



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 SEPTEMBER 28, 2006

Present

3rd District, Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq.
3rd District, Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.
4th District, Jean Cohen
5th District, Susan Speir
Child Support Services,
Philip Browning
Children and Family Services,
Sue Harper
Public Social Services,
Sylvia Valencia
Superior Court,
David Jetton
CA Department of Child Support
Services, Mary Lawrence

Guests

Lisa Garrett CSSD
Steven Golightly CSSD
Patricia Tellechea CSSD
Lisa Garrett CSSD
Larry Silverman CSSD
Julie Paik CSSD

Staff

Jim Corbett Board of Supervisors
Julio Portillo Board of Supervisors

Absent

2nd District, Paula Leftwich
2nd District, John Murrell
4th District, Maria Tortorelli, Esq.
5th District, Reginald Brass
Franchise Tax Board,
Debbie Strong
Chief Information Office,
Fred Nazarbegan

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum of seven voting members being present, Chair Eisenberg called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. in the Dan River Room of the Child Support Services Department (CSSD) in Commerce.

**DCSS DIRECTOR'S REPORT -- To include: Status of new PIP plan,
including measures for increasing collections of current and arrears;
report on new policies and procedures**

Member Harper joined the meeting at 9:50 a.m.

Ms. Mary Lawrence reported that:

- Ms. Lawrence confirmed that everyone received the policy letter which asks LCSAs to develop a QAPI plan for 2007 that should focus on any action in reference to improvement of performance.
- *Status of New PIP Plan*: 11 counties are involved, and Ms. Lawrence's department is developing plans unique to those counties to enhance performance. A solid draft has been completed, though not a final draft. Once finalized, it can be forwarded to Mr. Browning. The plan includes measures that contain case clean-up, review and adjustment of orders, enforcement, case closure and enforcement among other areas. The finalized document will be available by the end of October

APPROVE MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2006

On motion of Vice-Chair Speir, seconded by Member Cohen, and carried unanimously, the minutes for August 24, 2006 were approved.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT -- To include: Update on non-IVD cases coming into the statewide system; new PIP plan; electronic referrals from DPSS to Child Support

Mr. Browning reported that:

- The state sent a letter to the federal government stating that it is ready for system certification, which would stop federal penalties, which have totaled \$220 million to date..
- The transition to CSAS is not expected to be completed by the County until approximately 2009. About 1500 staff members will be trained to operate the new system.
- *Update on non-IV-D cases coming into the statewide system*: If you are a CP on a non-IVD private case, and are being paid by wage assignments, those are now going through the. If there is a NCP who has a IV-D and a non-IV-D case, this may change the amount received by both cases. The impact is yet to be determined due to the newness of this situation.

Mr. Browning stated that employers are being urged to send payments directly to the Sacramento office. Ms. Paik stated that approximately 5-11 bank boxes are coming back per day. The contents vary, including medical cards and other correspondence. This correspondence is being forwarded to their appropriate places as best as possible.

The guideline calculator that replaced the 'disomaster' came out during the beginning of last month. The transition to this new calculator has

created some complications.

- *QAPI plan:* Mr. Browning stated that the budget that Ms. Lawrence mentioned for the state was 12 million, and the County received 2.4 million of that amount. The Board of Supervisors approved this money last week so the department can use these funds to hire 40 new positions to work on improving performance, which will be in the QAPI plan. Mr. Browning mentioned that the new PIP plan will include an emphasis on COAP, and other areas where there is a shortage of resources in. Mr. Browning believes that there is nothing new in the plan that will dramatically improve performance, and no new funds are provided for the PIP.

The new QAPI plan for 2006-2007 is due in October. Mr. Browning will report back on the status of the new PIP plan in October. Mr. Browning is working on a third plan, a strategic department-wide plan. This plan has a mid-October deadline.

- *Electronic referrals from DPSS to Child Support:* Mr. Browning stated that an electronic referral system sends cases to his department when they are created in DPSS. The information goes to ARS, and the eligibility worker will perform an interview and determine if a paper referral is needed to forward to the child support staff co-located in their district office, and that paper referral is matched against the electronic referral. Mr. Browning stated that Ms. Juiliano performed a sample, and that the electronic cases created by DPSS were 100% accurately referred to Child Support, however, on 4% of those cases the Child Support Office had not received a paper referral and as a result no child support case was opened.

Chair Eisenberg asked if these cases are still being referred prior to approval. Mr. Browning replied that this policy is under consideration, though the challenge is that the automated system refers everything. The matter is currently being reviewed by Mr. Browning's department. He will report back during the next CSAB meeting on what progress his department has made.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Chair Eisenberg stated that numbers have improved in each category as compared to last year. Arrears collections were up last month, as well as this month.

REPORT ON CAMPAIGN 5—JULIE PAIK

Ms. Paik stated that Campaign 5 is the campaign to identify how money will be processed now that the department has gone over to the SDU. The department is under contract with the Court Trustee for payment processing, and this function has been assumed by the state. However, some of the money

processing issues have to be performed by the County—issues such as exceptions and money that cannot be identified.

As a result, Campaign 5 came about as a way to figure out how to deal with these money issues created by the transition to the SDU. Ms. Paik identified the following goals, which she plans to test by November 1, to address these issues:

1. Ensuring that exception payments are correctly allocated according to statewide rules of distribution in 100% of cases.
2. Resolving 90% of exception payments within 5 business days, 100% within 10 business days.
3. Processing 100% of unidentified exception payments within 25 business days.
4. Acknowledging all referrals by the close of business on the 2nd day of business following receipt by CFW/CDRT.
5. Meeting the above standards with (Z) size labor force.

Ms. Paik stated that sometimes money goes to the wrong counties (on suspense). Approximately 1000 of these cases existed last week, this week it is down to 600. She issued a map that delineates how these procedures are being streamlined. According to Ms. Paik, benchmarks will be available by November.

REPORT ON PROCESS FOR OBTAINING ORDERS WITHOUT AN I&E FOR UPWARD MODIFICATIONS AND ON PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING I&E INFORMATION FROM NON-WELFARE APPLICANTS—LARRY SILVERMAN

Mr. Silverman stated that one of the areas for improvement was the court rule that every time you perform a modification, you need to have the financial information of both parties. This helps when creating guidelines. However, this is a problem because one of the parties is usually not a participant.

As a result, a lot of cases that need modifications are not modified because a financial declaration from one of the parties is not available.

Mr. Silverman's department has been working on finding a solution with the court. The court has now agreed to allow a modification without the financial information from both parties, given the department follow certain guidelines from the court.

Since the institution of this agreement, no rejections have been experienced by the department. This process has allowed the department to overcome the hurdle of needing to have financial declarations from both parties, thus allowing more necessary modifications for families.

Vice Chair Speir requested information as to when and why their policy changed regarding sending out the non-welfare application without an I&E and whether this new policy is being monitored to see if the non-welfare applicants are sending the I&E back. The department agreed to provide the documents

and data that she requested at the next meeting

ARREARS PROJECT REPORT—JULIE PAIK

Ms. Paik stated that in April 2006 the project was created to review cases that had arrears only, and had no payments for fiscal year 2004-2005. 34% of 24,667 cases were reviewed. Wage assignments were issued in 11% (895) of the 8446 cases that were reviewed and 16% (1351) of cases that were reviewed qualified for closure. Ms. Paik stated that Ms. Juiliano believes that at this point, it would be beneficial to run a new list, considering the list she is currently working on was created in April.

Chair Eisenberg requested to see the written data on these findings. Ms. Paik stated that she would inform Ms. Juiliano of this request.

REPORT ON NATIONAL FOSTER CARE COLLABORATION AND FOSTER CARE ISSUES—STEVEN GOLIGHTLY

Mr. Golightly's department was contacted by the federal child support department to see if CSSD would be willing to collaborate with other urban jurisdictions on child welfare and child support issues. The other 3 jurisdictions are the State of Minnesota, the City and County of Milwaukee and the State of New Jersey.

Several discussions came about with these entities and a plan emerged. The following 3 activities were agreed upon:

1. Communication between the two departments can be improved. A liaison list was created between CSSD and DCFS which provided contact information for staff to use regarding potential inquiries.
2. There is a new state regulation that deals with determining whether or not to refer a child welfare case to child support for enforcement. The caseworker needs to make a determination concerning whether or not referral of that case would be in the 'child's best interest.' This state policy was implemented by DCFS in February. The expectation was that the number of cases referred to CSSD would diminish, though this did not happen. This matter was investigated by DCFS senior leadership, and the lack of reduction in referrals was attributed to the need for further training, and a lack of consensus on what the 'best interest of the child' means between all involved parties. CSSD is providing training to DCFS staff to better inform them on what happens to a case once it is referred to CSSD.
3. Acknowledge that a better job needs to be done on having frontline staff communicate with each other, and have staff understand both child support and child welfare. Mr. Golightly expects that by early 2007, that 300-400 frontline staff will be brought together for a daylong training to

explore how both departments can more effectively work together.

Vice-Chair Speir requested the Department to respond to a memo regarding foster care client problems that she prepared in 2004. The Department agreed to review the memo and provide answers

Chair Eisenberg excused herself from the meeting at 11:37 a.m.

WAGE ASSIGNMENT COMMITTEE REPORT AND DISCUSSION
REGARDING FUTURE COMMITTEES—SUE SPEIR

Vice-Chair Speir stated that Ms. Juiliano reported on the social security project that she was working on and of the 2 samples (2300 cases) it was indicated that in 10-15% of the cases they found an employer or closed the case. Also, in any case where the NCP was over 62 a wage assignment was automatically sent to Social Security. This project is on going as their work load permits.

The Committee also looked at the problem where an out-of-state case indicates in the system that there is a primary active verified employer, but no wage assignment was sent. 7,865 cases were identified, and to date, 285 have been reviewed. Of those 285 cases, 37 wage assignments were sent and 5 cases were closed. This was believed to be a valuable project but is currently on hold due to CCSAS.

The Committee has continued to look at the problem of staff not inputting family law orders in the system in a timely manner, and because of this QAPI continues to monitor this on a monthly basis.

Vice-Chair Speir reported there was a new written procedure regarding military service. Under the previous procedure, when a server went to serve a military person, if they had been transferred, the server would not ask where the person had been transferred. The new written procedure will be that the vendor will send it back to the clerk, and the clerk will perform further research to see where they were transferred to.

Vice-Chair Speir reported that the Wage Assignment Committee had decided to disband at this point in time but may be restarted, if appropriate, in the future. In the meantime, she indicated that the Committee believes that there are three continuing issues that the Department should address: incomplete/obsolete employer information; follow-up on mailed wage assignments; and inaccurate earnings income.

Vice Chair Speir raised an issue regarding the New Hire Registry and the Board to ask for a report from the state that would address the following issues:

1. Who is responsible for the New Hire Registry?
2. Is there a way to identify which employers report and who doesn't?
3. What, if anything, happens if an employer is non compliant?

**MATTERS NOT ON THE POSTED AGENDA (TO BE PRESENTED AND
PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA)**

No additional items were discussed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was made.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Speir declared the meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.