Matrix 3 Winter 2001 Edition

METHODS OF ACQUIRING FAMILY VIOLENCE INFORMATION MATRIX 3

	ONGOING IV-D ACQUISITION OF FV INFORMATION						ONGOING NON IV-D ACQUISITION OF FV INFORMATION				
STATE	VICTIM	GC SRC	PO REG	PO MAN	OTHER/COMMENTS	VICTIM	PO REG	PO MAN	OTHER/COMMENTS		
Alabama	Х					Х		Х			
Alaska	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
Arizona	Х			Х		Х		Х			
Arkansas	Х	Х						Х			
California	Х	Х		Х		Х					
Colorado	Х				Other = CPS agency	Х					
Connecticut	Х					Х					
Delaware	Х	Х		Х	Other = IV-D knowledge	Х		Х			
District of Columbia	Х	Х			PO = Undecided	Х			PO = Undecided		
Florida	Х					Х					
Georgia	Х					Х					
Guam					Unavailable				Unavailable		
Hawaii	Х	Х				Х					
ldaho	Х	Х	Х			Х	Х				
Illinois	Х		Х				Х				
Indiana	Х	Х		Х				Х			
lowa	Х	Х	Х		CPS reg & IV-D knowledge	Х	Х		CPS reg		
Kansas	Х			Х		Х		Х			
Kentucky			Х	Х			Х	Х			
Louisiana	Х					Х					
Maine		Х		Х	IV-D knowledge	Х		Х			
Maryland	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
Massachusetts	Х	Х	Х			Х	Х				
Michigan	Х	Х		Х	IV-D knowledge; UIFSA Nondiscl.			х	Address Conf.; UIFSA Nondiscl.		
Minnesota	Х	Х		Х	UIFSA Nondiscl.			Х	UIFSA Nondiscl.		
Mississippi	Х	Х						Х			
Missouri	Х	Х	Х		CPS agency	Х	Х				

Table 3 – Grid VICTIM

GC SRC PO REG PO MAN

- The State relies on the at-risk person to inform the IV-D agency and/or court of the safety concern.
- In TANF cases, information regarding potential risk comes from the entity receiving Good Cause requests and/or making Good Cause decisions. The SCR currently (or very soon) will interface with an automated protective order registry.
- The IV-D agency and/or child support court receives notice of orders with protection provisions from the victim or the issuing court.
- Initial load to the FCR.

Matrix 3 Winter 2001 Edition

METHODS OF ACQUIRING FAMILY VIOLENCE INFORMATION MATRIX 3 (CONTINUED)

		ONGOING IV-D ACQUISITION OF FV INFORMATION					ONGOING NON IV-D ACQUISITION OF FV INFORMATION				
STATE	VICTIM	GC SRC	PO REG	PO MAN	OTHER/COMMENTS	VICTIM	PO REG	PO MAN	OTHER/COMMENTS		
Montana	Х	Х						Х			
Nebraska		Х			Ct. discretion				Ct. discretion		
Nevada	Х	Х			IV-D knowledge	Х					
New Hampshire	Х				IV-D knowledge			Х			
New Jersey		Х		Х					St. discretion		
New Mexico	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
New York	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
North Carolina	Х	Х				Х					
North Dakota	Х	Х			UIFSA Nondiscl.	Х					
Ohio		Х		Х	CPS agency			Х	CPS agency		
Oklahoma		Х		Х	Others under consideration			Х	Others under consideration		
Oregon	Х	Х		Х	IV-D knowledge	Х			Clerk knowledge		
Pennsylvania	Х				Others under consideration	Х			Others under consideration		
Puerto Rico	Х	Х						Х			
Rhode Island	Х	Х				Х					
South Carolina				Х				Х			
South Dakota				Х				Х			
Tennessee				Х				Х			
Texas	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
Utah		Х		Х	IV-D knowledge; UIFSA Nondiscl.			Х			
Vermont	Х	Х		Х	UIFSA Nondiscl.	Х		Х	UIFSA Nondiscl.		
Virgin Islands					Undecided				Undecided		
Virginia	Х		Х			Х	Х				
Washington	Х					Х					
West Virginia	Х					Х					
Wisconsin	Х	Х		Х		Х		Х			
Wyoming	Х								Undecided		

Table 3 - Grid

VICTIM GC SRC PO REG PO MAN

- The State relies on the at-risk person to inform the IV-D agency and/or court of the safety concern.

 In TANF cases, information regarding potential risk comes from the entity receiving Good Cause requests and/or making Good Cause decisions.
- The SCR currently (or very soon) will interface with an automated protective order registry.

 The IV-D agency and/or child support court receives special notice of orders issued in the State and with protection provisions.
- Initial load to the FCR.