COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Los Angeles County
Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina
Yvonne Burke
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor

2006

PUBLIC MEMBERS

First District
Vacant
Vacant

Second District
Paula G. Leftwich
John O. Murrell

Third District
Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq., Chair
Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.

Fourth District
Jean F. Cohen
Maria C. Tortorelli, Esq.

Fifth District
Reginald Brass
Susan Speir, Vice Chair

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Chief Information Office
Jon W. Fullinwider

Department of Children and Family Services
Dr. David Sanders

Department of Public Social Services
Bryce Yokomizo

Child Support Services Department
Philip Browning

Los Angeles Superior Court
David Jetton

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

California Department of Child Support Services
Mary Lawrence

Franchise Tax Board

CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
AUGUST 24, 2006

Present

2nd District, John O. Murrell
3rd District, Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq.
4th District, Maria C. Tortorelli. Esq.
4th District, Jean Cohen.
5th District, Reginald Brass
5th District, Susan Speir

Chief Information Office, Fred Nazarbegian
Child Support Services, Philip Browning
Superior Court, David Jetton
CA Department of Child Support Services, Mary Lawrence

Absent

2nd District, Paula Leftwich
3rd District, Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.

Franchise Tax Board, Ron Dotta
Children and Family Services, Sue Harper
Public Social Services, Sylvia Valencia

Guests

Lori Cruz	Deputy Director, Branch Operations, CSSD
Wayne Doss	Chief, Change Mgmt. Division, CSSD
Steven Golightly	Chief Deputy Director, CSSD
Gail Juiliano	Chief, QAPI, CSSD
Sheryl Spiller	Adm. Deputy, Mgmt. and Admin. Services, CSSD
Lawrence Hill	SEIU, Local 660

Staff

Gabriel Alexander	Board of Supervisors
Jim Corbett	Board of Supervisors

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum of eight voting members being present, Chair Eisenberg called the meeting to order at 9:41 a.m. in Room 374-A of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT –– Update on implementation of SDU and SWS; Child Support Awareness Month activities; final legislative activity relative to budget items; new Performance Improvement Plan

Director Philip Browning reported that:

- *CCSAS System*—Mr. Browning discussed the State approach to conducting trainings for the implementation of this system. A letter will go out to the federal government on behalf of the state informing them that they (the state) are ready to be certified, which will stop penalties. The first 3 counties were originally scheduled for implementation in October, but have now been pushed back to February. The focus of the statewide trainings will be on the case management and financial components. It is estimated that it will take about 100 weeks to train LA County staff (Mr. Browning is working to shorten this time).

- *Update on Implementation of SDU and SWS*—Mr. Browning stated that Los Angeles has been sending payments to the SDU for a few months now. It is moving forward better than expected. A lot of nonpayment related correspondence (e.g. court orders) is being received.

  Chair Eisenberg asked if Bank of America (BOA) is receiving this non-payment related correspondence or DCSS. Mr. Browning responded that it is going to BOA, managing agent for the SDU. Chair Eisenberg proceeded to ask what BOA will do with this information. Mr. Browning responded that it is difficult to identify what county it corresponds to. BOA is working with DCSS on this issue.

  Chair Eisenberg inquired as to what the current proposed solution is. Mr. Browning responded that County staff is reviewing the correspondence to identify who it should be forwarded to. Chair Eisenberg asked how correspondence can be sent back to Los Angeles? Mr. Browning suggested that Mary Lawrence could better address this inquiry later in the meeting.

  Vice Chair Speir asked why there is no return address on the SDU payment envelope. Mr. Browning suggested that the question be posed to Mary Lawrence later in the meeting.

Additionally, Vice Chair Speir asked where payments are supposed to go to—the SDU or the court trustee. Why is this not more clearly delineated for the recipients of the respective correspondence? Mr. Browning has indicated that this a consequence of the state taking over this payment function

Overall, Mr. Browning reiterated that the SDU is operating pretty well. The money has been splitting well between entities, such as Los Angeles and San Diego County, and intricacies created by the allocation of wage assignments are working themselves out. Mr. Browning will report back in a few months.

Mary Lawrence joined the meeting via teleconference with Bill Otterbeck, who oversees the SDU for the State Child Support Services Department.

He was asked about the split between a IVD and a non-IVD check. Mr. Otterbeck responded that if they are mixed cases, those payments will go into suspense, if an allocation to each is not specified. At that point a state level financial worker will contact the employer to ascertain if there are two wage assignments in place to determine if the employer is making the right allocation of payment.

Member Tortorelli asked what happens when you have a family law case that is not being collected by the department, and is not subject to allocation with the IVD cases.

Mr. Otterbeck responded that based on state functionality rules, they are automatically allocated to those related obligations, separate for non-IVD cases that are not automatically allocated. The non-IVD cases must be associated with a CCSAS case number which they provide to employers. Each time they send in a non-IVD child support payment, it will be associated with the number. It is not automatically allocated like IVD cases. The goal here is not to misallocate funds.

Member Tortorelli asked why there is no return address. Mr. Otterbeck agreed to take this back as an action item. He stated that he would research the issue, and report back to Ms. Lawrence. Secondly, Member Tortorelli asked about the unrelated mail sent to BOA. He responded that the state operations division attempts to return the mail to the local child support agency, as appropriate.

Member Tortorelli asked when the non-IVD payment orders will start going to the SDU. Mr. Otterbeck replied by stating September 1st. He added that it will take employers some time to adjust their payroll systems to accommodate this new procedure.

Mr. Otterbeck added that, as of today, the state has processed 1.3 billion dollars through the SDU; has over 6 million payments processed, and over 80% of the payments have met the 2 day federal timeframe. He added that electronic payment cards (EPC) will be available for those without bank accounts. They can use it four times a month, and then they will incur a $1 charge thereafter. There are no daily withdrawal limits on this card.

Mr. Otterbeck stated that Version 1.4 (final piece of version 1) of the guideline calculator will be released August 28, 2006. It will be a certification requirement to know the guideline calculator. Mr. Otterbeck stated that the state will work with the court to get the word out on the guideline calculator. Mr. Browning asked if most of the courts are aware of the guideline calculator. Mr. Otterbeck replied by stating that he will conduct a training in late September/October to further increase awareness.

- *Child Support Awareness Month*—Mr. Browning talked about Child Support Awareness Month, and distributed documents and promotional items.

- Mr. Browning talked about a fire at CCW a couple of weeks ago that will impact collections; collections are down this year $5 million due just to liens.

- Mr. Browning discussed the Melinda T. case where a parent and his child were separated, and the child was in the County foster care system. The NCP may file a lawsuit against the County. As a result, the Board of Supervisors has asked foster care and child support to work together. He searched for a model, and found a place in Milwaukee to observe two similar agencies working in collaboration.

- *Budget Items*—Mr. Browning informed the Board that the state budget passed, and that the County budget changes will undergo final scrutiny in late September. The County received $2.4 million of a $12 million State Fund increase, which is to be used to improve performance. Ms. Spiller is working with the CAO to get the funds into the budget so CSSD can hire more staff.

- *Performance Improvement Plan*—Mr. Browning is working with Ms. Lawrence to develop a performance improvement plan to try to identify where improvements can be made.

  Chair Eisenberg asked what the plan is, and when we can expect to see it. Mr. Browning replied that it hasn't been developed.

  Ms. Lawrence stated that it has been drafted and focuses on the individual needs of each county. It is expected that the plan will be available to share with CSAB in October. Mr. Browning added that

certification should be the highest priority, not performance.

DCSS DIRECTOR'S REPORT –– To include: Status of policy letter regarding date of referral of welfare cases; issue regarding fraudulent checks

Ms. Lawrence reported that:

- *Status of Policy Letter*—Ms. Lawrence reported that the state published 10 referrals in July.

  Ms. Lawrence shared that there had been a misunderstanding about the information that Chair Eisenberg requested regarding the welfare referral policy. A detailed conversation between Chair Eisenberg, and Deputy Director of Policy, Karen Echeverria, the day before the CSAB meeting helped to clarify the request. Ms. Lawrence shared that the State originally thought that the recent policy letter regarding welfare referrals addressed Chair Eisenberg's concern and met the original deadline as requested. After the document was published, and further discussion took place with Chair Eisenberg, it was noted that it did not. With this new information, a new policy letter will be issued.

  Chair Eisenberg pointed out that Ms. Lawrence's department put together a policy letter in July of 2005, and Chair Eisenberg asked when a final decision would be made and when the letter would be issued. Ms. Lawrence stated that the document regarding the policy will be forthcoming and that Deputy Echeverria, had assigned the task to a staff member. Prior to development of the policy extensive research and analysis would be necessary to determine what is best for all local child support agencies and that at this time a date for completion could not be provided.

  Chair Eisenberg replied to Ms. Lawrence that this is precisely what she told CSAB 3 months ago. Ms. Lawrence stated that at this point she can not provide further information.

  Vice Chair Speir asked how other counties handle paper referrals. Ms. Lawrence replied that she did not inquire to that level of detail, but she can share any other information gleaned from her discussions with other directors.

  Ms. Lawrence proceeded to report that she had done some research on the practice of other large local Child Support Agencies and at what point they begin working a child support case when a IVA case is opened. Ms. Lawrence checked with surrounding counties, and found that they wait for approval before they start working the cases.

  Vice Chair Speir asked if other counties require everyone sign that

wants to sign to open a case even if they are not approved for welfare. Ms. Lawrence stated that she can check to find out. Member Tortorelli stated that she believes a standardized form is used, and Ms. Lawrence agreed.

Mr. Browning added that he was told four years ago that it was a requirement for all welfare applicants to be referred for child support services, yet this does not appear to be the practice statewide.

Mr. Browning now knows that other counties would only see those welfare applicants who became welfare recipients, which he noted would be a change in customer service, but would cut-down by half of the people they would need to see. He is waiting to see the state's decision on whether an applicant is referred, or a recipient is referred. This will impact how the interface between IVA and IVD should be structured.

- *Fraudulent Checks*—Ms. Lawrence reported that there are procedures on how to address fraudulent checks, and offered to provide copies delineating these procedures.

  Additionally, she asked what large employers are not honoring the checks. Mr. Golightly mentioned Albertsons, however other employers were mentioned. Ms. Lawrence mentioned that the state has forums for outreach. To further address this situation, she would need additional information from LA CSSD staff.

APPROVE MINUTES OF JUNE 22, 2006

On motion of Chair Eisenberg, seconded by Mr. Browning, and carried unanimously, the minutes for June 22, 2006 were approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was made.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Chair Eisenberg stated that two months of performance measures were up for review. Mr. Golightly provided a document that illustrates three months of figures on collections (copy on file). Chair Eisenberg stated that she spoke to Ms. Juiliano about whether the CS-157 form is still prepared by the state and the Board agreed to request this document in October and have it distributed.

Chair Eisenberg asked about collections going down as a result of liens. Mr. Browning replied that as of today, we have 5 million less in collections as compared to last year as a result of liens. People are no longer refinancing as frequently as last year (high interest rates). Mr. Browning added that our IRS revenue is down, which has in the past collected $40 million from federal

intercepts, and $10 million from state intercepts.

Additionally, Mr. Browning stated that the rate of growth for child support collections is down. In California, growth has gone down from an 8% rate of increase, to a 1-2% rate of increase in the last 4-5 years. This is part of the reason why the legislature awarded 12 million dollars to go to counties. Many counties have had a decline in collections.

Chair Eisenberg asked whether the transition to SDU would free up staff and money. Mr. Browning replied that there are more complexities to operate this system; therefore most counties are finding that it takes more staff than previously used before. In terms of money, there will be more money in the general operating budget after November 28, 2006 when the contract with the Court Trustee expires.

REVIEW AND APPROVE SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Chair Eisenberg informed the Board that they received a draft of the report in the mail, a copy of the transmittal letter, and the customer service committee report via email.

The Board made grammatical suggestions, such as changing ‘collected’ to ‘disbursed’ on page two of the document, and inquired about the blank spaces.

Member Tortorelli thanked Chair Eisenberg on behalf of the Board for her efforts in completing this report.

On motion of Chair Eisenberg, seconded by Member Cohen and carried unanimously, the Semi-annual report was approved.

Chair Eisenberg presented the transmittal letter, and made grammatical changes suggested by the Board, such as the correct spelling of CCSAS.

On motion of Chair Eisenberg, seconded by Member Speir and carried unanimously, the transmittal letter report was approved.

BENCHMARKS FOR MONITORING RESULTS OF “CAMPAIGNS” –– WAYNE DOSS

Mr. Doss reported that:

- *The Wage Assignment Compliance Campaign*: The campaign was initiated in the Division 2 office of the City of Commerce with the goal of improving employer compliance with wage assignments that were sent out by the department. When the Campaign began, the focus was on developing procedures for caseworkers to follow when a wage assignment did not result in payment and there was no updated information about the employment status of the non-custodial parent. Training on the new procedures was delivered to all enforcement

caseworkers in the Department.

During the course of this Campaign, many anomalies in the ARS processes for following up on wage assignments were identified. The Campaign made many recommendations for changes to ARS. Approval from the consortium is required for the changes that the Campaign had recommended. Approval for the changes came in July with strong support from Orange County. The changes are not yet in production—they are going through quality control testing. Once the changes go into production, Mr. Doss will be able to measure the impact. The changes will include mailing a new cover letter and business reply envelope with the initial wage assignment packet. The cover letter will provide employers a quick way to respond if the employee is no longer or never was employed.

Additionally, the current ARS process will be changed, substitute a one page document similar to the new cover letter in place of mailing a duplicate copy of the wage assignment to the employer when payment is not received. Also, the recommendation was made by the Campaign to telescope the timeframes for the processing of all the documentation from 75 days to 45 days.

Chair Eisenberg asked about when the letter states “we have not had a response”, refers to Los Angeles County or Sacramento. Mr. Doss replied that it refers to Los Angeles County. Chair Eisenberg asked if sending a check back to us would constitute a response. Mr. Doss replied that yes it would. Chair Eisenberg inquired if the wording should be changed to “you have not made a payment.” Mr. Doss replied that he is unsure whether the wording can be changed given the ARS consortium approval process. He recommended moving forward with the current letter to not slow the process.

Chair Eisenberg requested that Mr. Doss report back three months from the date when this goes into effect to the Board with the benchmarks listed at the bottom of the said page, along with the baseline which would be from 6 months earlier. Mr. Doss agreed.

- *The Workers Compensation Campaign*: Mr. Doss stated that this Campaign focused on desktop procedures for handling workers compensation cases. A number of procedures were created, including sending the order notice to withhold to all insurers once a workers compensation case was identified to his department. They were also trained on computer software that gives them the status of workers compensation cases from the Workers Compensation Appeals Board database in Sacramento.

  Mr. Doss has been tracking workers compensation collections since October and provided a chart that reflects the improvement of the data.

Chair Eisenberg stated that the Board has been told that this data is inaccurate due to some confusion at the Court Trustee about differences between workers compensation payments and state disability. Mr. Doss responded that this was clarified in October 2005.

Mr. Doss reported that since the implementation of the SDU in May, workers compensation payments have declined because there is a lack of training at the state level that is on par with the issues the Court Trustee had in terms of identifying a workers compensation payment when it comes in the door. Mr. Doss has been working to identify any discrepancies with the court trustee and the SDU staff. Mr. Doss responded that in May approximately $40,000 of payments, they were mischaracterized as something else. He is in the process of clarifying the data, but indicated that it takes a lot of time and staff resources.

Member Tortorelli inquired if workers compensation is considered to be a lien. Mr. Doss responded that it is not classified as a lien for the purposes of ARS recordkeeping. Member Tortorelli asked if this would be true if arrears were associated with workers compensation. Mr. Doss stated that it would still not be considered a lien.

Chair Eisenberg asked if Mr. Doss could report on the end of fiscal year data for workers' compensation cases

Ms. Tortorelli suggested that the state should provide extra money to the counties if this will be required to gather accurate data. Mr. Browning stated that his concern is not how the money is characterized, but how it is allocated. If it is incorrectly identified, it may go somewhere where it should not. Mr. Doss agreed and stated that his department has been providing a lot of feedback to the SDU, and showing them how to identify this as a workers compensation payment.

Ms. Lawrence asked if the payments are coming with no identifiers. Mr. Doss responded that they do come with identifiers, on the face of the check or an attachment that includes the case number in most instances. Ms. Doss assured Ms. Lawrence that the identification of workers compensation cases has been improving, which is exemplified by the August numbers. Chair Eisenberg asked the board if they would like to see the figures quarterly, and they agreed.

- *Case Create:* Mr. Doss stated that the goal of this campaign is to shorten the time for opening a child support case on ARS from the point of referral (welfare cases) or application for services (non-welfare cases). The Campaign team has identified three critical areas it would like to measure. The first is the amount of time required for a welfare referral to be processed from the point of referral at a co-locate office to the point of receipt at the Central Intake Division. The second critical period is the time required for a non-welfare application to be processed from receipt (at a division office or by mail) to the point of receipt at the

Central Intake Division. The third critical period, which applies to both welfare and non-welfare cases, is the amount of time required to process the case once it is received at the Central Intake Division.

Chair Eisenberg inquired when Mr. Doss would have this data. Mr. Doss responded that he would possibly have it in three months, which would include both receipt to Central Intake and the actual create in Central Intake.

- *Campaign 5:* Chair Eisenberg asked if this Campaign is near any benchmarks. Mr. Doss responded that it is not, considering the fact that it was started last week. It is a different Campaign in the sense that it is not trying to 'tweak' a process, but 'set-up' a process.

Chair Eisenberg inquired if the data the Board will receive on Central Intake will include all cases, or a sample. Mr. Doss replied that it will be from a large sample.

PROCEDURES FOR HELPING CPS WITH PROBLEMS ENFORCING AN ORDER FOR HEALTH INSURANCE AND INTERSTATE INSURANCE ORDERS—REPORT BY GAIL JUILIANO AND LORRAINE CAIN

Ms. Juiliano reported that:

- *Order for Health Insurance:* Ms. Juiliano reported that there will be an administrative federal performance measurement during the next federal fiscal year compliance review.

  Member Tortorelli asked if this would be regarding obtaining a health insurance policy, or only the cards. Ms. Juiliano responded that several issues will be addressed, including whether the health insurance included in the order. Ms. Tortorelli asked if it is already included. Ms. Juiliano responded that it is included in many cases, but not all.

  Chair Eisenberg stated that the Board is interested in enforcement. Ms. Juiliano stated that two of the areas the Department is concerned with are 1) that insurance cards were not provided to the custodial party, and 2) that the KRIS (Knowledge Resource Information System) program have clear instructions to the caseworker to tell them how to get that information relayed to the enforcement officer. The KRIS instructions and procedures have been enhanced. Also, a procedure was implemented to relay call centers to the Ombudsman team. From April 28 to July 31 there were 27 calls directly related to non-receipt of insurance cards. Ombudsmen assisted the party in 26 of those cases, and one case is under review. Ms. Tortorelli asked how long it normally takes. Ms. Juiliano responded that she did not have that information, but that it often varies.

  Member Tortorelli asked about when the custodial parent refuses to go

off Medi-Cal when the non-custodial parent is paying insurance. She asked if there is a procedure in place that gets the information to Medi-Cal that there is insurance in place. Mr. Browning stated that his department tells the Medi-Cal agency, and he used to get paid $50 dollars a case. If two insurances are present, private insurance (Blue Cross) becomes secondary, and Medi-Cal becomes first. In some situations, Medi-Cal sometimes provides coverage that private insurances do not.

Vice Chair Speir recommended that the County include information as part of medical training to the employer to let them know that the cards should go to CSSD and not the SDU, and that they can legally send them to the custodial parents. Chair Eisenberg replied that they are not given the address. Mr. Doss stated that identification is possible to present the custodial parent or the agency as a substitute official. Once this happens, the health plan administrator is required to forward the information exclusively to the designee. Mr. Doss added that the personal information in most instances is not available to outsiders.

Vice Chair Speir added that the problem is when the CP gets the information from CSSD that they have health insurance from Blue Shield, and they call the number and Blue Shield tells them they will not give them a card. She suggested that CSSD tell the custodial parents, and let them know that his department can help them get the card. Secondly, in order for the card to not go to the SDU, this is another way of letting employers know you need to send it to us and we will send them first to the custodial parent. Mr. Doss replied that he can accomplish her first request, but on the second request, he does not know what his office sends to the custodial party.

Chair Eisenberg asked Ms. Lawrence if her department has any data about CPs who get orders for insurance that ended using them. Ms. Lawrence stated that her department does not capture this information.

Chair Eisenberg proceeded to ask how much of a priority is getting health insurance for Ms. Lawrence's department. Ms. Lawrence stated that the department has numerous priorities, if Chair Eisenberg thought this topic a priority that she would be more than happy to bring this topic forward for consideration. She asked that Chair Eisenberg put together in writing her request. She mentioned that this topic was brought up several months ago by the CSAB and that the department had shared several documents related to this subject and committed to developing articles to go in local newsletters of our stakeholders.

- *Interstate Insurance Orders:* Ms. Juiliano stated that her department reviewed forty cases, and found that in four of those cases, health insurance was at one time a concern. The issue was not that the insurance was not used by the custodial party, but that the NCP did not have the funds to afford the insurance in the other state. Since the non-

custodial parent in question paid 50% of his income towards child support, there was not enough leftover to pay health insurance. Ms. Juiliano stated that this is an ongoing issue that will need attention.

Chair Eisenberg asked Ms. Lawrence who handles this type of policy issue. Ms. Lawrence replied that if it is a national issue, the Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) does. Chair Eisenberg asked if this is considered a national issue and gave the example of a NCP who is required to pay health insurance for a child out-of-state and the child cannot use it because he/she is out of state and the out-of-state insurance is unaffordable.

Mr. Browning stated that OCSE took this up about ten years ago and a decision was made that there would be no money attached to that as a performance indicator. Mr. Browning suggested that Ms. Lawrence raise this issue to Greta Wallace, Director of the Department of Child Support, and stated that the Board is interested in this issue and is willing to participate in national forums.

Chair Eisenberg inquired as to who can be asked for information on OCSE. Ms. Juiliano offered to provide the Board material if necessary. Mr. Browning is confident that the federal government would be willing to help if Ms. Wallace is on board. Chair Eisenberg stated that she can get RAND involved. Ms. Lawrence stated that if Chair Eisenberg can clarify the statement and present it in writing, she can meet with Ms. Wallace regarding this issue. Chair Eisenberg agreed to forward the necessary information to Ms. Lawrence. Mr. Browning agreed to assist Chair Eisenberg.

Vice Chair Speir contacted the Judicial Council regarding this issue, and she recommended to the Judicial Council that they add a notice to inform the public that the CP is legally entitled to receive the health insurance card. They have agreed to add language indicating this, and Vice Chair Speir sent them the proposed language to be added. They have a meeting in September and will review this issue.

REPORT ON SIX CASES OF IMPROPER SERVICE IDENTIFIED BY SUE SPEIR—SHERYL SPILLER

Ms. Spiller reported that these cases fall into two categories, 1) Personal Service and Sub-Service while the NCP was in jail (four cases) and Sub-Service at an address from which the NCP had reportedly already moved (two cases).

Category 1:

This category included four of the six cases. Three of which were old, dating back as far as 1995 and served by a previous vendor. There was only one case

which was served by the department's current vendor. Ms. Spiller stated that this case was classified under a personal service, but upon further review, the case does not fall into this category. The case should be classified as a sub-service. So she is going back with the contractor to deduct it from the invoice, so that no charges will be incurred
Category 2:
The remaining two cases had to do with NCPs being served while they had already moved from an address. Both cases were accurately classified as sub-service.

Vice Chair Speir asked if the processor checks with apartment managers to see if the NCP lives there. Ms. Spiller responded that the processor goes directly to the indicated apartment.

Ms. Spiller indicated that in one of the cases in question, the processor went to the apartment and was told the person was not there, and the person identified as having the same surname as the NCP was served, so the case was subsequently processed as a sub-service.

Vice Chair Speir stated that Ms. Spiller's report had notes indicating whether the NCP was paying or not paying, and asked where that information came from. Ms. Spiller replied that she asked her contract staff to find out if the NCP had paid or not, and her staff were not prepared to answer that question and had provided erroneous information. She added that this information should have not been listed on the report.

Ms. Juiliano added that what she gleaned from the report was that there were a number of situations where the NCP was incarcerated at the time of service. Statewide, better information is needed from the Department of Corrections.

Member Tortorelli asked Ms. Lawrence if interface with the Department of Corrections is part of the CCSAS contract. Ms. Lawrence did not know.

Member Brass added that in his experience, many people are not being personally served and that the subservice is deficient. Mr. Browning stated that many times, service only meets the technically of the law, which consists of serving someone the NCP knows because it is not always possible to serve the person in question.

Member Tortorelli asked if there is monitoring of contracts. Ms. Spiller replied that the contract division monitors the contracts, and meets with the branch divisions on a monthly basis.

Member Tortorelli stated that relying on only looking at defaults is not the best way, and suggested that a certain amount of monitoring of process servers be performed, such as checking on the processors to see that proper processing is being performed

Chair Eisenberg asked Ms. Spiller what her department is actively doing to check the quality of the service. Ms. Spiller replied that her department takes measures to ensure quality and contract compliance going out to the contractor site to monitor the contractor employees.

Member Tortorelli suggested that every time the court sets aside an order for non-service, we take that information and find out who the server is and go back to the processor and inform them that the court set this order aside. Ms. Cruz stated that it is something that her department can look into, and will report back in two months.
Vice Chair Speir inquired whether the contract server is instructed to serve the home address, and if so why that is done given the fact that most people are work during the day. Ms. Tortorelli stated that double service is not a realistic option, and that it may prove difficult to locate folks at a worksite. Mr. Browning suggested that Ms. Spiller get a written statement that the processor is willing to serve a work address. Ms. Spiller stated that the processor goes to all the addresses provided to them.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Eisenberg declared the meeting adjourned at 12:24 p.m.