

NOTICE

This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

2014 IL App (4th) 140726-U

NO. 4-14-0726

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

FILED

December 22, 2014
Carla Bender
4th District Appellate
Court, IL

In re: MARRIAGE OF)	Appeal from
GREG BROQUARD,)	Circuit Court of
Petitioner-Appellant,)	McLean County
and)	No. 12D19
CARRIE BROQUARD,)	
Respondent-Appellee.)	Honorable
)	Lee Ann S. Hill,
)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE HOLDER WHITE delivered the judgment of the court.
Presiding Justice Pope and Justice Turner concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

¶ 1 *Held:* The appellate court affirmed the trial court's decision to grant respondent's petition for removal of the Broquards' minor children to Washington, D.C.

¶ 2 In March 2014, the trial court dissolved the marriage between petitioner, Greg Broquard, and respondent, Carrie Broquard. As part of the judgment, the court granted Carrie sole custody of the couple's children. Subsequently, in April 2014, Carrie filed a petition to remove the children to Washington, D.C. In July 2014, the court granted Carrie's petition.

¶ 3 Greg appeals, asserting the trial court erred by granting Carrie's petition for removal. For the following reasons, we affirm.

¶ 4 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 5 A. Dissolution Proceedings

¶ 6 In March 2014, the trial court entered a judgment dissolving the marriage of Greg and Carrie. The parties shared two children, N.B. (born March 9, 2007) and S.B. (born December 1, 2008). As part of the dissolution judgment, the court incorporated a November 2012 order granting sole custody to Carrie and awarding reasonable and liberal visitation to Greg. Greg's visitation schedule included alternate weekends, every Wednesday evening, and alternating holidays.

¶ 7 B. Removal Proceedings

¶ 8 In April 2014, Carrie filed a petition for removal, requesting the trial court's permission to remove the children to Washington, D.C. The hearing occurred on two nonconsecutive days in June and July 2014.

¶ 9 1. *Carrie's Testimony*

¶ 10 During the first day of the hearing, Carrie testified she received a job offer from Lafayette Elementary School, a Washington, D.C., public school, to serve as principal. After receiving the job offer, she took the children to visit the school and surrounding area to determine if she thought the move would be in their best interests. The children participated in one of the classes and enjoyed themselves. Carrie had visited Washington, D.C., with the children on numerous occasions and had established "a level of support" and familiarity with the city.

¶ 11 Carrie described Lafayette as the largest of the city's elementary schools and one of the top-performing schools in the area. Her salary would be \$103,000 annually, with a gross monthly income of \$9,233. Each year, she would receive a \$5,000 salary increase and would be eligible for a \$25,000 annual bonus. At Carrie's current position with Bloomington-Normal's

Unit 5 schools, she earned a gross monthly income of \$5,833 and received a \$1,500 annual bonus.

¶ 12 Carrie had served as a school administrator for nine years. She was an assistant principal for three years in California and four years in Unit 5 schools. Her salary decreased \$21,000 annually when the family moved from California to Illinois prior to S.B.'s birth. On cross-examination, she stated they moved back to Illinois because Greg needed his mother's support with parenting. She had to focus on increasing her salary because Greg refused to work outside the home or seek higher-paying employment. Originally, Carrie accepted the position with Unit 5 with the understanding that the school intended to promote her to a principal position. For the past two years, she had been a special-education coordinator in a local elementary school. She made the change in order to build a well-rounded résumé that would provide her with access to new job opportunities. She also sought a more lucrative position because she provided the majority of financial support for the children.

¶ 13 Carrie explained she applied for 16 open principal positions in the Bloomington-Normal area and other nearby districts over the course of five years but, despite often reaching the final interview stages, never received the position. She received a recommendation to apply for an associate principal's position, but she did not apply because that position required her to act as an athletic director and attend all athletic events. She also applied for positions in other nearby districts with no success. She shaped her educational background, which included a master's degree and a doctorate in educational administration, with the goal of becoming a principal. In March 2014, Carrie said she informed Greg that she had expanded her search to areas where she had a support network in place for their children. She did not know Greg would contest removal until April 2014, when she was already in the final rounds of interviews.

¶ 14 Carrie received two job offers from the Washington, D.C., area and accepted the one at Lafayette because it had the highest salary and better benefits for the children.

Specifically, Carrie noted the children could receive tuition assistance for college from the school. The position also satisfied one of Carrie's professional goals.

¶ 15 Carrie noted her position at Unit 5 was as an at-will employee, as they had no union representation. Conversely, at Lafayette, she had a negotiated one-year contract, to be renegotiated at the end of the 2014-2015 school year.

¶ 16 With respect to the children's quality of life, Carrie testified the children would also attend Lafayette. For the 2013-2014 school year, the children had been granted an exception to attend a Unit 5 school outside of their district; however, they had not yet been granted that exception for the upcoming 2014-2015 school year. Neither Unit 5 school met the federal standard for adequate yearly progress. Conversely, Lafayette met adequate-yearly-progress standards and offered numerous special programs of interest to the children, such as art programs and peace clubs, that Unit 5 schools did not offer. The peace club would specifically further Greg's Buddhist teachings. The school's enrollment included children of numerous international ambassadors, an international influence supported by both Carrie and Greg.

¶ 17 The Washington, D.C., community would also be far more diverse than Bloomington-Normal, which Carrie explained would directly benefit the children by giving them understanding and respect for other cultures. Lafayette also rated high in athletics and safety. The children would attend before- and after-school enrichment programs that included the ability to learn a foreign language, participate in science club, and other activities not available in Unit 5 schools. On cross-examination, Carrie admitted her home had a backyard and was located near a park with various athletic fields. The children had school friends but rarely spent time with them

outside of school. Carrie conceded the children had family in the Bloomington-Normal area. She noted her parents saw the children only about once every four to six weeks due to visitation schedules. She stated, however, that her parents were willing and able to travel. In Washington, D.C., Carrie had several friends, one of whom had a young daughter for the children to socialize with until they made new friends. Carrie stated she did not feel she had professional support in Unit 5.

¶ 18 In terms of the long-term benefit to the children, Carrie testified the Washington, D.C., area boasted eight nationally ranked high schools that would increase the children's college opportunities. The curriculum also provided more advanced-placement opportunities. The children would have access to prominent Washington, D.C., colleges such as Georgetown, Howard, and the University of Maryland. Carrie stated, "it's not to say our kids won't be successful here, but their benefit to them is just literally the world is their oyster in D.C., both nationally and internationally." Additionally, the children would have access to all of the museums, aquariums, and facilities at the seat of national government.

¶ 19 Carrie testified that Greg's share of the children's health-care premiums would decrease due to the change in her insurance coverage. Her increased salary would allow her to save money for the children's college accounts, something she had been unable to do at Unit 5. She would also have an increased retirement contribution that would provide further benefit to herself and the children in the future. The children would also be eligible for college-tuition assistance of up to \$10,000 per child, per year. Carrie presented an estimated budget demonstrating a significant increase in her discretionary income. She had already secured a renter for her Bloomington-area home that would provide additional income of \$1,300 per month.

¶ 20 Carrie presented three housing examples to the trial court but explained none of those options were definitive because she was waiting for the court's ruling before placing a deposit. She had already researched which neighborhoods were safe and intended to avoid those known for high crime rates. However, she admitted she had not run those prospective homes through a Washington, D.C., police database. Though she would work in an affluent neighborhood, she would be unable to afford rent in that particular neighborhood. By the second hearing date in July 2014, the options presented by Carrie were off the market, which would require her to find other housing.

¶ 21 In terms of visitation, Carrie offered two suggestions. One option involved Greg relocating to Washington, D.C., and maintaining the same visitation schedule. The second option, if Greg remained in Illinois, would provide him with (1) summer, spring break, and Thanksgiving visits; (2) alternating Christmas breaks; and (3) in-state visitation that he could exercise at his leisure. Carrie offered to let Greg stay in her home when he visited the children, and she would stay the night elsewhere if necessary. She was "flexible" on transportation costs and had even offered to pay any costs related to Greg's relocation to Washington, D.C. Carrie stated she wanted the children to maintain a healthy relationship with both parents.

¶ 22 *2. Greg's Testimony*

¶ 23 In July 2014, Greg offered his testimony to the court. Greg testified he was concerned that Carrie removing their children to Washington, D.C., would impact his relationship with them. He expressed concerns about the safety of the girls and the emotional impact of the children attending Washington, D.C., schools. Greg attempted to enter into evidence his research on crime statistics in the areas in which Carrie testified she sought housing. However, the trial court sustained Carrie's objection to the evidence based on Greg generating

the reports following Carrie's testimony. Greg provided an offer of proof that he did not know how to obtain information on the safety of certain neighborhoods until after Carrie's testimony. Greg also expressed concerns about Lafayette being located in an affluent neighborhood, as he believed his children would not fit in with the other students.

¶ 24 Greg remained in the former marital residence and worked from home. He grew up approximately 30 minutes from his current residence. Carrie grew up in the same town. Though Greg and Carrie lived in California during the beginning of their marriage, they moved back to Illinois so their children would be close to their grandparents and learn Midwestern values. Because Greg worked from home, they did not require child-care services. Greg testified, after their separation, the children stayed with him after school each day until Carrie returned from work. He said he missed about five visitation days since the trial court entered its November 2012 order regarding custody. Greg stated Carrie tried on two occasions to prevent him from exercising his after-school time with the children. In February 2014, she discontinued his after-school visitation and reverted back to the court's November 2012 visitation order. After a week, she restored Greg's after-school visitation. In all, Greg saw the children almost every day outside of the weekends where the girls remained with Carrie. In other words, he saw the children all but four days each month.

¶ 25 Greg explained he had a very close bond with his children due, in part, to his daily access to them. He believed that it would be detrimental to the relationship to substantially change his visitation. Both children were doing very well in school, and Greg added that N.B. even had a "boyfriend." He noted the girls had close friends in school that they sometimes socialized with outside of school.

¶ 26 Greg's mother saw the girls approximately once a week. She would take the girls on nature walks and the girls formed a "loving and nurturing" relationship with her. In September 2013, Greg's stepfather attempted to commit suicide by shooting himself. He continued to live with Greg's mother but was undergoing psychiatric care. Greg admitted he did not honor Carrie's request to prohibit the girls from being under his stepfather's sole supervision.

¶ 27 Additionally, Greg testified Carrie did not offer to pay any costs related to him relocating to Washington, D.C. She also did not offer to pay for any of Greg's transportation costs if he chose not to relocate. Greg disputed that Carrie would have more disposable income from her job at Lafayette because the cost of living was higher in Washington, D.C. Carrie's income would increase approximately 45%, but the cost of living in Washington, D.C., was approximately 33% higher than in Bloomington-Normal. He also asserted he did not wish to live in Washington, D.C., nor could he afford to do so. Moreover, he could not afford half of the children's transportation costs. On cross-examination, Greg said he received his work from referrals and did not actively seek projects to increase his income.

¶ 28 One reason Greg stated for not wanting to move to Washington, D.C., was that he had a girlfriend, with whom he was contemplating marriage. He said the children had formed a close bond with his girlfriend.

¶ 29 *3. The Trial Court's Order*

¶ 30 The trial court stated it believed both parents loved the children and it understood the positions of both parties. However, in weighing the factors set forth in *In re Marriage of Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d 316, 518 N.E.2d 1041 (1988), the court granted Carrie's petition for removal. The court noted the move would provide financial, cultural, and educational benefits to the children. Moreover, with Carrie's substantial increase in salary came the elevated position as

principal and the prestige of working in the Washington, D.C., area. The court determined Carrie had been pursuing this career goal since early in the marriage and prior to moving to Illinois, so her motive was clearly not an attempt to thwart visitation. The court did not find Carrie's lack of specific housing dispositive because she was waiting on permission from the court before securing housing.

¶ 31 The trial court stated it understood Greg's concerns about the children's safety and that the removal would result in his inability to exercise visitation as he had before. However, the court believed it could fashion reasonable visitation for Greg. The court ordered Greg would receive visitation on (1) spring break, (2) Thanksgiving weekend, (3) alternate Christmas holidays, (4) summer vacation outside of the two weeks following and preceding the school year, and (5) any three-day weekends. Greg would have the ability to exercise his visitation twice per month, either in Illinois or Washington, D.C. Carrie would pay two-thirds of any transportation costs. The court also recommended Carrie facilitate frequent online communication between Greg and the children.

¶ 32 This appeal followed.

¶ 33 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 34 On appeal, Greg asserts the trial court erred by granting Carrie's petition for removal. Initially, we note Carrie did not file an appellee's brief. However, because the record before us is simple and the claimed errors are such that this court can easily decide them without the aid of an appellee's brief, we will address the merits of Greg's appeal. See *Thomas v. Koe*, 395 Ill. App. 3d 570, 579, 924 N.E.2d 1093, 1100 (2009).

¶ 35 Section 609(a) of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act (Marriage Act) (750 ILCS 5/609(a) (West 2012)) provides, in relevant part:

"The court may grant leave, before or after judgment, to any party having custody of any minor child or children to remove such child or children from Illinois whenever such approval is in the best interests of such child or children. The burden of proving that such removal is in the best interests of such child or children is on the party seeking the removal."

We will not overturn the trial court's decision allowing removal of the children unless it is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 328, 518 N.E.2d at 1046. "A judgment is against the manifest weight of the evidence when the opposite conclusion is clearly apparent or when the trial court's findings are unreasonable, arbitrary or not based on the evidence." *In re Marriage of Dorfman*, 2011 IL App (3d) 110099, ¶ 46, 956 N.E.2d 1040.

¶ 36 Determining the best interests of the children must be made on a case-by-case basis, depending on the circumstances presented in each case. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 326, 518 N.E.2d at 1045. However, the trial court should consider the following factors in reaching its decision: (1) the likelihood the move will improve the quality of life for the custodial parent and the children; (2) whether the motive in seeking removal is to defeat or frustrate visitation; (3) the motives of the noncustodial parent in resisting removal; (4) the visitation rights of the noncustodial parent; and (5) whether the court can fashion a realistic and reasonable visitation schedule. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 326-27, 518 N.E.2d at 1045-46.

¶ 37 Greg takes exception to the trial court's application of the *Eckert* factors. Specifically, Greg contends the court erred by (1) finding the move to Washington, D.C., would improve Carrie's quality of life, (2) determining the move would improve the children's quality of life, (3) failing to assess the potential harm to the children which could result from the move,

and (4) finding that a realistic and reasonable visitation schedule could be reached. We take Greg's assertions in turn.

¶ 38 A. Carrie's Quality of Life

¶ 39 Greg first argues the trial court erred in finding removal of the children to Washington, D.C., would improve her quality of life because a higher salary alone is not enough to favor removal. See *In re Marriage of Demaret*, 2012 IL App (1st) 111916, ¶ 49, 964 N.E.2d 756. According to Greg, Carrie failed to prove (1) her salary would provide more disposable income, (2) she would receive a \$25,000 annual bonus, or (3) the Lafayette position provided more job security.

¶ 40 Greg asserts Carrie failed to prove her increased salary would provide for more disposable income, as the cost of living in Washington, D.C., is significantly higher than that in central Illinois. He also noted Carrie had yet to secure housing, so she could not testify as to how much disposable income would remain after deducting rent payments and travel expenses.

¶ 41 Though Carrie could not testify as to the precise amount she would be paying in rent, as she was waiting for the trial court's ruling before obtaining housing, she did present several housing options to the court. Carrie was able to present a range of rental fees based on the market she was searching. Moreover, she had already found a renter for her Bloomington-Normal home to offset the rental costs of a home in Washington, D.C. She presented documents demonstrating that her salary would increase 45% while her cost of living would increase 31%, enough to provide her with increased disposable income.

¶ 42 Greg also asserts Carrie misrepresented the annual bonus she would receive, as she was not guaranteed a \$25,000 annual bonus. In her testimony, Carrie stated she would "have the *potential* of earning \$25,000" *if* she met her performance goals and received a favorable

evaluation. (Emphasis added.) She did not tell the court she would definitely earn a \$25,000 annual bonus; rather, she indicated she could receive a bonus *if* she met the appropriate conditions. Though she was guaranteed a \$1,500 annual bonus at Unit 5 schools for holding a doctorate degree, that sum pales in comparison to the potential bonus she could receive at Lafayette.

¶ 43 Finally, Greg argues Carrie would have no more job security at Lafayette than she does at Unit 5 schools. However, Carrie testified she was an at-will employee at Unit 5, which would permit the district to release her at any time. Conversely, at Lafayette, Carrie would be protected by a one-year negotiated contract, which could be renegotiated at the end of each school year. That affords her significantly more job security than her at-will employment at Unit 5 schools.

¶ 44 Moreover, a move to Washington, D.C., would improve Carrie's quality of life in ways not addressed by Greg on appeal. She testified she would have far more professional support in Washington, D.C. She developed her career with the goal of becoming a principal, a goal she has finally obtained at a "prestigious" public school. All of this will improve her quality of life.

¶ 45 Accordingly, we conclude the trial court did not err in concluding removal would improve Carrie's quality of life.

¶ 46 B. The Children's Quality of Life

¶ 47 Greg next contends the trial court erred in determining removal to Washington, D.C., would improve the children's quality of life.

¶ 48 First, as we noted above, the children will benefit financially from the move to Washington, D.C., due to the significant increase in Carrie's salary. Additionally, Carrie pointed

to the cultural and educational benefits of living in Washington, D.C., including associating with people from various cultures and visiting the numerous museums in the area. Moreover, the children would be attending school in the same facility where Carrie would be the principal, thus giving the children instant access to her when necessary.

¶ 49 Greg relies on *In re Marriage of Clark*, 246 Ill. App. 3d 479, 482, 616 N.E.2d 2, 4 (1993), to demonstrate that a custodial parent fails to prove removal is in the best interests of the children where the custodial parent provides no evidence regarding the schools the children would attend, the neighborhood in which they would live, or the house they would occupy. However, here, Carrie provided evidence regarding the school the children would attend and provided examples to the trial court of the type of neighborhood to which she intended to move. Greg emphasizes that Carrie had not obtained specific housing; however, she could not obtain housing until she knew whether the trial court would permit removal. Therefore, Greg's emphasis on this argument is unpersuasive.

¶ 50 Greg argues it is in the children's best interests to remain in Bloomington-Normal. There, they had a large backyard adjacent to a park, access to both parents and their grandparents, and were well-adjusted to their schools. Greg compares the factual circumstances to those set forth in *In re Marriage of Elliott*, 279 Ill. App. 3d 1061, 665 N.E.2d 883 (1996). In *Elliott*, the appellate court affirmed the denial of the mother's petition to remove the children, concluding the father's work schedule was too erratic to schedule reasonable visitation. *Elliott*, 279 Ill. App. 3d at 1067, 665 N.E.2d at 887. The court focused on the Marriage Act's purpose of securing " 'the maximum involvement and cooperation of *both parents* regarding the physical, mental, moral and emotional well-being of the children during and after the litigation.' " (Emphasis in original.) *Elliott*, 279 Ill. App. 3d at 1066, 665 N.E.2d at 887 (quoting 750 ILCS

5/102(7) (West 1994). While we agree with the *Elliott* court's focus on securing the involvement of both parents, the facts presented in *Elliott* are distinguishable because that case hinged on the inability of the court to adequately provide reasonable, consistent visitation given the father's erratic work schedule. In the present case, Greg works from home, thus providing him with flexibility in his schedule not present in *Elliott*.

¶ 51 Greg also asserts Carrie misrepresented the amount of tuition assistance the children would receive if they attended school in Washington, D.C. Carrie testified the girls could each receive \$10,000 annually for their college education. Greg points out that the children would receive *up to* \$10,000 if they met certain conditions and the fund financing the assistance remained intact. Greg overlooks that Carrie provided the same documentary evidence to the trial court in support of her testimony that he relies on for this appeal. Accordingly, the court had the opportunity to weigh the credibility of Carrie's statement in light of her documentary evidence.

¶ 52 While both Carrie and Greg agree the children were well-adjusted and enjoyed their lives in the Bloomington-Normal area, the trial court considered the benefits of moving the children to Washington, D.C., which included exposure to cultural diversity, access to superior schools, and additional financial security. We therefore conclude the court's finding that it was in the children's best interests to grant Carrie's petition for removal was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 53 C. Potential Harm to the Children

¶ 54 Greg next asserts the trial court erred in not considering the potential harm that will result from Carrie removing the children to Washington, D.C. Specifically, Greg argues the

removal prevents the children's routine, daily contact with him, which will be detrimental to the bond they have formed.

¶ 55 The trial court should consider the bond between the children and the noncustodial father when hearing a petition for removal. See *In re Marriage of Smith*, 172 Ill. 2d 312, 324, 665 N.E.2d 1209, 1214 (1996). Greg notes, in *Smith*, the supreme court held the detriment to the children's relationship with their father outweighed the benefits of removal. *Smith*, 172 Ill. 2d at 324, 665 N.E.2d at 1214. However, he overlooks the distinguishable facts in *Smith*, specifically that one of the children in that case was "troubled" and removal would have the adverse effect of changing her surroundings and interrupting her close relationship with her noncustodial father. *Smith*, 172 Ill. 2d at 322-23, 665 N.E.2d at 1213-14. Here, the children are well-adjusted, and no evidence demonstrated their mental or emotional well-being would be placed in jeopardy with the move to Washington, D.C.

¶ 56 Greg also relies on two other cases. In *In re Marriage of Matchen*, 372 Ill. App. 3d 937, 950, 952, 866 N.E.2d 683, 694-95 (2007), the appellate court affirmed the trial court's denial of removal because the detrimental effect of removing the children from their father outweighed any benefits the move might bring. In *In re Marriage of Collingbourne*, 204 Ill. 2d 498, 535-36, 791 N.E.2d 532, 552 (2003), the supreme court affirmed the trial court's decision to grant removal but emphasized the importance of weighing the potential harm that might result from removing the children, particularly in terms of the relationship with the noncustodial parent.

¶ 57 Greg asserts the trial court failed to engage in an analysis of the harm that would result in granting the petition for removal. We disagree. Though the court did not explicitly outline the harm to the children in granting removal, the court highlighted the importance of the

children maintaining a healthy relationship with Greg and recognized that its order would place a strain on visitation. Accordingly, we conclude the trial court properly weighed the potential harm to the children when granting removal.

¶ 58 D. Reasonable and Realistic Visitation Schedule

¶ 59 Finally, Greg contends the trial court did not create a reasonable and realistic visitation schedule, as one would not be possible under the circumstances.

¶ 60 "A reasonable visitation schedule is one that will preserve and foster the child's relationship with the noncustodial parent." *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 327, 518 N.E.2d at 1046. The trial court should not grant a petition for removal for frivolous, unpersuasive, or inadequate reasons, especially where the noncustodial parent has dutifully exercised visitation. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 327, 518 N.E.2d at 1046.

¶ 61 Greg points to several cases in support of his position. In *Demaret*, 2012 IL App (1st) 111916, 964 N.E.2d 756, the appellate court affirmed the trial court's denial of removal because the quantity and quality of visitation time between the noncustodial father and his children would be reduced by a move to New Jersey. Similarly, in *Elliott*, 279 Ill. App. 3d at 1067, 665 N.E.2d at 887, the appellate court affirmed the trial court's denial of removal because the noncustodial father "ha[d] been a constant and important figure in his daughters' lives, and he wants to continue to be a full-time father to his daughters." In *In re Marriage of Lange*, 307 Ill. App. 3d 303, 312, 717 N.E.2d 507, 514 (1999), this court affirmed the trial court's denial of removal, where "the children were safe, happy, loved, and receiving a good education," absent evidence of a significant financial advantage. However, all of these cases turned on their specific facts.

¶ 62 We note, in all of these cases, the trial court denied the custodial parent's petition for removal, whereas the opposite occurred here, as we are reviewing the court's order granting removal. In those cases, the reviewing courts determined the trial court's decisions were not against the manifest weight of the evidence. The appellate court must not substitute its judgment for the trial court's factual findings. *Best v. Best*, 223 Ill. 2d 342, 350, 860 N.E.2d 240, 245 (2006). Rather, we may only overturn the court's factual findings were those findings are against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Eckert*, 119 Ill. 2d at 328, 518 N.E.2d at 1046.

¶ 63 In this case, the trial court recognized it could not recreate the same visitation schedule already in place between the parties. However, the court kept intact the bimonthly visitation schedule, encouraged daily online contact, and permitted lengthy visitation over school breaks and holidays. These visits will be facilitated largely at Carrie's expense. As the court noted, no altered visitation schedule would be reasonable to Greg and a perfect solution was impossible. However, in working with the situation, the court modified the visitation order to grant Greg roughly the same amount of time he had before under the November 2012 visitation order, only that time came in more substantial blocks. As the court correctly pointed out, if all the court could consider was that removal would alter visitation, then the court would never be able to grant leave to remove.

¶ 64 Accordingly, we conclude the trial court's calculation of reasonable and realistic visitation was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 65 III. CONCLUSION

¶ 66 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 67 Affirmed.