

Gambling Intercept Act How It Works For Child Support Enforcement

The numbers:

Amount intercepted through December 2008 is \$314,116.94 from 210 intercepts.
The intercept match rate is .45% and the average intercept amount is \$1,496.

2008	Number Intercepted	Amount	Average Amt.
July	41	\$60,833.08	\$1,483.73
Aug	49	\$60,408.59	\$1,232.83
Sept	31	\$39,883.79	\$1,286.57
Oct	29	\$77,541.24	\$2,673.84
Nov	29	\$42,981.18	\$1,482.11
Dec	31	\$32,519.06	\$1,049.00
Total	210	\$314,166.94	\$1,496.03

\$154,807 has gone to arrears due on cases where current support is also due.

\$77,320 has been paid to families on arrears only cases.

\$82,038 has been retained to pay back public assistance.

The process:

The Department of Revenue (DOR), Colorado Interactive and Child Support Enforcement (CSE) designed the interface to be as user friendly as possible.

When a person wins \$1200 at a slot machine, the casino worker goes to the winner and collects identification from the winner. The casino employee signs on to an Internet application and enters the winner's name, date of birth and social security number, the inquiry usually takes less than a minute and if there is no match it ends there and the winner is paid.

If there is a match, the casino worker is required to check the address that is supplied by CSE, if the winner provided a different address the worker enters the new address. They then print a receipt and the CSE Notice regarding the right to an Administrative Review and proceed to inform the winner. Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-35-607(4) and DOR Rules, the casinos receive a \$15 fee for each intercept.

After the intercept is completed, an employee who has authorization to make payments from the casino bank account goes to a different screen where all unpaid intercepts are listed, clicks on the intercept they want to pay and then does an electronic funds transfer (EFT) to the Registry Operator. This does not have to be done at the time of the intercept but must be done within 24 hours of the intercept.

At the time of the intercept, the obligor is given a notice that they can request an Administrative Review within 30 days. They are given the option to waive that 30 days

and have the payment credited to their accounts immediately. 26 obligors have chosen to waive the 30-day period.

Other information:

35 payments have been sent to other states for two state (interstate) cases.

The largest intercept was for \$35,468. He actually won \$52,000 so he got money back. He went up 4 days later and won another \$12,000. The intercept paid off arrears on two cases, one case was an arrears only case and the other was for current support of a minor child. He had not paid on the current case in the last 3 years. Mom received \$7956 on 12/15. He is now paying current support and when I spoke to him, he was actually glad this happened, as the debt is now "off his back".

There are 19 obligors that have been intercepted more than once. One person has been intercepted 7 times for a total of \$9,585. His case is an arrears only case that started with \$16,037 in arrears. He continues to gamble! One female obligor has been intercepted 4 times. She is now paying her monthly support regularly.

One county had a gentleman walk into their office and pay off his arrears of \$8500. He was on his way to Blackhawk and did not want to be intercepted.

One casino had problems with their Internet connection. They did 3 inquires to the database and each time they lost the connection. After 15 minutes, they paid the obligor his entire winnings. A short time later, they received the match. They actually tracked the winner down in the casino and collected most of the winnings back from him.

A member of the CSE staff has talked with several casino workers in different casinos that are responsible for intercepting winnings. With out exception, they indicate that they "like" the intercept program. One actually said that it makes her feel like she is doing something meaningful.

My discussions with casino workers have also been positive. When I have occasion to talk with them their responses are that this is not a workload impact unless there is a match and that the process only takes a few minutes (one employee said less than a minute.)

Several other states are interested in passing similar laws. California and Maine are pursuing legislation this year. Michigan has requested information regarding our law. New Mexico has a law that went into effect Jan. 1, 2009 but they were not ready to implement it. They want to use our intercept as a template for theirs. I have sent a copy of the Act to at least 15 other states.