspaper he was "livid" about the state's "incredible blunder," which he said had threatened his credit rating.

Young said he was sorry about the 6 percent error rate and believes that there are now safeguards in place to ensure such mistakes will not happen again.

"We're not perfect," said Martin D. Brown, a senior aide to Young. "We're going to make mistakes tomorrow. Where we find them, we correct them."

Young's agency has 432 caseworkers in 20 offices across Virginia who track child support. The state uses a number of tools, including liens, driver's license suspensions and seizing lottery winnings, to force payment of child support.

For example, the state recently warned 8,000 delinquent parents their driver's licenses were going to be revoked and quickly collected $8 million in overdue support. Only 260 drivers actually lost their licenses, Young said.

FAX TRANSMISSION

The Office of Child Support Enforcement
Administration for Children & Families
Department of Health & Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW
Washington, DC 20447

FAX: ~~(202) 401-5559~~
(202) 401-3450

This transmission consists of this cover sheet plus 5 ***page(s)***
FAX to:

DATE: March 20, 1998

TO: Cynthia Rice

FROM: Eileen McDaniel

MESSAGE:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

DATE: March 20, 1998

TO: Cynthia A. Rice
Special Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy

FROM: Eileen C. McDaniel
Special Assistant to the Commissioner
Office of Child Support Enforcement

SUBJECT: State of Virginia Booting Initiative

Prior to going on medical leave, Judge Ross asked me to follow-up with you regarding the State of Virginia's "booting" initiative. Attached you will find a paper prepared by Nick Young, the State IV-D Director, which describes the program background and its early results.

If you need any additional information, you can reach me at (202) 401-4030.

Thank you.

THEATER ROW BUILDING
730 EAST BROAD STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-1849

(804) 692-1944

FOR HEARING IMPAIRED
VOICE/TDD:
1-800-828-1120

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Clarence H. Carter
Commissioner

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

March 10, 1998

The Honorable David Gray Ross
Deputy Director, Office of Child Support Enforcement
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

Dear Judge Ross: Sir:

This replies to your call of March 2, relative to the Virginia "booting" initiative. I am pleased to provide some basic information about the origin and use of this additional tool in our enforcement kit.

The idea grew out of a collaboration between the Fairfax County Sheriff's Department and the Fairfax District Office of the Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE), building on the success of the County in using "Denver boots" to help stem an ever-increasing tide of delinquent personal property taxes on motor vehicles. The existing processes for seizure and sale of assets -- entailing lengthy time delays, extensive work by already-burdened law enforcement and court systems, and high costs of towing, moving, storing and securing the vehicles, not to mention prosecuting the owners -- were cumbersome and expensive.

Fairfax County decided to go to the boot, a device similar to those used throughout the country, though elsewhere mainly for parking enforcement. Fabricated of heavy steel with case-hardened locks, the boots come in various sizes allowing immobilization of any vehicle from a sub-compact to a tractor-trailer rig. In 1996 alone, the County collected more than $3,000,000 in delinquent personal property taxes using boots.

DCSE has a similar kind of problem with delinquent child support. While we do make extensive use of laws and procedures allowing the distraint, seizure and sale or levy of debtor assets, we face the same limitations as did Fairfax County. At the suggestion of the Sheriff's Department, accordingly, the Fairfax District Office began to explore using boots for child support collection enforcement, as a variant of the existing processes. If there exists authority to seize, tow and sell a car, surely booting it in place is supportable and arguably less intrusive.

District office procedures insure proper notice to debtors, with multiple safeguards to insure due process. After a lien has been filed in the appropriate jurisdiction, a levy request is forwarded to the Sheriff of the jurisdiction where the vehicle is physically located. Obviously, full cooperation

of local law enforcement agencies is vital. Sheriff's Deputies locate the vehicle and immobilize it with an appropriate boot, usually attached to the left front wheel (though the device works on any wheel). A weather-proof label is attached to the driver's side window advising that the vehicle has been immobilized and providing instructions as to who to call to resolve the delinquency (see the enclosed sample).

Common-sense precautions to be observed include making sure the right vehicle is booted through checking the Vehicle Identification Number (VIN), obtainable from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), since tags are easily switched. The Deputy Sheriff will generally have DMV records available on-line in his/her cruiser, or at least have a print-out on hand.

It probably could go without saying that the actual booting should be done only by the appropriate law enforcement personnel, since they not only have the authority but also the ability and training to deal with volatile situations, should those arise. DCSE staff need not be present, unless the Sheriff's Department requests it.

Experience shows that the debtor's driveway is generally the best location for booting, both for vehicle safety and maximum incentive to pay the outstanding child support debt. Some jurisdictions have ordinances prohibiting seized vehicles on public streets, and booting in public-access areas like shopping mall parking lots could lead to trespass issues. As DCSE is developing procedures for the statewide application of this tool, these and other considerations are being taken into account.

In addition to any general or local restrictions, procedures must be crystal-clear as to all related activities. For example, criteria for what will constitute an acceptable payment plan for authorization of boot removal must be in place. Where a finance lien exists on the vehicle, the lien holder must be notified, and equity positions must be determined and followed. This could result in various outcomes, even including the debtor's having to refinance the vehicle loan or borrow elsewhere to enable the payment of his/her child support debt and regain his/her vehicle.

Public acceptance, and associated media attention, have been excellent. Custodial parents see the program as benefitting their children. Some non-custodial parents seem to fear loss of their vehicles, and public embarrassment, as sufficient motivation to pay up after all prior efforts to achieve their compliance have failed. It is worth noting that since the boots belong to DCSE, they are clearly labeled and painted in a distinctive color: that plus the car-window label leave no doubt as to why the vehicle has been booted.

Though this initiative is new, early financial recovery results are also exciting. Four boot applications in the Fairfax area alone netted some $12,000 -- far in excess of our total expenditures on the process to date.

I am also enclosing a flier from Palma Auto-Boot of Gaithersburg, MD, the maker of the boots we have bought so far. For the initial efforts in Fairfax County, we bought 17 boots of various sizes at a unit cost of $350. The unit consists of the boot, a case-hardened padlock and a ratchet/socket tool for attaching and removing it. The tools are interchangeable, and we have had all boots keyed alike so that as we buy more (which we have and are continuing to do), we can easily move them anywhere in the state without worrying about whether the keys will fit. The boots come primed, but the buyer has to arrange for painting and, if desired, labeling. We have had some of them painted by an auto body shop, and others by a state facility. Weather-proof labels can be developed through state print shops or purchased locally (in fact, we have had one situation where a local merchant was so enthusiastic about the initiative that he provided the labels as a public service!).

Virginia is as enthused as that merchant about the potential for this tool. It does not fix every problem, but with local support and careful coordination, it can surely help. For further information, might I suggest that interested child support enforcement agencies get in touch with our Fairfax District Manager, who worked hand in glove with her local Sheriff to develop the idea and bring it to fruition. Her name and address are:

Ms. Loretta Swope
District Manager, Division of Child Support Enforcement
Fairfax Office Park
3953 Pender Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030
e-mail: swope4@juno.com

Thank you for this opportunity to share our positive experiences and high hopes for this initiative.

Sincerely,

YR

Nathaniel L. Young, Jr.
Director, Division of Child Support Enforcement

Enclosures

c: DCSE Executive Team
Ms. Loretta Swope

Commonwealth of Virginia
Divison of Child Support
Enforcement

WARNING

DO NOT MOVE THIS VEHICLE

AN IMMOBILIZING DEVICE HAS BEEN ATTACHED TO A WHEEL

THIS VEHICLE HAS BEEN SEIZED BY THE SHERIFF FOR UNPAID CHILD SUPPORT

CONTACT
DCSE
AT (703) 934-0397
FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THIS SEIZURE