



# **DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

State of Arizona

2008 Annual Report

Submitted by:  
Representative Peter Hershberger  
Senator Linda Gray



## ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	
<i>Historical Background .....</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>Legislative Response.....</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>Membership .....</i>	<b>6</b>
<b>Domestic Relations Committee 2008</b>	
<i>Summary .....</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>Membership.....</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>Work, Findings and Recommendations .....</i>	<b>9</b>
<b>Tasks and Objectives</b>	
<b>Court Procedures .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Education/Prevention.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Substantive Law .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Ad-hoc Custody Statute Sub-workgroup .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Integrated Family Court.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Credit Issues.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Recommendations for Legislative Action.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Other Issues Before the Committee .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<i>Future Actions .....</i>	<b>15</b>

*TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued*

**Appendix A**

**Domestic Relations Committee**

*Purpose* ..... i  
*Membership* ..... ii

**The following Appendices (B to I) are located online at:**

<http://supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/DRC/DRC.htm>

**Appendix B**

**Coconino County Integrated Family Court Pilot Program  
Quarterly Program Progress Report  
October 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007**

Includes:

Addendum 1: Interim Evaluation Report, November 6, 2007

Addendum 2: IFC Advisory Committee

Addendum 3: Family Law Assistance Program Procedures



**Appendix C**

**Coconino County Integrated Family Court Pilot Program  
Quarterly Program Progress Report  
January 1, 2008 to March 31, 2008**



**Appendix D**  
**Coconino County Integrated Family Court Pilot Program**  
**Quarterly Program Progress Report**  
**March 31, 2008 to July 31, 2008**



**Appendix E**  
**Final Evaluation Report Integrated Family Court**  
**Helping Families and Children in Coconino County, Arizona**  
**May 19, 2008**



**Appendix F**  
**Pinal County Integrated Family Court**  
**Pilot Program – State Justice Institute Quarterly Progress**  
**Report No. 4**  
**October 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007**



**Appendix G**  
**Pinal County Integrated Family Court**  
**Pilot Program – State Justice Institute Quarterly Progress**  
**Report No. 5**  
**January 1, 2008 to March 31, 2008**



**Appendix H**  
**Pinal County Integrated Family Court**  
**Pilot Program – State Justice Institute Quarterly Progress**  
**Report No. 6**  
**April 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008**



**Appendix I**  
**Pinal County Integrated Family Court**  
**Pilot Program – State Justice Institute Quarterly Progress**  
**Report No. 7**  
**July 1, 2008 to September 30, 2008**



# ***DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE 2008 ANNUAL REPORT***

## ***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

As required by Arizona law (A.R.S. § 25-323.02), the Domestic Relations Committee, (“Committee”) jointly chaired by Senator Linda Gray and Representative Peter Hershberger, submits to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court this report.

The Committee was conceived as a forum to broadly explore, identify problems in and develop reforms for the state’s domestic relations statutes. Focusing on these goals, the Committee, with the assistance of its various workgroups, again realized success with the passage of legislative proposals that originated from the Committee.

The work of the Committee’s workgroups produced legislative recommendations for 2009 that tie into its overarching mission to develop reform for the state’s domestic relations statutes. Some initiatives provide easier access to the family court system while others impact Arizona’s families currently involved in that system as well as those who will be involved in the future.

The Committee actively continued the work of its predecessor, the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee (DR Subcommittee) throughout 2008, to explore concepts for improving the domestic relations system and Arizona’s domestic relations statutes. The group set an active schedule holding four meetings in 2008 during the interim session. Senator Linda Gray and Representative Peter Hershberger, Committee co-chairs, led the group through the study and discussion of new initiatives, issues carried over from the previous year and the mandate set forth in Laws 2002, Chapter 332.

Two standing workgroups continued to focus on custody and relocation issues and evaluate recommendations for future change through the legislature and the courts. One of the two ad-hoc workgroups, Integrated

Family Court, continued to monitor the on-going pilot programs in Coconino and Pinal Counties and initiated exploratory discussions regarding permanent funding for the program. The Credit Issues workgroup will make recommendations regarding financial issues that arise in the family law context.

The groups continued to focus on specific issues developed through strategic planning and from information gleaned from research, committee members, workgroup members, invited speakers and members of the public.

# **DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

## ***2008 ANNUAL REPORT***

### ***INTRODUCTION***

#### ***Historical Background***

Session law establishing the original Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee grew from the work of a legislative advisory committee.

In June 1993, Senator John Greene, President of the Senate, and Representative Mark Killian, Speaker of the House of Representatives, appointed a Joint Select Committee on Child Support Enforcement, co-chaired by Senator Matt Salmon and Representative Pat Blake Wilder, with the goal of creating an effective child support system for Arizona families and children. To assist in this effort, in July 1993, the Select Committee appointed a Technical Advisory Committee co-chaired by David Byers, Administrative Director of the Courts, and Bonnie Tucker, Deputy Director of the Arizona Department of Economic Security.

The Technical Advisory Committee brought together major stakeholders in the statewide child support arena. Membership represented a cross section of program administrators, parents, judicial officers and attorneys, creating a forum for meaningful debate on the issues facing Arizona's child support enforcement system.

The Technical Advisory Committee identified various problems within the system and recommended solutions for corrective action, including identification of the agency or entity responsible for initiating implementation. The Committee developed 57 recommendations, of which 28 required legislative action. At the conclusion of its mission, the Committee submitted a report of its recommendations dated November 1, 1993.

In the course of deliberations, there was consensus that integrated planning and communication among all of the child support and domestic relations

stakeholders is vital to ensure continued improvement in the system. Thus, the first recommendation made in the Committee's report was that a child support coordinating council be formed to provide a mechanism for ongoing communication and integrated planning among stakeholders to ensure consistency in child support policies.

The Technical Advisory Committee also identified a problem concerning the difficulty in understanding laws and procedures due to the lack of integration of the statutes relating to domestic relations issues. To address this problem, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that a domestic relations reform study committee be established to consolidate, revise and modernize Arizona's domestic relations statutes.

### *Legislative Response*

During the forty-first session, the legislature created each of the two subcommittees proposed in the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee. By Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24, both the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee ("Council") and the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee ("DR Subcommittee") were established within a single overarching legislative committee called the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee.

The Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee consisted of the four co-chairs from the two subordinate subcommittees. This overarching committee was established to coordinate the work of the subcommittees, but was specifically directed not to make substantive changes to the work, findings or recommendations of the two subcommittees. Any conflicts between the findings or recommendations of the subcommittees were to be referred back to the subcommittees for resolution.

Each of the subcommittees was co-chaired by a member of the Senate and a member of the House of Representatives. The enabling legislation identified the composition of each subcommittee's membership and prescribed the tasks to be undertaken. Reports were to be submitted by the subcommittees quarterly to the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee. The overarching committee was responsible to report annually on the work, findings and recommendations of the subcommittees to the

Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court.

The original legislation creating the overarching committee and its subcommittees was effective July 17, 1994. That same enabling law appropriated funds to the Arizona Supreme Court for costs associated with staffing the subcommittees. In July 1994, the Arizona Supreme Court designated the Domestic Relations Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts (“AOC”) to provide that staff support.

The legislation that originally established the overarching committee and its two subcommittees was scheduled for repeal from and after December 31, 1997. Provisions of law enacted in 1997 (Laws 1997, Chapters 45, 176 and 250) extended this date so that each of the subcommittees continued to serve the public until December 31, 2000. New legislation (Laws 2000, Chapter 312) repealed Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24 and added A.R.S. § 25-320.01 to statute. This statute, effective as of July 18, 2000, created the committee and subcommittees by statute, rather than session law, and extended the life of the committee and the two subcommittees until July 1, 2007. The statute further specified that the Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee was to meet jointly with the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee at least twice each year.

Legislation passed in 2002 (Laws 2002, Chapter 332) eliminated the Child Support Enforcement and Domestic Relations Reform Committee, the Child Support Coordinating Council Subcommittee and Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee. The new law created a new structure and two independent committees, the Child Support Committee and the Domestic Relations Committee (“Committee”), with simplified purposes, appointments and reporting requirements and provides that the two committees will expire on January 1, 2008. Legislation was passed in 2007 (Laws 2007, Chapter 73) which provides an extended expiration date of December 31, 2017 for these valuable and productive committees. The Court Services Division, Court Programs Unit, AOC, is responsible for staffing the committees created by this legislation.

Effective August 22, 2002, A.R.S. § 25-323.01, directed the Committee to prepare a statewide plan for an integrated family court with comprehensive subject matter jurisdiction over all matters involving the family and submit

this plan to the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on or before December 31, 2002.

The law further requires the Committee to prepare an annual report regarding the Committee's recommended changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead to a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. The Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court are to receive copies of the report.

This report reflects the Domestic Relations Committee's work, findings and recommendations for the 2009 legislative session.

### ***Membership***

The session law originally enacted in 1994 outlined the membership of each subcommittee by position or category and directed how chairpersons would be appointed. In 1995, the Legislature amended this law. Chapter 44 of the Laws of 1995 altered the numbers of subcommittee members and attempted to balance political party representation of legislative members. The 1995 law also directly affected the composition of the DR Subcommittee.

Under the original law, the only legislative members of the DR Subcommittee were the two subcommittee co-chairs, one appointed from each legislative chamber. As amended, session law provided there shall be *two* members of the Senate from different political parties and *two* members of the house of representatives, also from different political parties. As a result, two additional members, both of the minority party, were added in 1995. Co-chairperson positions were unaffected.

In 1997, the legislature also added additional requirements of membership. An amendment (Laws 1997, Chapter 173) to the original enabling law (Laws 1994, chapter 374, section 24) provided that members of each subcommittee shall serve two-year terms at the pleasure of the official or officials who appointed them. Additionally, the law specified that the appointments shall be made at the start of each even fiscal year and that members may be re-appointed.

The new law enacted in 2002 that created the Domestic Relations Committee further altered its membership composition and the method by which members are appointed. Three new positions were added that were not on the DR Subcommittee and include a: 1) law enforcement representative, 2) children's advocacy representative, and 3) representative from the family law section of the State Bar of Arizona. Also, a second active or retired judge or commissioner from the domestic relations department of the superior court was added and specified that one of the two should be from an urban county and one from a rural county. The statute eliminated a two-year term limit; members now serve at the pleasure of the appointing official. Appointments are now made by the Governor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

# ***DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE***

## ***2008***

### ***Summary***

In 2008, the importance of the Domestic Relations Committee as a recognized forum for cooperative decision making in the area of domestic relations was reaffirmed. Under the leadership of Representative Peter Hershberger and Senator Linda Gray, the Committee and its workgroups developed ideas intended to continue the mandate to reform the state's domestic relations system. In addition, several workgroups continued to study and suggest recommendations for the revision of domestic relations laws throughout the year.

The Committee continued its endeavor to analyze current laws and procedures and propose legislation to improve them. Through the activities of the various workgroups, recommendations to improve Arizona's family law statutes will be proposed for 2009 legislation and will be introduced by Senator Linda Gray and Representative David Lujan.

### ***Membership***

The session law originally establishing Domestic Relations Reform Study Subcommittee (Laws 1994, Chapter 374, Section 24) prescribed the membership composition of the DR Subcommittee by title or category and directed how and by whom each would be appointed. The new law enacted in 2002 that eliminated the DR Subcommittee and created the Committee altered the membership composition and expanded the individuals making appointments. Three new positions were added including representatives from a law enforcement agency, a child advocacy agency and the family law section of the State Bar of Arizona. A second active or retired judge or commissioner from the domestic relations department of the superior court was added and the law specified that one of the two judges or commissioners should be from an urban county and one from a rural county. The statute eliminated a two-year term limit; members now serve at the pleasure of the appointing official. Appointments are now made by the Governor, the president of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Linda Leatherman was the only member to resign in 2008, while two new members were appointed.

New members joining the Committee included:

- Danette Hendry, custodial parent
- Laura Cabanillas, representative from a faith-based organization

### ***Work, Findings and Recommendations***

The Committee is specifically charged in its enabling legislation (Laws 2002, Chapter 332) to recommend changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead to a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. The Committee met four times during the interim session. Comment from the public was encouraged to assist the Committee's efforts to continually improve Arizona's domestic relations system. Existing workgroups continued to meet and develop recommendations intended to benefit the citizens of Arizona.

As required by A.R.S. § 25-323.02, the Committee developed an integrated family court plan in 2002. Although the intent was to introduce legislation to implement the plan statewide, budget cuts made the occurrence of that very unlikely. The Committee instead worked jointly with the Arizona Supreme Court to develop three Integrated Family Court pilot projects in Maricopa, Coconino and Pinal Counties. The projects were formulated to adhere to the adopted Integrated Family Court plan to the extent possible, recognizing that some administrative and financial variances and obstacles would occur. In December, 2004, the three pilot counties submitted reports to the Arizona Supreme Court. Some progress and successes were realized, but funding remained a barrier to full implementation of such a plan.

In 2005, reinforced by support by the courts in Pinal and Coconino Counties, the Committee voted to seek legislation in the 2006 session authorizing two pilot projects in those counties that would run for two years each. The proposal carried an appropriation request and authorized the courts to follow the original integrated family court plan to the extent possible.

In 2006, Governor Napolitano signed SB 1267, Integrated Family Court pilot program into law as Chapter 364 E, to be effective July 1, 2006. Chief Justice McGregor signed an Administrative Order No. 2006-68, selecting the

Superior Court in Coconino County as the court in which the Integrated Family Court pilot program would be conducted. The Coconino County IFC opened their doors in December 2007. The Coconino County IFC program coordinator has regularly reported to the Committee and has submitted quarterly and interim reports to the Administrative Office of the Courts for approval.<sup>1</sup> On May 19, 2008, an independent *Final Evaluation Report* by Mark Morris Associates with Joanne M. Brown Consulting, was released. The evaluation “describes the implementation of the IFC model, analyzes quantitative data, and includes qualitative data from surveys and interviews with attorneys, parents, and judges.” The evaluation made the following findings:

1. The IFC is in complete compliance with the “Arizona Integrated Family Court Plan”;
2. The IFC, in structure and practice, satisfies established court performance measures. (The court performance measures include: (1) access to justice; (2) expeditious and timely disposition; (3) equality, fairness and integrity; (4) independence and accountability; and (5) public trust and confidence.)
3. The IFC has achieved the goals which Coconino County identified in its successful application for funding of this pilot.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, the report noted, “In addition to the potentially quantifiable costs and savings, the cost-benefit equation must also consider significant intangible factors. This evaluation concludes that the Coconino County Integrated Family Court has resulted in a higher quality of service to county citizens, reduction of stress and conflict for many families, and overall strengthening of the County’s judicial system.” In 2006, the Legislature approved \$850,000 from the General Fund in Fiscal Year 2006-2007 to implement the Integrated Family Court pilot program.

In 2007, Pinal County Superior Court was the recipient of a State Justice Institute (SJI) grant for an Integrated Family Court in rural Arizona in the amount of \$200,000.00. Pinal County’s IFC Steering Committee actually began planning and developing procedures and personnel job descriptions

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendices at: <http://supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/DRC/DRC.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix E - Final Evaluation Report - Integrated Family Court, “Helping Families and Children in Coconino County, Arizona, November 6, 2007 at: <http://supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/DRC/DRC.htm>.

one year before receiving grant monies from SJI. Pinal County's pilot program began calendaring their first IFC hearings in December 2007. The Pinal County IFC program coordinator has regularly reported to the Committee and has submitted quarterly reports to the Administrative Office of the Courts for approval.<sup>3</sup>

One of the Committee's standing workgroups, Court Procedures, merged with the Substantive Law workgroup in order to focus their efforts on examining the complex relocation and custody statutes. The Education and Prevention workgroup traveled to Flagstaff, Arizona to observe and study child component programs that enhance the level of meaningfulness to the Parent Education programs participants.

### ***TASKS AND OBJECTIVES***

Listed below is a description of the major activities by Committee workgroups.

#### ***Court Procedures***

Many projects and legislative proposals from the Committee's workgroups are developed over a period of several years due to the complex nature of data required for study and analysis. One such project undertaken by the Court Procedures workgroup and the Substantive Law workgroup is the assessment and analysis of the custody and relocation statutes. In 2008 the Court Procedures workgroup made a strategic decision to merge with the Substantive Law workgroup in order to thoroughly examine these statutes; thereby eliminating duplication of efforts and increasing productivity.

#### ***Education/Prevention***

The Education/Prevention workgroup continued to shape policies and procedures to develop and offer new education and prevention ideas and improve methods currently in use within the domestic relations system.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendices at: <http://supreme.state.az.us/courtserv/DRC/DRC.htm>.

In 2007 the workgroup started looking at inclusion of a child's component to the Parent Education Program, in order to illustrate to parents their child's unique perspective and specific concerns when experiencing the parents' divorce or separation. In 2008 workgroup members traveled to Flagstaff, Arizona to observe the Coconino County Integrated Family Court's innovative child's component pilot program which began in January 2008.

### ***Substantive Law***

2008 was an exciting year for the Substantive Law workgroup as the membership grew to include varied stakeholders consisting of the public, community legal services, and members of the Court Procedures workgroup. The workgroup continued to tackle complex issues surrounding the relocation of minor children who are the subject of a court order and interfacing custody issues.

The workgroup gained valuable perspective from internationally renowned relocation specialist, Dr. Phil Stahl, Ph.D., ABPP (Forensic). Dr. Stahl spoke to the group about relocation concerns, emerging national trends, and common pitfalls to avoid when contemplating changes to relocation statutes.

Additionally, the Substantive Law workgroup drafted proposed legislation that will update and remove references in statute to the *Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure* and replace those references to the appropriate *Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure* references.

The Substantive Law workgroup continued to encourage and invite public comments. This year a public comment culminated in proposed legislation that will require a parent or custodian to notify the other parent or custodian, if the parent or custodian knows that a convicted or registered sex offender or person convicted of a dangerous crime against children may have access to the child.

The workgroup will submit several legislative proposals for the 2009 legislative session as reflected in the following section below titled "Recommendations for Legislative Action."

### ***Ad-hoc Custody Statute Sub-Workgroup***

Towards the end of 2008, a new sub-workgroup was formed for the sole purpose of brainstorming potential changes to the custody statute which will achieve two goals:

1. Reduce the number of parents that are either not involved, or only minimally involved with their child(ren) after a divorce or separation, and
2. To facilitate shared parenting arrangements which allow for large amounts of time the child(ren) can spend with both parents.

This ad-hoc workgroup will report the results of their brainstorming sessions, along with any recommendations of proposed legislation, to the Substantive Law workgroup to ensure these complex issues have been thoroughly examined from all relevant perspectives.

### ***Integrated Family Court***

The IFC workgroup continued to monitor both the Coconino County and Pinal County IFC pilots. Based upon the success of the Coconino County IFC, the workgroup is exploring development of sustainability of the programs.

### ***Credit Issues***

This workgroup was formed to address concerns that were raised during the “Call to the Public” by parents who had experienced problems with post-divorce credit and financial problems that resulted from conflicts between divorce law and credit laws and practices.

The Credit Issues membership also grew this year as new members from bankruptcy law, collection law, and family law backgrounds positively contributed to the structure of this workgroup.

The Credit Issues workgroup will submit a few legislative proposals for the 2009 session as reflected in the following section below titled “Recommendations for Legislative Action.”

## **Recommendations for Legislative Action**

Potential legislative proposals for the 2009 session include the following:

- Changes to eight separate statutes that remove outdated references to the *Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure* and replaces them with references to the *Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure*.
- Changes to a custody statute which requires a parent or custodian to notify the other parent or custodian, if the parent or custodian knows that a convicted or registered sex offender or person convicted of a dangerous crime against children may have access to the child.
- Changes to the parenting plan statute which requires each parenting plan to include a statement regarding the notification requirement of parents or custodians as it relates to convicted sexual offenders and those convicted of dangerous crimes against children.
- Changes to the domestic relations education statute which require each program to include education regarding the notification requirement of parents or custodians as it relates to convicted sexual offenders and those convicted of dangerous crimes against children.
- Revisions to the disposition of property statute that requires parties involved in actions for dissolution of marriage, legal separation or annulment to file with the clerk of the superior court a confidential schedule outlining all assets and debt or other obligations. The proposed legislation will also create a rebuttable presumption that undisclosed property was willfully concealed and allows the injured party to elect from a series of forfeiture provisions.

### **Other Issues Before the Committee**

Last year one of the Committee's member's professional experiences led the Committee to investigate the issue of possession of child pornography material in the context of a family court dispute. As a result of this, the Committee and the AOC collaborated with the Arizona State Bar and featured this subject matter to a State Bar Continuing Legal Education webcast aired in February 2008.

In February 2007, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts brought together a working group of thirty-seven experienced practitioners and researchers to identify and explore conceptual and practical tensions that have hampered effective work with families in which domestic violence has been identified or alleged. Former Committee member, Hon. Karen Adam, was an attendee at the Wingspread Conference on Domestic Violence and Family Courts. Judge Adam gave an informative presentation to the Committee outlining the points of consensus from this important and timely conference.

As in past years, many issues and ideas came before the Committee that never reached the level of proposed legislation but ultimately each issue leads to an important and thorough evaluation of various components within the domestic relations system. Some issues take more than one year to finalize while others lead to ideas that merit further investigation.

### ***Future Actions***

Based on the recommendations of the workgroups, the Committee will continue to develop proposals for future legislative action and to pursue a strategy for accomplishing the long-term goal to improve and reform the domestic relations system. Workgroups will continue to explore issues currently under discussion, new issues that arise, and endeavor to increase public awareness of domestic relations issues.

Once again, the intended purpose of maintaining and continuing a statewide Committee comprised of stakeholders from various backgrounds in the domestic relations arena was shown to be a wise and successful endeavor. Significant gains in domestic relations law have been realized through the efforts of this Committee by utilizing current, empirical, data-driven research, practical experience, and testimony from Arizona's citizens. Arizona is held up nationally as visionary and progressive in domestic relations law, due in part to this Committee's collaborative efforts.

Each year, a number of proposals are introduced to the Legislature with the intent of altering procedures and standards in domestic relations cases without presentation to the Domestic Relations Committee first. The

Committee stands prepared to serve as a clearinghouse for new ideas and proposals and provide input to the Legislature, in order that system changes be developed in a coherent manner in the best interests of our State's families and children.

*APPENDIX A*  
*TO*  
*DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE*  
*2008 ANNUAL REPORT*

**Domestic Relations Committee**

# ***DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE***

## ***PURPOSE***

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-323.02, the Domestic Relations Committee was formed to:

Prepare a statewide plan for an integrated family court with comprehensive subject matter jurisdiction over all matters involving the family and submit this plan to the Governor, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on or before December 31, 2002.

Prepare an annual written report regarding recommended changes to the domestic relations statutes, rules and procedures and other related issues designed to lead a reform of the state's domestic relations statutes. The Committee shall submit this report to the Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court on or before December 31 of each year and provide a copy of the report to the Secretary of State and the Director of the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records.

# ***DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE***

## **MEMBERSHIP**

House Four members of the House of Representatives, not more than two from the same political party and one designated as Co-Chair, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Andy Biggs, David Bradley, Pete Hershberger (Co-Chair), David Lujan***

Senate Four members of the Senate, not more than two from the same political party and one designated as Co-Chair, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Tim Bee, Linda Gray (Co-Chair), Leah Landrum Taylor, Rebecca Rios***

Other One administrative officer of the Supreme Court or the officer's designee, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***Ms. Theresa Barrett, Arizona Supreme Court***

One professional domestic relations mediator, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Ms. Jodi Brown***

One representative of a conciliation court, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***Mr. Sidney Buckman, Conciliation Court***

One representative from a faith-based organization knowledgeable in domestic relations issues, appointed by the Governor:

***Laura Cabanillas***

One parent who has joint custody, who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Mr. Daniel Cartagena***

Two parents who are knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who are not judges or commissioners, appointed by the Governor:

***Dr. William Fabricius, Mr. Todd Franks***

One clerk of the superior court, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***The Honorable Beverly Frame, Clerk of Superior Court in Yuma County***

One domestic relations educator experienced in matters relating to parenting or divorce classes, appointed by the Governor:

***Ms. Grace Hawkins***

One custodial parent who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Ms. Danette Hendry***

One member of a law enforcement agency in Arizona, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Mr. Jeff Hynes***

One custodial parent who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Dr. Ella Maley***

One representative of a statewide domestic violence coalition, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Ms. Patti O'Berry***

One non-custodial parent who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Mr. George Salaz***

One member of an agency that advocates for children, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Ms. Donnalee Sarda, Executive Director, Defenders of Children***

One domestic relations attorney, appointed by the Governor:

***Ms. Ellen Seaborne***

One active or retired judge or commissioner from an urban county from the domestic relations department of the superior court, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***The Honorable Judge Sarah Simmons, Superior Court, Pima County***

One parent who has joint custody, who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the President of the Senate:

***Mr. Russell Smoldon, State and Local Government Relations, Salt River Project***

One marriage and family therapist knowledgeable in domestic relations issues, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Dr. David Weinstock***

One active or retired judge or commissioner from a rural county from the domestic relations department of the superior court, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***Honorable Thomas Wing, Superior Court in Navajo County***

One member of the family law section of the state bar of Arizona, appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court:

***Mr. Steve Wolfson, Attorney, Family Law***

One psychologist experienced in performing child custody evaluations, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Dr. Brian Yee***

One non-custodial parent who is knowledgeable in domestic relations issues and who is not a judge or commissioner, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

***Vacant***

***Prepared by Committee Staff:***

Court Services Division - Court Programs Unit  
Administrative Office of the Courts  
Arizona Supreme Court  
1501 West Washington, Suite 410  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007