FAMILY SUPPORT FORUM

The Official Newsletter of the Illinois Family Support Enforcement Association

Vol. 10 **MAY - JUNE, 1998** **No. 2**

IDPA Responds to Payment Delays

by Thomas P. Sweeney

In May it was discovered that IDPA's efforts to "bring up" the KIDS statewide child support computer system caused many Illinois families to experience delays in receiving their support payments.

But IDPA's Division of Child Support Enforce-ment quickly responded to the problems by mobilizing a task force to alleviate client difficulties. "We believe the worst is behind us now," said DCSE Administrator Robert Lyons.

On June 9, 1998, the *Chicago Tribune* reported that child support checks for up to 45,000 families through-out Illinois had been delayed as much as three weeks because of computer problems at the Depart-ment of Public Aid. The delays involved thousands of dollars of support payments, the report said. Accord-ing to the article the problems were attributed to "the tedious task of combining 100 county computer systems into one database for the entire state."

Prior to the *Tribune* article, IDPA officials had acknowledged that processing of child support checks, which normally takes two days, had risen to three weeks "in some cases," but had already improved sig-nificantly. The problem arose when support payments had to be posted on the computer manually for some counties during the conversion to KIDS.

"We have hired temporary workers and redeployed regular employees to reduce the time for processing payments and to address individual problems being experienced by families waiting for child support payments," said Lyons. "The situation is temporary, and the delays should be eliminated soon."

As counties are converted to KIDS the payment processing will be automated and the number of families affected will be reduced, Lyons said.

Some delays had been experienced in 100 of Illinois' 102 counties, which have 40% of the state's caseload. Cook County, with 50% of the state's cases, was not expected to be affected during the conversion, and the impact in St. Clair County was expected to be lessened when conversion was completed in late-June.

DCSE staff have worked weekends to catch up with the manual postings needed, officials report. DCSE's client services unit was also strengthened to answer customer calls and provide help with landlords, utility companies and others awaiting payments. In one case a DCSE worker intervened for a mother to get a high school graduation cap and gown for her daughter. Another worker called a landlord to explain that a child support payment would be forthcoming, thus averting an eviction notice. In a third case a woman who was hospitalized had her phone service restored so she could talk with her children at home.

Families experiencing delays can call 877-852 6437 toll free to learn the status of their payments.

Plan Now to Attend!

IFSEAÁs 10th Annual Conference on Support Enforcement

October 18 , 20, 1998
Springfield, IL

Details in the next FORUM

- In This Issue -

FAMILY SUPPORT FORUM

is the official newsletter of the

ILLINOIS FAMILY SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 370
Tolono, IL 61880
published quarterly and distributed free to members of the Association.

Newsletter Editor
Thomas P. Sweeney
P. O. Box 370
Tolono, IL 61880
(217) 485-5302

The *FORUM* is published four times per year - in March, June, August (the conference preview issue), and December.
Items for publication are needed by the 8th of the month.
News items and other articles of interest to Illinois family support practitioners are eagerly sought.
Contact the Editor for details.

Please Contribute - its YOUR Newsletter!

From the Statehouse . . .
. . . LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

New Support Enforcement Legislation Sent to the Governor

by Thomas P. Sweeney

The following is a summary of legislation relevant to family support enforcement passed by the Illinois General Assembly and currently awaiting the Governor's signature. In several cases the bills passed differ substantially from how they appeared when summarized in the last issue of the *FORUM*. For specifics reference should be made to the bill itself. Other bills previously summarized are "dead."

Public Act numbers and effective dates will be provided in future issues of the *FORUM* when available.

S.B. 1700 sent to the Governor 6/18/98

a) **State Case Registry**. Adds new § 10-27 to the Public Aid Code (305 ILCS 5/10-27), requiring IDPA to establish and maintain an automated State Case Registry to satisfy federal welfare reform mandates.

The registry is to contain a minimum of the following information for all IV-D cases, and for *all* support orders (IV-D or non-IV-D) entered or modified after October 1, 1998: the names, dates of birth, residence and mailing addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers and driver's license numbers of both parents; the names, addresses and telephone numbers of both parents' employers; the names, dates of birth and social security numbers if available for children covered by the order; the case and other identification numbers; and "any other information that may be required under Title IV, Part D of the Social Security Act or regulations promulgated thereunder."

For IV-D cases the registry is to contain specifics as to support orders, payments due, payments received, distributions and liens filed. The registry is to monitor, update and exchange information with other agencies of this state as well as the federal and other state agencies to facilitate IV-D activities. The registry is to have safeguards against release of information to locate a party where there are orders of protection, evidence of domestic violence or child abuse, or where IDPA has reason to fear release of the information may result in physical or emotional harm to the party or child.

b) **Expanded Administrative Authority**.

- 305 ILCS 5/10-17.1 is amended to authorize administrative registration of another state's orders for both enforcement and modification (previously authority

(Cont'd. on page 4)

Clinton Signs "Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998"

On June 24, 1998, President Clinton signed into law new federal legislation that imposes tougher penalties for parents who repeatedly fail to support children living in another state or who flee across state lines to avoid paying child support..

"This bill today is a gift to our children and the future," President Clinton said at an Oval Office ceremony. "The quiet crisis of unpaid child support is something that our country and our families shouldn't tolerate. Our first responsibility, all of us, is to our children," Clinton said.

The "Deadbeat Parent's Punishment Act of 1998" (H.R. 38911) creates three categories of felony offenses for failure to pay child support. Willful failure to pay support for a child residing in another state, if such obligation has remained unpaid for more than one year or is greater than $5,000, may be punished by a fine and/or imprisonment for up to 6 months for a first offense and up to 2 years for a second or subsequent offense. If the obligation has remained unpaid for more than two years or is greater than $10,000, up to 2 years imprisonment may be imposed for any offense. Any person who "travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation, if such obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than 1 year, or is greater than $5,000" may also be punished by fine and/or imprisonment for up to 2 years. Upon conviction, restitution of all support owed at the time of sentencing shall also be ordered.

A copy of H.R. 3811 is reproduced on page 13.

("Legislative Up-date," cont'd. from page 3)

extended only to enforcement), under UIFSA.

- Deleted from 305 ILCS 5/10-17.7 is the exclusion of non-AFDC cases from the authority otherwise given to IDPA to determine contested cases of paternity administratively. Also removed is the availability of direct appeal to the court under § 2-1401 of an IDPA administrative parentage determination if obtained by default through service by publication.

- 305 ILCS 5/10-11 is amended to permit copies of administrative orders be sent to a responsible relative by regular mail if he appeared in person or was defaulted after being served by certified mail or personal service.

c) **Administrative Appeals**.

- 305 ILCS 5/10-12 is amended to provide that a responsible relative "aggrieved" by an administrative order or parentage determination may within 30 days petition IDPA for "relief from or modification of" the administrative order or determination. A man against who an administrative determination of paternity was entered by default may have it vacated if he appears in person at the IDPA office within 30 days and files a written request for relief; this relief is available only once, however.

- New § 10-12.1 (305 ILCS 5/10-12.1) is added to permit any person receiving child and spouse support services (i.e., a IV-D client) "aggrieved" by an administrative order or paternity determination to petition for release from or modification of that order or determination within 30 days of the mailing of notice. §§ 10-11, 10-13 and 10-14 are also amended to include IV-D clients as parties entitled to adminis-trative appeals.

- New § 10-14.1 (305 ILCS 5/10-14.1) is added to permit petitions for relief from an administrative order or paternity determination by responsible relatives or IV-D clients who did not appeal within 30 days. Either party may file a petition with IDPA within two years of the order, on the same grounds as are provided for relief from judgments under § 2-1401 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

d) **Redirection of Direct Payments**.

Deleted from several sections regarding support orders is the requirement that, when support is ordered to be paid directly to persons who are or become IV-D clients, those payments shall be redirected to the Clerk when the obligor or his payor is given notice by IDPA to do so.

e) **Income Withholding Changes**.

Amends the several income withholding sections:

- A definition is added for "business day;"

- Requires the Notice to Withhold to state the date of the support order upon which it is based;

- Requires the Notice to Withhold to contain the "signature of the obligee or the printed name and telephone number of the authorized representative of the public office. . .;"

- Clarifies that a copy of the Notice to Withhold be filed with the proof of service whenever it is served;

- No longer requires a "calculation of the period" and total amount of the delinquency be contained in a Notice to Withhold served after accrual of a delinquency; a mere statement of the delinquency total is sufficient.

f) **Vital Records Act Changes**.

§ 12 of the Vital Records Act (410 ILCS 535/12) is amended to allow the oral explanation of rights and responsibilities required to be given in connection with voluntary acknowledgment of paternity may be given through use of audio or video equipment, and to require that any rescission of the voluntary acknow-ledgment must be filed with IDPA within the time limitations provided in § 5 of the Parentage Act in order to void the acknowledgment and nullify the presumption of paternity.

g) **Child Support Information Act**. (5 ILCS 405/1, et seq.), requiring applicants for state employ-ment to declare if they have a child support order and the details about the order and any delinquency, is repealed.

To take effect upon becoming law.

S.B. 1259 sent to the Governor 6/12/98

"**Unadjudication of Parentage**." Amends §§ 7 and 8 of the Parentage Act to permit an action to determine the non-existence of the parent and child relationship to be brought by a man adjudicated to be the father pursuant to the presumptions in § 5 of the Parentage Act (i.e., as the result of marriage to the mother, legitimation through subsequent marriage to the mother and acknowledgment of parentage following the birth, or acknowledgment pursuant to § 10-17.7 of the Public Aid Code or § 12 of the Vital Records Act) if, as the result of DNA tests it is discovered that he is not the natural father of the child. If DNA results establish that he is not the father, the adjudication of paternity and any orders regarding custody, visitation and *future* support *may* be vacated.

An action to declare the non-existence of the parent and child relationship shall be barred six months after the effective date of this revision, or two years after the petitioner "obtains actual knowledge of relevant facts," whichever is later. The 2-year period shall not apply to periods of time when the mother refuses to submit to DNA tests, but the action may not be initiated after the child reaches the age of 18. The amendment does not suggest how or if a man adjudicated to be the father may compel the mother to submit to DNA tests once he obtains knowledge of facts to question his paternity.

To take effect upon becoming law.

H.B. 3048 sent to the Governor 6/5/98

Income Withholding for Support Act.

Consolidates into one new act provisions relating to withholding of income to pay orders for support

(Cont'd. on page 12)

Chicago Ordinance Proposed to Broaden City's Child Support Compliance Program

by Thomas P. Sweeney

On June 10, 1998, Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley introduced an ordinance into the City Council to expand the scope of the city's Child Support Compliance Program.

"Failure to pay child support is child neglect," said the Mayor in introducing the ordinance. "This program has improved the lives of hundreds of children and relieved the financial burden of their custodial parents. By expanding the scope of the program, we will be able to aid even more families," Daley said.

The proposed ordinance would allow the city's Department of Consumer Services, which coordinates the Child Support Compliance Program, to

- Require businesses to comply with withholding orders served on them against their employees. Any business that fails to do so could risk the loss of its city license, loan or contract.
- Review Water Department records to determine if an individual owns any property in the City of Chicago. The address of the property can also be used to assist in locating a "deadbeat" parent.
- Determine if any city employee who is about to receive a Worker's Compensation payment owes any outstanding child support. In the event money is owed, notification would be made to the Cook County State's Attorney's office or the attorney for the custodial parent so that a lien can be placed against the money.
- Investigate individuals who are seeking or have licenses issued by the Department of Buildings to make sure that their child support payments are current.

The city's Child Support Compliance Program has been in effect since July, 1996. Under the program a business whose "substantial owner" -- a holder of more than 25% interest in the business -- is found to owe an arrearage judgment may have its city operating license denied, revoked or not renewed unless the delinquency is cured. Compliance with all child support orders is also made a condition of employment by the city. An employee found to owe an arrearage is subject to discipline. Upon offer of employment applicants must submit an affidavit disclosing any unpaid child support obligations owed by the applicant. Any such delinquencies disclosed or discovered must be resolved, either by payment or entry into an agreed court order for payment, within six months; failure to resolve the situation may be grounds for discharge.

Under the program the Department of Consumer Services runs matches of city license holders and employees against child support delinquency records of the Circuit Clerk's office. In addition to initiating its own disciplinary action, the Department provides information about persons found to be delinquent to the State's Attorney's office and other state agencies involved in enforcement.

"Virtually every business is required to have a license to operate in the city, which have to be renewed every year," said Constance Buscemi of the Department of Consumer Services. The city Department of Revenue issues approximately 60,000 business licenses, covering almost any kind of business. There are approximately 22,000 licenses just for taxi, limo and charter bus operators. The city also has approximately 40,000 employees. "We search records for about 100,000 individuals each year," Buscemi reported.

Employees of the Chicago Park District, Chicago Transit Authority, Board of Education and Chicago Housing Authority are not covered by the program.

The program extends to applicants for loans or contracts with the city. All loan applicants and contract bidders must submit an affidavit disclosing whether any of their substantial owners (here defined as holding more than a 10% interest in the entity) are delinquent on any court-ordered child support arrearages. Loans are to be denied unless prior to closing the applicant shows proof he has satisfied the arrearage or entered into a court-approved payment agreement. Any misrepresentation may result in the applicant being barred from receiving city loans for three years. If a contract bidder has a delinquency or has made a misrepresentation that contractor may have his bid increased by 8% or be declared an unreliable bidder and may be ineligible for additional city contracts for a period of three years.

Since its inception the program has either collected or identified for collection more than $1 million in delinquent child support which was owed on behalf of 543 children. More than 16,200 individuals have been investigated through the program.

"The goal of this program is clear -- pay your child support. Non-custodial parents must understand that simply because they leave a relationship that does not entitle them to financially abandon their children," said Caroline Orzac Shoenberger, Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Services.

The proposed ordinance amendment is not expected to be addressed by the full City Council until the Fall.

Anyone with information about a "deadbeat" parent who may be doing business with or in the City of Chicago, or for more information about the program, please contact the Department of Consumer Services at (312) 74-CHILD.

From the Courthouse . . .
. . . CASES & COMMENTARY

As a regular feature the Family Support FORUM will endeavor to provide timely summaries of court decisions, both published and unpublished, and information about pending decisions of general interest to the support enforcement community. Anyone who becomes aware of significant decisions or cases, whether pending or decided at any level, is encouraged to submit them for inclusion in future editions.

by Thomas P. Sweeney

Supreme Court Agrees: Unexplained Depreciation Expenses Not Deductible in § 505 (a) Income Determination

In Re Marriage of Minear, 181 Ill 2d 552, 693 N.E. 2d 379 (3/26/98), affirmed appellate and trial court rulings disallowing unexplained depreciation expenses as a deduction from net income in ordering maintenance and the denial of child support as a sufficiently explained guideline deviation.

Following a dissolution of marriage in 1994, orders on ancillary issues were entered in August, 1996. Custody of one child was granted to dad, with no support required of mom. However, mom was awarded maintenance of $500 per month based on a calculation of dad's net income of $3,063 per month. The court disallowed deduction of more than $1,200 per month in depreciation reflected on business records for dad's service station. Among other things, dad appealed the court's failure to allow depreciation as a business expense under § 505 (a)(3)(h) of the IMDMA, and the denial of child support to him.

The Appellate Court affirmed. (287 Ill. App 3d 1073, 679 N.E. 2d 656 (4th Dist, 1997) - *see* "Cases & Commentary, May-June, 1997 *FORUM*) The court concluded "while in some circumstances depreciation may be a 'reasonable and necessary expense for the production of income' . . . it is not an 'expenditure for repayment of debt' as those terms are defined [in § 505 (a)(3)(h) of the IMDMA]." And "[d]epreciation expenses cannot reasonably be construed as 'payments' subject to 'payment periods' as required by the Act."

Here the only evidence of the depreciation expense was its mention in an "income statement" for dad's business. The Appellate Court found,"[t]his minimal evidence is insufficient to justify a deduction under section 505 (a)(3)(h)." Dad "failed to present any evidence the claimed depreciation expenses were either 'expenditures for the repayment of debts' or 'reasonable and necessary expenses for the production of income,' much less any specific repayment schedule as required by the Act."

In denying dad child support the trial court had stated, "Respondent has a net income in excess of that of Petitioner and is not in need of child support from the Petitioner by reason thereof." The Appellate Court found this a sufficient finding for failure to apply guidelines to award child support to dad. Dad appeals further.

The Supreme Court affirmed on all issues, carefully limiting its decision to the facts of this case. "Without deciding whether a depreciation expense may in all cases be excluded from consideration in determining an individual's available income, we find that [dad] has failed to present evidence that would, under the rule he proposed, warrant exclusion of that expense. Because no evidence was offered to explain the [depreciation expense] we cannot say that the judge in any event abused his discretion in refusing to deduct this expense in determining [dad's] available income."

On the failure to award child support or explain deviation from guidelines the Supreme Court was satisfied that the trial court's enumeration of the parties' respective financial circumstances was a sufficient finding for deviating from guidelines. The trial court had also made specific findings of mom's income from which calculation of guideline support could readily be made. "Although we believe the better practice is for a trial judge to calculate the amount of support that would have been required under the guidelines, as is provided for in section 505 (a)(2), we cannot say that the judge's failure to do so in this case amounted to reversible error."

Support Order in Paternity Prior to 1989 Amendment Does Not Establish Custody; "Best Interests" Governs Custody Issue

In Re Custody of D.R., 295 Ill. App. 3d 115, ___ N. E. 2d ____ (2nd Dist., 3/6/98), affirmed an order granting custody to the father in a paternity case without requiring evidence of changed circumstances.

On May 25, 1989, Martin was found to be the father of D.R. and was ordered to pay child support to D.R.'s mother, Yvette. D.R. resided with Yvette from his birth in 1986 until 1994 when he began staying with Martin occasionally. In February, 1996, Martin filed to change D.R.'s custody. Support was abated and D.R. remained with Martin without a ruling on custody. In August Yvette sought D.R.'s return to her. D.R. moved back and forth from parent to parent over the next few months. In February, 1997, the court finally awarded custody to Martin, based on the best interests of the child. Yvette appeals, claiming the court had failed to find changed circumstances as required to modify

(Cont'd. on page 7)

("Cases & Commentary," cont'd. from page 6)

custody, arguing the court's original order of May 25, 1989, requiring Martin to pay support, constituted an award of custody to her under § 14 (a)(2) of the Parentage Act.

Affirmed. The Appellate Court holds that the amendment to § 14 of the Parentage Act, adding the paragraph considering an award of support to one parent as an award of custody to the other parent, changed substantive rights. Thus it cannot apply retroactively to orders entered prior to its effective date, August 30, 1989. Prior decisions applying this paragraph to earlier orders had "assumed, without any analysis or justification, that the amendment creating section 14 (a)(2) would apply retroactively." Since the May 25, 1989 support order did not constitute a custody order, the court's February, 1997, order was the first custody determination, thus governed by the "best interests" standards of § 602 of the IMDMA. Here the court did not err in applying the standards of that section.

URESA Court May Not Offset Current Support Against Petitioner's Prior Support Obligation

Public Aid ex rel. Jones vs. Jones, 295 Ill. App. 3d 383, ___ N. E. 2d ____ (4th Dist., 3/25/98), reversed an order offsetting a URESA respondent's support obligation against support due her from the petitioner under the parties' judgment of dissolution.

Yana and Randall were divorced in Macon County in 1983. Yana was given custody of their one child Miranda; Randall was ordered to pay $85 per week unallocated maintenance and support for one year, then $70 per week in child support. In June, 1994, with Yana's consent Miranda began living with Randall in Florida. Apparently the Macon County orders were never modified, and that support order was being pursued through URESA action in Florida.

In November, 1994, the Florida Department of Revenue initiated a URESA petition on behalf of Randall seeking support from Yana. That petition was filed in Morgan County where Yana then resided. Yana transferred venue of the Macon County cause to Morgan County. At the hearing on the URESA petition Yana presented evidence of an October, 1995, Florida court finding that Randall owed Yana $3,500 in support arrears and ordering payment of $10 per week toward that arrears. In June, 1996, the Morgan County court found Yana was the custodial parent and Randall remained under order to pay $85 per week in child support under the Macon County order, and that Randall was in contempt of court in Morgan County and Orange County, Florida. The court also found that Yana owed a duty of support, ordered her to pay $85 per week with the stated intention that the two support obligations would offset and "no funds will actually be transferred." IDPA, on behalf of Randall, appeals.

While sympathetic to the trial court's "sincere effort to be practical," the Appellate Court reversed the finding of an offset. "[W]e find in a RURESA proceeding the court is *limited* to considering the respondent's duty of support. The trial court here exceeded its authority by addressing and enforcing Randall's child support obligation established in the dissolution of marriage proceedings." (emphasis by the Court)

The trial court was correct in finding Yana owed a support obligation to Randall, despite her having legal custody under the Macon County judgment. "In order to be entitled to an order for child support a parent need not have legal custody of a child, but only physical custody." But in the URESA action the petitioner (Randall) did not submit himself to the court's jurisdiction for other proceedings, and enforcement of the judgment of dissolution was not properly before the court.

Since Yana's support was apparently set at $85 per week to facilitate the offset of Randall's obligation, rather than being based on her income, the cause was remanded to determine what support Yana should pay consistent with guidelines. "To the extent the trial court took into account the fact Randall owed an arrearage under the judgment of dissolution when setting the amount of Yana's support obligation, the doctrine of 'unclean hands' is inapplicable because child support is to be awarded without regard to misconduct on the part of the parent." In any event the trial court was wrong in finding Randall in contempt for his non-payment.

Paternity and Retroactive Support Order Following Child's Majority Not Final For Appeal Without Addressing Other Relief Sought, Despite Rule 304 (a) Finding

Dept. of Public Aid vs. Lekberg, ___ Ill. App. 3d ____, ____ N.E. 2d ____ (2nd Dist., No. 2-97-0074, 4/13/98), dismissed plaintiff's appeal of a retroactive support award for a child who had attained majority as not a final and appealable order, despite a finding of appealability under Supreme Court Rule 304 (a).

In July, 1993, an action was filed to establish parentage of a child born in October, 1976. The petition sought adjudication of parentage, current support, reimbursement of expenses for pregnancy and delivery, health insurance and payment for blood tests. An agreed order of parentage was entered in October, 1994 -- two weeks after the child attained majority. On August 20, 1996, a hearing was held, and on August 30, 1996, a judgment was entered for $29,700 in retroactive support (for what period is not clear from the decision). Other issues raised in the petition were not addressed. Both this order and a subsequent order deny-ing plaintiff's motion to reconsider contained a finding of appealability under Supreme Court Rule 304 (a). Plaintiff mother appeals the retroactive award.

Though the parties agreed the Appellate Court had jurisdiction, the Court disagreed and dismissed the appeal. The August 30, 1996, order was not final because it left unresolved substantial issues raised in the petition. "[T]he order left pending other financial issues of potential importance, i.e., defendant's respon-sibility for the expenses of pregnancy and delivery, blood testing, health insurance, and child support for the period of time between the filing of the petition to

(Cont'd. on page 14)

From the IDPA . . .
. . . ILLINOIS IV-D UPDATE

(From the Office of the Administrator1 Illinois Department of Public Aid, Division of Child Support Enforcement

DCSE Staff Help Prison Inmates Connect With Their Kids

Out of sight, but not out of mind. Most prison inmates don't see their children on a regular basis - some, never see them. But most care about their kids and want to “connect" with them in some way. As Illinois Child Support's Paternity establishment Liaisons (['ELS) have discovered during prison visits, some of the world's most caring dads live behind bars.

PELs are responsible for visiting the prisons in his or her region to give inmates the opportunity to establish paternity for their children. The program began in November, 1996, and has been very successful. Through May o(1998,1.172 inmates have signed the Acknowledgment of Paternity form.

"I wasn't sure what to expect when I started visiting prisons," says Denise Johnson, a PEL based in Rockford. "But the inmates' response has been overwhelmingly positive. In most cases the men want to see their children when they leave prison and they see establishing paternity as a step towards achieving that goal."

She recalls meeting an inmate who brought a huge pile of kids' photos to the interview. "He was the very proud father of twins who were almost three years old," says Johnson. The inmate was overjoyed to see Johnson because he had been trying unsuccessfully to go through court to establish paternity for his children. He will have a bachelors degree by the time he finishes his prison sentence and hopes to secure employment when he is released. "I believe he will have a strong relationship with his children after he leaves prison," says Johnson.

Susan Boggs, a PEL who covers central Illinois, actually looks forward to her visits to the "big house." "I love going to prisons," she says. "I have never felt scared or in danger.” She attributes that feeling of security to the cooperation she receives from staff from Illinois' Department of Corrections (DCC).

"DOC staff are very cooperative and helpful," says PEL Maggie Tuerk who works in the western part of the state. "And the inmates are very respectful. They appreciate what we are trying to do."

The PELs find connecting with the prisoners is easier than they originally anticipated. The prison staff as well as the inmates always know in advance when a PEL is coming. In the minimum and medium security prisons they give presentations explaining the program to inmates in groups, then meet with them individually In the maximum security prisons all contact is made one on one -- with a guard present at all times. They've seen inmates who are in isolation 23 hours a day and others who wear shackles.

Most inmates who establish paternity hope they will be able to see their children when they leave prison. For those who won't be leaving --its a chance to show their children that they are there for them in spirit. "Many tell me that they love their children, and I believe them," says Johnson. "One inmate told me he had never had a job but he was determined to get one when he left prison so he could support his children."

In several instances inmates have initiated contact with the PELs. "One man heard I was visiting and requested to see me," recalls Boggs. "His parents had custody of his child and he wanted to establish paternity. So the word is out about us and inmates are happy that we are helping them establish paternity."

Johnson is working with officials at a female prison in hopes of setting up a similar type of program. If successful, she will secure names of children's fathers from the female inmates and help them get paternity established. "We're doing this for the children," she says. "Every child wants and deserves to know both parents, and I'm doing all I can to help put children first."

DCSE Joins Dept. on Aging to Assist Grandparents Raising Grandchildren

Child Support Enforcement staff from the IDPA have teamed up with staff from the Illinois Department on Aging to help grandparents learn about state services and how to overcome barriers in seeking assistance and services.

In Illinois, an estimated 70,000 children are being raised in homes where a grandparent is the sole caregiver. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the number of such children increased nationwide by 40% from 1980 to 1990.

To better understand the options and also the support available, Child Support Enforcement staff are looking to new roles in participating in the Grandparent Task Force -- and in sharing information with the Department on Aging. Staff from the two agencies have collaborated on public service announcements (PSA’s) targeted to grandparents. DCSE staff provided

(Cont’d. on page 9)

("Illinois IV-D Up-date," cont'd. from page 8)

in-service training to Senior Help Line staff on child support and paternity establishment services.

Messages to grandparents have gone out statewide. Three versions of PSAs (30 seconds, 15 seconds, and 10 seconds) are in use. The 30 second message reads: "I'm a grandparent! Proud to be one! But I never thought I'd be raising my grandchild. I just learned that I may be able to get child support so my grandchild can have a brighter future. Child Support? I never thought I'd need to know about that. Message brought to you by the Illinois Department on Aging and the Illinois Department of Public Aid. Call the Senior Help Line at 800-252-8966."

DCSE staff developed a grandparent brochure on paternity establishment in English and in Spanish, and have been distributing them through the Grandparents Task Force. If you would like copies of the brochures and of the joint Illinois Department on Aging/IDPA letter to radio stations, please call Richard Priess at (312) 793-8220.

Plans are underway for DCSE and Department of Aging staff to work together at Senior activities during this summer's State Fair. We hope to play a part in reaching these grandparents, many of whom are overwhelmed with the situation they face and are totally unprepared to deal with problems facing parents and children for the '90's. Grandparents/care-givers may be 40 to 80 years old.

Many organizations from throughout the state, with such names as "Grandparents As Parents," "Grandparents Raising Grandchildren" (in several locations), "Magnificent Other Mom" and "Parents Again Support Group," make up the Grandparents Task Force. The mere existence of so many such groups indicates the extent of concern and need for help.

DCSE Participates in Teen Moms Television Programs

IDPA DCSE staff have taken part in a Chicago Cable Access Network Series television program for teens and community specialists to discuss important issues, with a focus on teen mothers. "Teen Moms Only" follows a call-in format allowing the audience to talk with the teen moderators and their featured guests.

The TV series is devoted to examining a parent's responsibilities and rights. In 1997, the show's format

(Cont'd. on page 10)

Illinois Most Cited in Federal "Best Practices" Compendium

In March the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement released its 1998 Compendium of State Best Practices in Child Support Enforcement. IDPA's DCSE was cited for eight programs, placing it in a tie with Washington state for most programs cited.

The report features ideas on programs, techniques and management viewed as effective or innovative.

The Illinois programs receiving recognition were:

- Cook County Hospital Pilot Paternity Program, which stations a full-time child support worker at the hospital to provide counseling to unwed parents and helps them complete voluntary paternity acknowledg-ment forms. In one year, voluntary paternity establishments increased sevenfold.
- Administrative Accountability Analysis Unit, which provides customers with a written status of their case, the results of the unit's review and the actions to be taken within 30 days.
- Domestic Violence Prevention, which con-nects DCSE with the Prevention of Domestic Violence Coalition, to encourage child support applicants who are abuse victims to seek help.
- Outreach Deluxe, which involved a series of public education programs to promote the importance of child support.
- Non-Custodial Parent Services, which refers unemployed parents to employment assist-ance and encourages them to play an active role in their children's lives.
- Voluntary Acknowledgment of Paternity Training, which trained more than 1,000 persons on a new state law designed to increase the number of paternity establish-ments.
- Automated Mailings to Expectant Unwed Mothers, which mails paternity establishment information to 2,000 unwed, expectant mothers a month. The mailings help women plan ahead to have the fathers with them at the hospital to complete the paternity forms.
- Child Support/Revenue Partnership, which uses the tax collection authority and tools of the Illinois Department of Revenue to recover unpaid child support.

("Illinois IV-D Up-date," cont'd. from page 9)

included a panel of child support "experts" and a panel of teens discussing child support issues. The 1998 format features an individual guest at each of the weekly shows. Child Support staff joined with the teen mom moderators in three shows with the following topics: How to Establish Paternity and Why It's Important, Getting a Child Support Order, and Enforcing the Child Support Order.

The teens come from an alternative Chicago high school, called Arts of Living. Through DCSE programs conducted at the school the teens taking part in these programs actually are quite knowledgeable on paternity establishment and child support matters.

Each show begins with "Mentor Moms" stressing the importance of teen moms bonding with their babies with a special focus on parenting skills and infant development. These teen moms talk about how to play with kids, how to read to them and why reading is good for kids. They encourage reading instead of TV watching and discuss particular books. Then the guest speakers present information on the chosen topic for the show.

The questions from the audience varied in complexity and the participants made an effort to answer on the show. During the program on paternity establishment one caller wondered about getting paternity established for a child of 13 or 14 years of age. Another caller asked if you could have someone else sign paternity forms even if they are not the father! As three of the "mentor moms" already receive support from the minor fathers of their children, they could answer the question of whether fathers under 18 could be required to pay support.

The show moves very quickly. DCSE staff come prepared with a very brief script on the assigned subject and spend some time before the show discus-sing the topic with the young moms. Participants note that what is actually discussed on the air ends up differently from what was practiced in rehearsal. The casual atmosphere of the show encourages good discussion and information exchange. It isn't often that we have such a public opportunity to focus on the interests of teens.

Progress Made in Head Start Programs

As reported in the November-December, 1997, issue of the *FORUM,* IDPA DCSE received a federal grant to work with Head Start and Child Care sites throughout Illinois. Now past the half-year point, DCSE is involved in a collaborative/educational out-reach effort and paternity establishment pilot program designed to coordinate resources and expertise of all three partners. We are collaborating at a state level as well as at selected local levels to help families of young children at Head Start and Child Care facilities to establish paternity and collect child support, as well as to encourage increased emotional and social interaction between children and both of their parents.

Collaborating with Head Start and Child Care at selected sites will help to achieve IDPA's goals to provide children with stability, health, and economic security. This encompasses developing state and local strategies to increase parental support for the children participating in Head Start and Child Care programs. It is believed the collaborative approach to outreach, information sharing and public awareness can lead to more productive citizens, stronger, healthier, more child-nurturing families, and better educated/adjusted children.

DCSE wants to assure that parents, as well as providers who work with parents and their children understand:

1) How Child Support Enforcement works;
2) What the role of paternity establishment is in the process;
3) Why having legal paternity established is important for the child's future; and,
4) How working to obtain child support as soon as possible is important in the long range plans for the family.

The aim is to empower parents to use "the system" so their children can have a brighter future.

Under the auspices of the Springfield Urban League Head Start, DCSE began a paternity establishment pilot program at seven sites in February.

In Chicago, several sites of the Community & Economic Development Association (CEDA) Head Start/Early Head Start made plans to become "pilot sites" to offer services on paternity establishment. The CEDA Harvey and Blue Island Head Start sites have received training which enables them to help interested unmarried parents establish paternity. CEDA Blue Island began a paternity establishment pilot program in February, and the Harvey Area Child & Family Development Center began the pilot program in April.

DCSE is working with the City of Chicago's Department of Human Services Head Start training team to have training and presentations on child support. The City of Chicago's Department of Human Services sent an "Open Invitation" to each of their Head Start sites to become a paternity establishment site, and selected three sites to collaborate with DCSE on the grant. DCSE is working with Chicago's Ounce of Prevention Head Start on presentations and a male responsibility effort, and recently began working with Chicago's Day Care Action Council.

All of these grant activities are steps to building strong partnerships. We hope we can link more families with young children to child support services to help achieve a brighter future for Illinois children.

August, 1998, "Child Support Awareness Month" in Illinois -- See page 11

STATE OF ILLINOIS

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Proclamation

WHEREAS, *Illinois recognizes that our children are our future and their well-being is our highest priority; and*

WHEREAS, *bold changes in the way we deliver services to our families through the Department of Human Services and our streamlined Department of Public Aid will more efficiently assist families to become self-sufficient; and*

WHEREAS, *the Department of Public Aid is working closely with the Department of Human Services, other state agencies, and community groups to increase the number of children for whom paternity is established; and*

WHEREAS, *Illinois is taking the lead in many child support initiatives and vigorously enforcing collection of child support payments to help Illinois families gain independence; and*

WHEREAS, *Illinois is committed to ensuring that all our children receive the emotional and financial support of both parents, their extended families, and their communities so that they can grow up in a nurturing environment; and*

WHEREAS, *Illinois recognizes that children need strong family support. Illinois works to focus attention on the needs of fathers as well as mothers; and*

WHEREAS, *the Department of Public Aid has joined with other states and agencies in a national "Put Children First" campaign to build collaborative efforts for the sake of our children; and*

WHEREAS, *the Department of Public Aid, Division of Child Support Enforcement, has been given the responsibility of providing child support services to all Illinois families;*

THEREFORE, *I, Jim Edgar, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim August 1998 as* CHILD SUPPORT AWARENESS MONTH *in Illinois.*

In Witness Whereof, *I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.*

Done at the Capitol in the City of Springfield, this TWENTY SECOND *day of* JUNE *, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and* NINETY EIGHTH *, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and* EIGHTIETH

George H Ryan
SECRETARY OF STATE

Jim Edgar
GOVERNOR

("Legislative Up-date," cont'd. from page 4)

currently found in numerous other Acts in the statutes; amends those acts, the Collection Agency Act, and UIFSA to make conforming changes in cross-references; includes technical corrections, but makes no substantive change in the law. Each of the main paragraphs as they appear in each of the several current income withholding sections (A through J) becomes its own separate section within the new Act. Specific paragraph and section numbers will be assigned by the Legislative Reference Bureau after the bill is signed by the Governor. To take effect 1-1-99.

H.B. 3415 sent to Governor 6/18/98

a) **Title registration and driver's license denial**. Amends §§ 3-408 and 6-103 of the Illinois Vehicle Code to provide that the Secretary of State shall refuse registration or transfer of registration of titles (§ 3-408) or issuance of a driver's license or permit (§ 6-103) to any person who "is 90 days or more delinquent in court ordered child support payments or has been adjudicated in arrears in an amount equal to 90 days' obligation or more and has been found in contempt of court for failure to pay the support, subject to the requirements and procedures of Article VII of Chapter 7 of the Illinois Vehicle Code."

b) **Community Service & Work Alternative sentence**. Amends § 1 of the Non-Support of Spouse and Children Act (750 ILCS 15/1) to provide that, in addition to any other penalties imposed for violation of this section (criminal non-support), the court *may* order the offender to perform community service for not less than 30 or more than 120 hours, if community service is available in the jurisdiction and if funded and approved by the respective county board, and/or *may* sentence him to service in a work alternative program administered by the sheriff during nonworking hours, requiring the offender to obtain or retain employment. Also amends § 10-16 of the Public Aid Code (305 ILCS 5/10-16), § 505 of the IMDMA (750 ILCS 5/505), and § 15 of the Parentage Act of 1984 (750 ILCS 45/15) to authorize prosecution and imposition of the community service or supervised work program under § 1 of the Non-Support of Spouse and Children Act as additional penalties for violations of those sections. To take effect upon becoming law.

H.B. 1612 & S.B. 499 sent to the Governor 6/18/98

Qualified Illinois Domestic Relations Order (QUILDRO). § 503 of the IMDMA (750 ILCS 5/503) is amended and new section 1-119 (40 ILCS 5/1-119) is added to the Illinois Pension Code to permit access to certain benefits under a state pension plan for parties in proceedings for dissolution of marriage or declaration of invalidity of marriage. It provides for entry by the court of a specified form of QUILDRO, subject to revisions as may be required by individual plans, specifying sums to be paid to an "alternate payee" which may be all or a portion of benefits otherwise payable to the member entitled to benefits under the plan. The bill makes clear a QUILDRO is different from a Qualified Domestic Relations Order issued under the federal Retirement Equity Act (ERISA). Unlike a QUADRO, benefits to the divorced "alternate payee" terminate at the death of either party. Since until now the Illinois Constitution exempted state pension plans from attachment, garnish-ment, judgment or other legal process, the bill effects only persons who become members of public pension systems after the bill's effective date unless the member executes a consent meeting requirements and substantially in the form specified in the bill.

House Bill 1612 and Senate Bill 499 are essentially identical in their QUILDRO provisions. House Bill 1612 also includes an amendment to § 452 of the IMDMA increasing the limits of parties' income and property value under which they may be eligible to file for a "simplified" divorce. It will remain to be seen which bill is signed by the governor.

To take effect upon becoming law.

S.B. 1674 sent to the Governor 6/?/98

Illinois Legislation on the Internet. In addition to creating the "Year 2000 Technology Task Force Act" to address government computer capacity to deal with the year 2000, adds new § 5.09 (25 ILCS 145/5.09) to the Legislative Information System Act to require the Legislature to provide to the public through the Internet, no later than July 1, 1999, both a synopsis and full text of all bills and resolutions introduced, each engrossed, enrolled and re-enrolled bill and resolution and each adopted amendment and conference committee report, plus summaries of legislative and gubernatorial actions on each bill and resolution introduced. On or before "the conclusion of the Ninety-second General Assembly" -- i.e., by the end of the 2002 sessions -- the text of Public Acts, the Illinois Compiled Statutes, the U. S. and Illinois Constitutions, the Illinois Adminis-trative Code and the "most current" issue of the Illinois Register are also to be available on the Internet.

House Bill 2359, calling for transfer of the IV-D program from the Illinois Department of Public Aid to the Office of the Attorney General, was not addressed by the Senate during the Spring session.

DEADBEAT PARENTS PUNISHMENT ACT OF 1998

(House of Representatives - May 12, 1998)

H.R. 3811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998'.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF FELONY VIOLATIONS.

Section 228 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

`228. Failure to pay legal child support obligations

`(a) Offense: Any person who--

`(1) willfully fails to pay a support obligation with respect to a child who resides in another State, if such obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than 1 year, or is greater than $5,000;

`(2) travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to evade a support obligation, if such obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than 1 year, or is greater than $5,000; or

`(3) willfully fails to pay a support obligation with respect to a child who resides in another State, if such obligation has remained unpaid for a period longer than 2 years, or is greater than $10,000; shall be punished as provided in subsection (c).

`(b) Presumption: The existence of a support obligation that was in effect for the time period charged in the indictment or information creates a rebuttable presumption that the obligor has the ability to pay the support obligation for that time period.

`(c) Punishment: The punishment for an offense under this section is--

`(1) in the case of a first offense under subsection (a)(1), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both; and

`(2) in the case of an offense under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), or a second or subsequent offense under subsection (a)(1), a fine under this title, imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

`(d) Mandatory Restitution: Upon a conviction under this section, the court shall order restitution under section 3663A in an amount equal to the total unpaid support obligation as it exists at the time of sentencing.

`(e) Venue: With respect to an offense under this section, an action may be inquired of and prosecuted in a district court of the United States for--

`(1) the district in which the child who is the subject of the support obligation involved resided during a period during which a person described in subsection (a) (referred to in this subsection as an `obliger') failed to meet that support obligation;

`(2) the district in which the obliger resided during a period described in paragraph (1); or

`(3) any other district with jurisdiction otherwise provided for by law.

`(f) Definitions: As used in this section--

`(1) the term `Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a);

`(2) the term `State' includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States; and

`(3) the term `support obligation' means any amount determined under a court order or an order of an administrative process pursuant to the law of a State or of an Indian tribe to be due from a person for the support and maintenance of a child or of a child and the parent with whom the child is living.'.

("Cases & Commentary," cont'd. from page 7)

declare parentage and the child's attaining majority." Insertion of a finding of no just cause to delay enforcement or appeal does not make a non-final order final and appealable.

The moral? Particularly in parentage cases, if you ask for it, you better address it before anything can be appealed.

Emancipation by Marriage Terminates Post-Majority, Educational Support Obligation

In Re Marriage of Daniels, ___ Ill. App. 3d ___, ___ N.E. 2d ____ (4th Dist., No. 4-97-0171, 5/15/98), affirmed a finding that post-majority, educational support terminated upon emancipation of the child by marriage.

An order in the parties' dissolution of marriage required dad to pay $300 per month for educational expenses for their daughter, Theresa, to continue "so long as she is a full-time student in good standing at Moody Bible College, with an anticipated graduation date of June, 1997." Theresa was born in June, 1975. Theresa was married August 9, 1996. Dad stopped paying the educational support. Mom filed a rule to show case in January, 1997, seeking judgment for sums due. Dad filed a petition for modification to terminate the educational support obligation based on Theresa's emancipation by marriage. In February, 1997, the court found dad's obligation had terminated by reason of Theresa's emancipation, denied entry of any judgment and discharged the rule. Mom appeals.

Affirmed. Section 510 of the IMDMA provides that terms for support of a child are terminated by emancipation of the child except as otherwise provided by statute. "Section 513 (a)(2) of the Act is an exception to support obligations for education expenses regarding a child who is emancipated only in the respect that he is no longer a minor. Consequently, support obligations for education expenses terminate upon the emancipation of a child other than by age, '[u]nless otherwise agreed in writing or expressly provided in a judgment.'." Here the order did not provide dad's obligation would continue if Theresa were to marry.

Termination of Support Obligation Dictated by Original Settlement Agreement, Despite Change in Custody

In Re Marriage of Sweders, ___ Ill. App. 3d ____, ___ N.E. 2d ____ (2nd Dist., No. 2-97-0528, 5/21/98), affirmed an order requiring mom to pay support until the emancipation date originally specified when dad had custody.

In a settlement agreement incorporated into their 1982 judgment of dissolution Kandyce was awarded custody of the parties' children and Peter was ordered to pay support until each child was "emancipated." In a separate paragraph "emancipation" was defined as the earliest to occur of several events, including "The child's reaching majority or completing his education, which-ever is later but not beyond age 22." In May, 1996, another agreed order was entered, awarding custody of the youngest child, Adam, to Peter and terminating support for all children. In February, 1997, an agreed order was entered requiring Kandyce to pay support for Adam; the termination date was reserved. In February, 1997, the court ordered that Kandyce's obligation to pay support for Adam would continue until he reached the age of 22 or otherwise became emancipated under the terms of the marital settlement agreement. Kandyce appeals her obligation extending beyond Adam's eighteenth birthday.

Kandyce loses. Section 510 of the IMDMA provides support terminates at emancipation, "unless otherwise agreed in writing." The original settlement agreement clearly indicates an agreement to a different definition of emancipation, in a separate section not limiting its application only to Peter's support obligation. "The Wife urges this court to hold that the definition of a term contained in the marital settlement agreement applies only to the Husband, absent an express provision expressing such intent. This interpretation would clearly result in an unusual, unreasonable, absurd, and inequitable result, inconsistent with a child's right to support from both parents." Order affirmed.

First Child Due Guideline Support Without Reduction for Second Family's "Prior" Support Order

In Re Marriage of Potts, ___ Ill. App. 3d ____, ___ N.E. 2d ____ (2nd Dist, Nos. 2-97-0912 & 2-97-1149, 6/22/98), affirmed denial of a first wife's inter-vention to vacate support orders entered in her ex-husband's second dissolution case, but reversed and remanded a support order setting the ex-husband's support for their first-born child after support and maintenance for the second family was deducted from his income.

Jeffrey was divorced from Jennifer (Wife #1) in Winnebago County in 1991. On January 16, 1997, custody of their one child (Child #1) was transferred to Jennifer, but support was reserved by the court because Jeffrey was (supposedly?) unemployed. Meanwhile Jeffrey had married Julie (Wife #2) in 1992, and they had two children. On January 17, 1997, Julie filed for divorce in Boone County.

A hearing on Jennifer's motion for child support was scheduled for March 13, 1997, in Winnebago County. On March 12, 1997, in Boone County, Jeffrey agreed to entry of a judgment dissolving his marriage to Julie (Wife # 2) and an order to pay $50 per week in maintenance plus $150 per week in support for the two children of that marriage. On March 13, 1997, the Winnebago County court entered its support order of $33 per week for Child # 1, after first subtracting from Jeffrey's net income of $366 per week the $200 per week ordered the day before in Boone County. Pursuant to a motion to reconsider the court increased the order to $50 per week, based on an increase in Jeffrey's income. But on both occasions the court felt obliged by § 505 (a) (3) (g) of the IMDMA to deduct from his net income the Winnebago County order for Jeffrey's second family as a "prior" support order. At the suggestion of the Winnebago County court Jennifer

(Cont'd. on page 15)

("Cases & Commentary," cont'd. from page 14)

attempted to intervene in the Boone County case to vacate that order, but that motion was ultimately denied. Jennifer appeals both the denial of her petition to intervene in the Boone County cause and the support determination in her Winnebago County cause.

Denial of Jennifer's intervention in Jeffrey and Julie's Boone County case was affirmed. Allowing a former spouse to intervene in proceedings involving subsequent obligations would be too confusing and disruptive. "Jennifer's interest in the outcome of the Boone County litigation is too remote to grant her a right to intervene."

However, the Winnebago County determination of support for her child was reversed. While § 505 requires deduction of "prior obligations of support or maintenance" in determining net income for setting of support, "'prior' refers to the obligations to a family that is 'first in time' in relation to another family. . . . A divorced spouse's obligation to the first family must be met before the obligations to the second family can or will be considered." * * * "We find the court abused its discretion by deducting the order of support for the second family from Jeffrey's net income before determining the award of support for the first child. We therefore direct the Winnebago County court to redetermine the amount of the first child's support without regard to the Boone County court order of support." Specifically the court was directed to apply the 20% guideline unless it found a basis for deviation.

"In the interests of justice" the Appellate Court made a final comment, chastising Jeffrey's concealing from the Boone County court the pendency of the support proceedings for his first child, and his "purposefully" agreeing to pay more than 50% of his net income for his second family before the first child's needs were addressed. "A litigant who fails to fully inform the court that on the next day another court is going to set child support for his first family acts reprehensibly and should not benefit from such conduct."

[The upshot of all this? Assuming his income remains at $450 per week, presumably Jeffrey will remain under the obligation he accepted to pay $200 per week in support and maintenance to family # 2, plus $90 per week for Child # 1. There is such a thing as justice after all!]

HELP!

Contribute to the FORUM

Its <u>YOUR</u> Newsletter!

ILLINOIS FAMILY SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION
Application for Membership / Address Correction

Please: [ ] accept my application for membership in IFSEA. [ ] correct my address as noted below.

[ ] Regular membership - please enclose $20.00 annual dues.
[ ] Subscription membership - please enclose $20.00 annual fee.
[ ] Affiliate membership (dues to be determined by Directors upon acceptance).

Applicant's Name: _____
Position/Title: _____
Employer/Agency: _____
Office Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____ Office Phone: _____
Preferred Mailing Address: _____

Is this a [ ] New Application [ ] Renewal [ ] Address Correction ONLY?
Please return with dues to: IFSEA, P. O. Box 370, Tolono, IL 61880
(FEIN: 37-1274237)

(5/98)

New Hire Directory Making Connections

by Thomas P. Sweeney

In connection with his signing of the "Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998" (*see page 3 and 13*), President Clinton on June 24, 1998, announced that the National Directory of New Hires has located more than one million delinquent parents since its launch on October 1, 1997.

The President also reported that:

- in 1997, a record 1.3 million paternities were established nationally, over two-and-a-half times more than five years ago,
- in 1997, a record $13.4 billion in child support was collected, an increase of 68 percent from 1992, and
- the number of families actually receiving child support payments has increased to 4.2 million, a 48 percent increase since 1992.

The Next FORUM is due out in mid-AUGUST!

Contributions are needed NOW!

Delinquent Patents Located Thru National Directory of New Hires

(Estimated NDHD Case Hits)
10/1/97 - 6/11/98

State	Case Hits	State	Case Hits
AK	3,828	MT	5,701
AL	13,753	NC	14,391
AR	13,205	ND	3,846
AZ	44,449	NE	24,603
CA	123,313	NH	7,440
CO	23,513	NJ	20,413
CT	19,967	NM	2,726
DC	4,517	NV	5,488
DE	3,807	NY	55,447
FL	33,230	OH	34,719
GA	14,423	OK	8,627
GU	153	OR	8,494
HI	6,339	PA	25,464
IA	22,141	PR	1,031
ID	4,886	RI	2,853
IL	26,837	SC	8,895
IN	15,437	SD	3,643
KS	18,165	TN	16,658
KY	12,822	TX	75,962
LA	14,935	UT	16,096
MA	25,114	VA	23,928
MD	13,878	VI	28
ME	6,038	VT	2,128
MI	50,146	WA	21,452
MN	15,228	WI	32,706
MO	42,349	WV	10,702
MS	21,287	WY	5,151
TOTAL			1,032,352

Source: White House Press Release, 6/24/98

ILLINOIS FAMILY SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION
P. O. BOX 370
Tolono, Illinois 61880

NON PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
URBANA, IL
PERMIT NO. 60

Is your address correct?
See reverse to change