

Child Support Advisory Committee Meeting

July 14, 2020 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Healthcare and Family Services (HFS)

By teleconference

Committee Members Present via phone:

Darryl Apperton, Maria Barlow, Maggie Bennett, Turyia Clay (for The Honorable Dorothy Brown), The Honorable Kelly Burke, Trent Cameron, Dr. Kirk Harris, Juanita Sanders and LaTanya Law-Fontain (for Secretary Grace Hou), Elizabeth Lingle, Christina Mahoney, The Honorable Sidney Mathias, Nicole McKinnon, Phil Mohr, Jessica Patchik, Christine Raffaele, Vickie Smith, Derrick White, Richard Zuckerman

Committee Members Absent:

Howard Feldman, The Honorable La Shawn Ford, Geraldine Franco, The Honorable Lindsay Parkhurst, Honorable Judge Pamela Loza, The Honorable Judge Charles Smith

HFS Staff Present via phone:

Ralph Abt, Mary Bartolomucci, Irene Curran, Hilary Felton, Gina Hemphill, Daun Perino, Sean Rosenthal, Sharon Shapiro, and Bryan Tribble

Public Guests: Ian Mitchell, John Furbee, General Parker, Rodney Hodge, Annette Bannon, Michael Gerhardt, Sheila Mannix, Sally Kolb and Richard Thomas

- **Welcome to CSAC members – Richard Zuckerman**

- Roll call of committee members – Richard Zuckerman
- Introduction of state employees and members of the public
- All committee members, attendees and members of the public were asked to announce their name before speaking and to mute their phone if they are not speaking.
- Approval of April 8, 2020 meeting notes
Motion made to approve. Motion was seconded, Notes were passed.

- **COVID-19 – Mary Bartolomucci**

Talked about COVID issues that she had given an update on during the last CSAC meeting. We have resumed serving bank liens, but on a case by case basis. We have not started with drivers license to the extent of what we are doing as we have noticed those that are in second suspension status. We had Senate Bill 1473 pass last August to remove the requirement to pay in full for second suspension. We wanted to send that letter out to the population of people and let them know that was no longer in effect. They can contact us so that we can work with them on getting their license back. With the pandemic, we have been hit with courthouse closures and the inability to do genetic testing. It is affecting our KPI's. The biggest one affected so far is paternities. If we fall below 90% on that then we could be sanctioned. We have asked for the President to declare a nationwide emergency under the Stafford Disaster Relief Act. Illinois has submitted a lengthy request in all kinds of areas to ask for flexibility in those things. They are approving a lot of them. We have not heard back yet from Illinois. We asked for a lot of things. We are hoping that we can get some kind of relief under that act.

- **Current Status of Courts – Daun Perino**

Gave an update on those things that our office is working on. The last time we met she talked about the modification process and that we were working with our legal partners and the judiciary to see what we could do to address a potential increase in requests for modification as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. We were able to work with our partners through Maximus. We have been able to develop a more expedited way to address or review and adjustment process and procedure. Originally there was more of a paper process. We have now moved more toward an electronic process. We are also working with our program department within HFS to make changes internally, so we are able to review these cases that are coming in on a weekly basis as apposed to a longer timeframe. We have also worked with our legal partners for them to accept these referrals from Maximus electronically. All our legal partners, the AG and the SAO with the exception of one have agreed to accept electronic referrals. This will speed up the process. We also worked with AOIC to try to address the issue of retroactively. They think that this is an issue that needs to be addressed by the legislature. Stimulus funds have been added into regular unemployment. There have been some changes in the courts that have been made during the pandemic. Many were closed to child support matters. It depends on where you are located in the state as to how your issues are being handled. It seems like the further south you are the more access you have to the courts. In central Illinois you are seeing some in person court. The further north you go nearly everything is being done electronically through Zoom, Skype etc. Christina Mahoney from the Attorney General's Office and Jessica Patchik from the DuPage County States Attorney's Office also spoke.

- **Christina Mahoney – Attorney General's Office**

The most in person hearings are happening in the southern districts. There are only one or two counties that are seeing clients. In the southern districts it appears that there is a two to three month backlog. They have not been able to address as many cases in the court calls as the counties that are using Zoom. The Northern districts are close to being caught up. In our larger counties we are about a month away from catching up. Most of our courts are Zoom, with the exception of our smaller counties that are mostly in person. Special districts are mixed between Zoom and in person. Some of the problems that we have seen with the in person at the beginning of this was that many court rooms really were not abiding by social distancing, wearing masks and keeping the population of the court room within the guidelines. Many of those courts then began to use Zoom. Now that there is a 50-person limit many of these calls are successful by using Zoom. The big obstacle with our counties was maintaining the standards. People have adjusted to Zoom hearings and many of the Judges that were apposed to it early on have adapted. A lot of the pro se population are thankful for Zoom. They are able to attend their hearing via Zoom on a break from work rather than having to take the day off to go to court. This may be helpful in reducing default numbers.

- **Jessica Patchik – States Attorney's Office**

In March the goal was how we were going to reopen. The plan that the presiding of Domestic Relations came up with was that we were no longer going to have the traditional court calls. Instead we were limited to fourteen individual timeslots using Zoom. When we were told that we had to continue to use Zoom we had to convert all in-person court dates to Zoom dates. We have been sending out a

Zoom notice letting people know that the courthouse is closed and that they must participate remotely and must provide an email address in order to participate in proceedings. Failure to participate would result in a default judgement being served. We are getting a great response to this. It is now Zoom until further order. We can do in person hearings in the afternoons for exigent issues. Regarding the backlog we are setting dates in August and starting to go into September.

- **Genetic Testing & Paternity – Christine Towles & Irene Curran**

Christine Towles - Getting paternity established has been a challenge with COVID shutdowns and social distancing. We have not been able to get paternity orders in court until recently or get genetic testing done for our administrative orders. The number of completed voluntary acknowledgment of paternity forms from hospitals has gone down because of the restrictions at the hospitals. We are coming up with alternate ways to reach that population. Our Paternity Establishment Liaisons are reaching out to our community partners to find safe locations for our workers to conduct genetic testing for parents and also to refer those families that they encounter that need paternity established to us. We are encouraging them to get the word out to help us locate parents who have not established paternity yet. They may need assistance with genetic testing or completing a VAP. Our field staff are identifying families as well. We are also in the process of exploring the possibility of working with our sister division to reach out to families that did not have the opportunity at the birth of their child to establish paternity. Our genetic testing vendor is also trying to find a sight to conduct testing.

Irene Curran – We are working with the courts to get the genetic testing. A lot of the testing had been done in the courts. We have not been able to do the genetic testing due to the courts being closed. We are working very closely with the courts and with our genetic contract person to come up with a plan so that we can get back into court to do the genetic testing. If we are not going to do them in the courts, then we are going to look for other safe places to do them. We are looking to get those DNA tests done quickly and safely.

- **Quadrennial Review Discussion – Bryan Tribble**

We have worked to put together a collection of our ideas from which we are going to determine our scope for our Quadrennial Review. A document was sent out to the committee members that had all the ideas that the members shared over the last couple of months. We have undertaken the projects that are going to be more long term. We are coming up with guiding principles. These are very valuable because a lot of times as the project goes on, we find ourselves outside of what was supposed to be our original goal and what we wanted to achieve. Some general suggestions and comments were put together that we could formulate into the guiding principles for our review.

General Suggestions or Comments Regarding the Quadrennial Review

- Our goal should be to achieve balance in our guidelines where parents are contributing to the care of their children, and no one is being harmed.
- Guidelines should be established in such a way that they always result in a fair and equitable award, based on discernable facts, so that debt is prevented from accruing, and the negative impact to individuals, and the family, is minimized.
- We cannot fail to adequately consider the impact of the guidelines on the recipient of support.

- We should be thoughtful and strategic regarding the changes we make during this quadrennial review as a means of controlling the variables and to allow us to further assess the effectiveness of the guidelines.

It was decided that we would take each of these suggestions and comments and go through them one by one.

1. Our goal should be to achieve balance in our guidelines where parents are contributing to the care of their children, and no one is being harmed.
 - Dr. Kirk Harris stated that this incorporates the idea that parents must work together and contribute in their own perspective ways to the outcome for the child. In doing this there should be no harm to either of the parents. If we fail to do this, it could be detrimental to the child.
 - Annette Bannon (member of the public) asked if the handout was available online so that she could look at it as we talked about it. It was not attached online to the agenda. It was stated that it will be posted online following the meeting.
2. Guidelines should be established in such a way that they always result in a fair and equitable award, based on discernable facts, so that debt is prevented from accruing, and the negative impact to individuals, and the family, is minimized.
 - Dr. Harris said that this one is very much linked to the first goal because the question about discernible facts as it relates to default orders and the setting of the right sizing of child support obligation as well as how it may relate to opportunities for individuals. The system must allow them to accurately set these orders. It is critical because there is not always a direct link between orders that are set and the ability for individuals to pay that order. This is critical in fair and equitable award. These are operating principles that we need to address. The obligor and the custodial parent are operating in some kind of familiar unit. In seeing this unit as a whole and not just people that are connected to each other by financial responsibility, we can get to a much more family strengthening approach that recognizes that the family dynamic is essential to improving the outcomes of children.
3. We cannot fail to adequately consider the impact of the guidelines on the recipient of support.
 - Dr. Harris commented that fundamentally if we don't look at the trauma and tribulations of the custodial parent then we haven't effectively done our job.
 - Vicki Smith agrees with Dr. Harris. She wants us to be very clear that when she reads this sentence her interpretation was that the recipient of the support is the child or the children. That is what the support is for. What we are really talking about here is the children. She is wondering if we shouldn't clarify that.
 - Dr. Harris stated that we are talking about the children.
 - Vickie Smith agrees, but said that this is where the bone of contention often occurs. We need to be really clear that child support

is for children. By being completely clear about that then we are not creating situations or adding to the contention between the payor and the payee.

- Bryan Tribble thinks that we could work on the wording.
- Mary Bartolomucci agreed with Vickie that there is that perception out there.
- Richard Zuckerman stated that he thinks that he understands what Vickie is saying. Use the word recipient. Lots of payors think that the recipient is the person that they are giving the money to not the children that are being supported by the money. That can be read both ways.

4. We should be thoughtful and strategic regarding the changes we make during this quadrennial review as a means of controlling the variables and to allow us to further assess the effectiveness of the guidelines.
 - Richard Zuckerman asked that Bryan break this down.
 - Bryan Tribble said that the underlying comment was that people wanted to make sure that we weren't making too many changes at one time because we just undertook a huge change in the guidelines by changing from percentage of obligor income to the income shares model. That just went into effect in July of 2017. We are two and a half years into this. This may not have been enough time for us to see the impact. We may not have seen all the aspects of the guidelines play out. By continuously changing the variables it might make it more difficult in the future to isolate any issues.
 - Maggie Bennett – Suggested that we add the word transparent in there. We should be thoughtful, strategic and transparent regarding the changes we make during this quadrennial.
 - Dr. Harris said that this makes sense to a point. If we are trying to achieve the other goals and we need to do some things with the system that is trying to take a path that historically has not been taken and which it needs to adopt a new set of touchpoints of understanding a more holistic and family centered approach. There may be instances where we need to do more to meet our objectives.
 - Bryan Tribble agrees that we could work on the language of this dot point.
 - Dr Harris suggested that if we do have to make changes that we add a level of vigilance in tracking those changes in result associated with the change.
 - Richard Zuckerman asked specifically what we had in mind when talking about variables.
 - Bryan Tribble – In four more years we know that we are going to have another quadrennial review. This one will conclude at the end of next year. Every time we need a change instead of looking at all

the changes, it makes it more difficult to do a root cause analysis and to be able to make a determination as to what the contributing factors were.

- Mary Bartolomucci asked if it would help to add the current guidelines.
- Bryan Tribble – As a general idea with us developing guiding principles for our quadrennial review is there general agreement that this is worthwhile work? We need to look at the comments that we receive today to get this into something that is more clearly stated and is something that everyone will be able to understand the intent of the committee as this work continues.
- Dr. Harris said that he thinks everything will be cleared up once the changes that we talked about are made.
- Bryan Tribble wants to make sure that everyone saw value in developing these principles and using them to guide the review.
- Richard Zuckerman – Does not see that these principles are set in stone. They may be subject to some slight modification.
- Maggie Bennett – A lot of problems that she sees in her practice that involves child support are lack of communication and that some don't understand the child support program. They think that they payed, but didn't or they think that the IWO follows them just like federal and state withholding taxes to a new job. Could we have something about the use of technology to better facilitate communication with families who participate in the child support program? People are gladly giving their email address which allows the DuPage County Child Support program to move forward faster and better. We are seeing this with Zoom now too. Technology in the next four years is going to play a very important role in the child support program and the improvement of the program. Communicating with families effectively would enhance the program. So many people don't understand it.
- Mary Bartolomucci – Agrees with what is being said. This is where we are moving to. When we talk about the new system, we have tried but money has always been an issue. We have known that we need to expand upon technology. That is what we are looking at with excitement with the new system. Christine Towles is also working with the various clerks' offices. Anything that we can automate and expand customer service, we are all for. We will be looking for any chance to do that.
- Dr. Harris stated that as technology emerges as an opportunity, we must remember that it is not equally available to everyone. As we create these new opportunities, we must remind ourselves of that again there are inequalities that make the distribution of access to

technology limited in too many communities. We do not want to recreate in a new context the same kind of problems.

- Mary Bartolomucci – We do not want to cut off a means from some people, but we want to expand where people are able to use technology.
- Bryan Tribble – As he is hearing this, he is wondering how it connects to our quadrennial review and to the guidelines themselves. He thinks that the idea is great and wonders if that is not an opportunity for another sub-committee. He would be happy to draft something and asked that Maggie send him some proposed language. He wants to make sure that this is within the scope of our guidelines or if it is outside of the scope of that and may be another task.
- Richard Zuckerman – In listening to the conversation he thinks that it might be something that we should be mindful of when we look at the changes and based on the principles that we are going to recommend to see how they would then play out in terms of the use of technology to either improve the system and access to the system. All those kinds of things and whether we need a separate subcommittee or some other mechanism to look at that. We need to drill down to the specifics of what changes we are going to recommend.
- Mary Bartolomucci – Wouldn't it also lend itself to the focus groups, as far as getting valuable feedback from them. Dr. Harris agreed with Mary. He also wants everyone to think about how things might be applied and how technology might facilitate that.
- Bryan Tribble – Is seeing it more clearly now. He asked Maggie if that was something that she would be willing to do. Maggie stated that she would be happy to do so. He asked if there were any other questions, comments or concerns regarding the guiding principles. He mentioned that he wanted to go to the bottom of page 4, it is under sub section H3. As a reminder that connects back to the code of Federal Regulations, 45CFR30256 H3. It states provide a meaningful opportunity for public input including input from low income custodial and non-custodial parents and their representatives. The state must also obtain the views and advice of the state child support agency funded under the title IV-D of the act. There are a couple of decision that are key for us to be able to complete the quadrennial review in a timely manner. The first is H3 that requires public input. Not just public input period, but meaningful opportunity for public input. The committee needs to decide if they put the public input before we go through and determine precisely what we want to change. If we want to put the public input after we have identified areas of change and then present those materials to

the public to get their input, guidance and direction or if we wanted to do before and after. That is a fundamental choice that guides some of our other decision that we must make throughout this process. This could be a good place for us to make some decisions.

- Vicky Smith would like to encourage that we start with public input. We can also talk about having it after as well. Hearing from the voices of those going through this and living with this will inform us much better as we look at what we think may be helpful. They could tell us upfront and then we use that to inform our process.
- Sidney Mathias agrees with Vickie. He thinks that we should have a before and after. The before is important rather than handing something out that appears to be done. This could make people feel that their input is not important. It is important to get their input first and work on it then get the reaction afterwards.
- Kirk Harris thinks that Vickie and Sidney are on target. Part of what we need to think about as we do this outreach is that this is not only trying to get some feedback. This is also relationship building. We really do what to understand how communities are impacted by policies and practices. We need to pen lines of communication. On the front end we can track their decisions and how their input enforce outcome. That becomes important in building the kind of trust and transparency becomes a part of the process. He mentioned that we should meet with the TANF people. We should build a relationship with TANF.
- Latanya Law from DHS and Wanita Sanders that has a long history of working with DHS and the TANF population. They are looking forward to working to try to come up with a better way to do things for the customers.
- Richard Zuckerman would like to look at this practically. In a pre COVID world we would have had about fifteen months to do these meetings. Depending on how many we decide to do in Cook and the colers, that would not have been a lot of time. We do not know what is going to happen with COVID. It is more difficult for people to get to these meetings. We need to be aware of trying to schedule these meetings and schedule them as much and as quickly as possible and still deal with the realities that we are living in a COVID-19 world at this point. That could restrict some of our efforts to have live in person feedback large groups that we would hope would come out to give us their feedback. Unfortunately, a practical consideration that we must look at.
- Kirk Harris – He thinks that we need to reengineer that decision. As a small organization he has had more success in the COVID situation to convene people than he did before. He thinks that we should reinvasion what we mean by having a public meeting.

- Richard Zuckerman – We also do not want to cut people out that do not have the technology in order to be able to participate. We are looking at the time that we have and the meetings that we need to hold. We need to make sure that everyone in the state has the opportunity to be involved if they wish to do so.
- Kirk Harris – Maybe part of the conversation when meeting with TANF folks is for them to discuss what that would like and how that would work. That may be a good point of discussion when we meet. That may be a good discussion point.
- Bryan Tribble – There is another factor that we must decide on who will be moderating these sessions; members of the committee, the department or is this going to be a procurement. We must make a decision on whether we are going to do this ourselves or whether we are going to procure. That is not a short process. We will likely lose the rest of 2020 for procurement. Then if we want to do the before and the after. We must know what we want and how we are going to do it. We need to decide very quickly on those things because time is of the essence.
- Kirk Harris – Thinks that a facilitator would be best and that it would be better if it were someone outside. We want to make sure that the structure the facilitation is that people are feeling comfortable and open. Not sure what the implications of getting a procurement are. If it could take months and that would take off our ability to participate then there is a concern.
- Mary Bartolomucci – It will be a very timely process. If we are wanting to start with the focus groups first, we will have to get through the procurement process and that will delay the quadrennial review. We have asked for flexibility under the Stafford Act. We do not have a response back on that. We have asked if additional time could be granted for the review to be done. Doing a procurement will definitely stall the beginning of starting all of this. It sounds like most people felt like we should do this before and after too. We do not want to be disingenuous in getting peoples opinions before we did something, meanwhile drafting something behind the scenes. We would be putting the review on the shelf while we went through the procurement process and eventually awarded the contract. The before could be conducted by the committee or members of the department and the after could be something that would be done through a procurement.
- Richard Zuckerman – We could get started with the committee while the procurement process was going on then see if there is any difference. It depends on what we have in terms of our membership that feels comfortable and has the ability to lead this kind of discussion.

- Maggie Bennett – In 2010 when we voted to become an income shares state the Child Support Advisory Committee met and voted on that. The public was invited. Afterward the committee went around and held public hearings to get input. We did it ourselves. Richard said that it was that way with the family law study committee. Maggie explained that they had a moderator and a chair, and had people come to make comments. They had experts in the area that would present. It worked out very well. Jessica said that Daun Perino was the one that planted the seed of suggesting that maybe we do a questionnaire or survey to litigants when they leave the courtroom. That is a fabulous opportunity to get info from people as well. We would be comfortable asking for input. Maybe the AG's would feel comfortable with it. When people leave court, many are more than willing to tell you about their experience. Some are not. That might be an easy way for us to get information.
- Kirk Harris – We need to make sure that outreach happens to make sure that we are reaching into those communities that are most affected. Part of this is not just the facilitation. It is also the affective outreach. We want to be sure that they are heard.
- Richard Zuckerman – There could be a general call for people to come and there could be targeted specific areas and neighborhoods, whatever way we want to break it down that are specifically invited and notified regarding the process. It depends on where you are.
- Mary Bartolomucci – Did the Shriver Center do something like this? Who took over for Margret Stapleton? Patrice James replaced her. Kirk Harris is planning to meet their CEO. That may be a question that he could ask.
- Richard Zuckerman – Asked Bryan if he has enough input on this to go forward with what may be an outline with what we want to do regarding obtaining public input.
- Bryan Tribble – It was not clear on whether we decided on before and after or just before or where we landed as far as who is going to conduct the outreach. Is there a way that we could have a motion for a vote?
- Kirk Harris – Recommended according to what he heard, that we do a before and after. Maybe the before work could start with committee members while we are starting the process for procurement and then we also identify potential other partners who might be willing to serve that roll as facilitator in their community for this reason because the subject matter is so relevant to their constituents. There are multiple things that we can do to get us started. Recommended that we do before and after. We start looking for other community partners that would be willing to facilitate session while we start the procurement process to ensure that we get

the fullest and most robust outcome that would include data collection.

- Richard Zuckerman – Interpreted Kirk’s comments as a motion. Kirk agrees that it was a motion. Richard asked for a second. Sidney Mathias seconded.
- Mary Bartolomucci – For clarification, is there going to be a subcommittee that will be starting the front-end process of the discussion on formulating how we are going to start this and then we will go back and work with procurement to start looking into the process. Look at RFP’s from other states that we can look into.
- Richard Zuckerman – We talked about how we are going to implement this once we have adopted or not adopted the motion. Wants to vote on the motion first and then talk about implementation. He asked for a vote. All were in favor. None opposed. The motion has passed. This goes back to how we are going to implement this. We need to figure out the fastest way we can to go ahead and start working on the implementation. We have about 15 months with time allowed to absorb the recommendation and come out with a recommendation by December 31, 2021. We need to get rolling on this as soon as possible within the limits of what we have to work with at this time. Any input? Kirk Harris offered his assistance.
- Richard Zuckerman - Asked for volunteers to put together the program for at least a structure for implementing this proposal. Volunteers are Juanita Harris, Jessica Patchik, Christina Mahoney, Maggie Bennett, Kirk Harris, Christine Raffaele and Richard Zuckerman. Judge Brown may want to participate. We need to make sure that we reach the southern end of the state. Bryan Tribble and Christine Towles can assist.
- Bryan Tribble – A decision needs to be made regarding the section titled Possibly Necessary Procurements. There are two ideas that came forward. The first was that this body does not have the expertise to conduct the review and compile the results in accordance with each one. We already decided that we would need to procure the services of an economist. This does match up with what we have done in the past. The second thing is if we want to find a second economist such as the one responsible for the Alice research who can look at each one through a different lens with a focus on the costs associated with lower income families. Kirk Harris thinks that this would be exceptional and that this info could be critical. He thinks that there is an emerging body of research that gives us better insight than the federal guidelines do in terms of what it takes for families. Bryan Tribble does not feel that there is enough time to discuss this. He could circulate the question via email and

there can be a decision made to determine if there needs to be a special meeting. Richard Zuckerman suggested that we may want to do that in the next week. There is also a matter of the actual economics of the finances of the procurement and the fact that there is probably a limited pool of people that would be available to do either of these economic studies. Getting the RFP out needs to be done ASAP. We need to stay on a timeline until we know for sure that the timeline is going to be accepted. Richard agrees that Bryan can circulate his question via email and give a one-week deadline for comments or suggestions. It can be analyzed very quickly and we can decide if we have enough information to make a request for funding to be able to do that through HFS and go from there.

- Richard Zuckerman – The Quadrennial review is going to be a long process and these meetings are going to take all their time if not more.

- **Old/New Business – Committee Members**

No old business. Kirk Harris had new business. He thinks that there is an opportunity with the quadrennial review, to look more up stream to avoid the accumulation of debt that has been the subject of the clean slate remedy. He thinks that we still want to consider the Clean Slate programing and figure out what we are going to do. From his view Clean Slate is not off the table. Richard Zuckerman stated that it was duly noted for the record.

- **Public Comment**

- **Ian Mitchel** from Texas. His case is out of St. Clair County. He commented about Vicky Smith's comment that child support is for the benefit of the children. He wanted to make it very clear that it is not.
- **Sally Kolb** from Champaign
Richard introduced her as the new Chair of the Family Law Section of the Illinois State Bar Association. As part of their section council duties they have been getting some push back or concern from members about the fact that they can withhold and process through SDU maintenance provided there is a child support component to it, but that they can't do so otherwise. She wants to know if there is anyone that they could meet with at SDU or otherwise that could maybe help them understand that a little bit and try to figure out why that is and if there is anything, they can do about that. Mary Bartolomucci said that this has been asked many times and is currently by state law that we can't do maintenance only. It also would be an additional cost to the state. It would be an additional duty of the clerks. They would have to work with each other. They would have to enter the information. You can't comingle those cases. There would have to be system changes to the SDU. It is more complicated than just excepting the maintenance payments. There are a lot of system changes and money would have to be involved. Also, the system that we are procuring does not take the maintenance only payments at their SDU. We have a lot of info on why this will not work for

us. We can always talk about it. This is just high level. Sally would like to meet with someone in the SDU. This will be facilitated.

- **General Parker**, Peoria Illinois

He is concerned about child support data. Richard Zuckerman clarified that we had a small data sample and that he did not say that we didn't have any data. It has only been three years since we implemented income shares so in relation for example, when we had our statutory maintenance based on percentage it is a small sample of data, but we certainly have data regarding what has occurred since July 1, 2017. Mr. Parker is asking if that is enough data to reach conclusions for the quadrennial. The point that Richard was making was that there was not twenty years of experience, it was only three. Mr. Parker said that a lot of things have changed. A lot more woman are working now and making more money than men. He thinks that we need to keep up with the times. He sees that there are a lot of people hurting because of these guidelines. He is one of them himself. He said a lot of people didn't know that they could get their license reinstated. He suggested public service announcements so people know that they can get their license reinstated. It was explained that we are sending out correspondence to all those cases and that we are reaching out to all the individuals in that situation. He mentioned stimulus checks and people not coming in for modification because the unemployment will put them back up where they were in the beginning. He also said that he heard that if you owe arrears you wouldn't get your stimulus check. Daun Perino explained that it was not with respect to the stimulus payments. It had to do with additional funds that the federal government was providing for unemployment benefits. Mr. Parker said that it was a grosse mistake to keep the stimulus checks. He said that he has never seen us be fair about child support. He commented about what Ian said about Vicky Smith's statement, he doesn't think that it should be put in there. If there are committees later on that let the public in or especially low-income people, he would like to be considered for that. He thinks that we need to hear from the people that are really going through it and that we need to hear from the public before we do the guidelines, not after. After is too late.

- **Annette Bannon**

She would appreciate it if the documents that are talked about at the meetings would be available to them online prior to the meetings. As for the quadrennial review, #3 is about recipient. She is wondering why we are not just using the word child or children. The wording should be centered around the children. The clearer we are the better. #4 talking about there being a lot of change. For her change can't be fast enough when there have been poor processes in the past that have really affected generations of children and therefor have been detrimental to families and society as a whole. She appreciates Maggie's enhancement using the word transparency. She is wondering if the CSAC has evolved in the past year so that they have parents on the committee. There was a comment that she thinks shows that not all comments are open to everyone's opinion. That needs to be thought about for whomever said that. Kirk Harris said that he said it. He tried to clarify that when he said professionals, he meant that too often the professionals that show up to these meetings because they are available to do so and the people that are the most affected aren't. Her point was that you must be careful with generalizations like that. She agrees that there needs to be feedback before and

after. She also thinks that the suggestion to get feedback when people are leaving court was excellent and that is the opportune time to talk to people and that we should reach out in all ways possible.

- **Dr. Sheila Mannix**, Illinois Family Court Accountability Advocates
She really appreciated the meeting and having it on the conference call. She has not been able to attend the meeting in a while. She was a little blown away by the conversation regarding the quadrennial review. The committee members that were here in 2014 may or may not be aware of the treatment of the public. It was completely opposite than what we saw today. She hopes that this is genuine. She is hoping that there is some kind of record or minutes, or something taken on what the public input is before and after. She is really encouraged. There are some people that have been sincere and genuine in trying to make things better and she really appreciates that. She is glad that someone brought up that the public didn't get the PDF. She stated that how can the public reasonably and meaningfully pursuant to federal guidelines participate and give input when they don't get the document. She asked what guiding principle 2 was. Richard read it. She stated that she founded the Illinois Family Court Accountability Advocates over 15 years ago and that she has collected a lot of data. She stated that she attempted to share her views of the Child Support program and the federal program back in 2014 at the last quadrennial review.

- **Closing**
Motion made to adjourn; motion seconded
- **Meeting Adjourned**