

## DRAFT MINUTES

2015 Child Support Schedule Workgroup  
Meeting of July 13th, 2015  
L&I Headquarters  
Tumwater, WA

*Workgroup Members attending: Wally McClure, Dr. Robert Plotnick, Judge Richard Okrent, Tami Chavez, Kevin Callaghan, David Hayes, Coti Westby, Ami Abuan, Melora Sharts, Charles Szurszewski, Nathaniel Hildebrandt, Inga Laurent, Kala Jackson, Dave Brown, Christine Kilduff*

*DCS Staff: Sharon Redmond, Matthew Parascand, Robert Bates, Janina Oestreich, Nancy Koptur*

*Guests: none*

### **I. Introductions**

- a. Workgroup members and Workgroup staff introduced themselves.
- b. Staff roles and responsibilities discussed.

### **II. Review of Agenda**

- a. The group reviewed the Draft Agenda.
- b. Discussed meeting after 2nd public meeting to consider input from public immediately following Seattle public forum
- c. August 13th CSSWG meeting will be in Olympia at the DCS Headquarters

### **III. Formula Subcommittee report out and discussion**

- a. Committee working on chart to be able to present to public and legislature which demonstrates formula
  - i. Currently working with a no threshold model in order to relieve pressure to meet a basic level of visitation
  - ii. Actively exploring language to protect low income parents
  - iii. Working to ensure there is no change in the burden of proof
  - iv. In the interest of simplicity of use multiplier not being pursued in development of formula
    1. When in effect there are questions as to who the multiplier benefits
    2. At what point would a multiplier be in effect
  - v. Group discusses when formula would be brought into effect, whether should be presumptive or advisory to judicial bodies
  - vi. Group discusses effect current lack of model is having on determinations
  - vii. Group discusses perceptions of a credit vs. deviation and its acceptance with the populations it will effect.

### **IV. Parenting Plan Subcommittee Report out and discussion**

- a. Reviewed parenting plan notes with key group issues
  - i. What to do if plan for residential credit is not followed
  - ii. Discussed threshold for action if plan is not followed

- iii. Discussed how to apply credit in residential setting
- iv. Possible courses of action if the plan is not being followed
  - 1. Allow custodial parent petition for modification
  - 2. Use statutes currently in RCW
  - 3. Review for fraudulent intent
  - 4. Allow judges to exercise discretion
  - 5. If parents testify to patterns of conduct before the court it may be taken into account

**V. Break**

**VI. Residential Credit recommendation**

- a. Concern has been expressed that parties have felt underrepresented in the discussion and barriers to group consensus
  - i. Discussion about how deviation and residential credit have struggled in the legislature in the past
    - 1. Residential credit formula was included in the 2011 work group findings; failed to make it through the legislative process
  - ii. Group discusses implications of how the state law will interface with the Federal laws

**VII. Low Income Limitations report out and discussion**

- a. Kevin Callaghan worked with Kris Amblad to create guidelines for transfer payment recommendations for lower income parents
  - i. Discussion involved amount of money available for support, and the disbursement of funds between children before and not before the court.
  - ii. Suggest setting a \$50 minimum for lower income households
  - iii. Current whole family formula does not help non-custodial parents with children not before the court
  - iv. Creation of limitations would add a safety net for family member interaction for families alleviating instances when choices are being made between basic needs and support.
  - v. Seeking more time to continue to review issue

**VIII. Multiplier report review**

- a. Discussed whether we should we have a multiplier, and if so how should be multiplier be enacted to be fair and equitable
- b. Presented several tables showing calculation using assumption of 25%
- c. Addressed the issue requiring a threshold
  - i. Consensus of group was that threshold would create discord and struggle to meet specific guidelines
- d. Concerns presented over where line starts and how this effects credit given, one day could be negated, but 1.5 days could be within the threshold
- e. RCW currently covers not just basic needs but also quality of life
  - i. Judge Okrent wants to add in more calculations to account for quality of life costs like transportation, health insurance, special needs, summer camp and how this effects outcomes

**IX. 50/50 report out and discussion**

- a. No current definition of what standard is for custodial parent
- b. The greater wage earner is considered the non-custodial parent especially when

- TANF is involved
- c. Addressed how non-economic issues would be addressed when tied to support issues
- d. Explored how changes of definition could be effected by the Federal Relocation Act
- e. Suggestion to revert back to obligor/ obligee to remove the semantics which are economic
  - i. Use terms which refer specifically to position with the court and not time
  - ii. Addressed the fact we must be mindful of how labels we use to discuss support can effect social and cultural issues
- X. 2011 Recommendations review and discussion**
  - a. Group asked what they would feel appropriate to adopt from the 2011 work group recommendations
    - i. New economic table
      - 1. Update of the economic table is warranted
    - ii. Self-support Reserve and Federal Poverty Level
      - 1. Clarified self-support reserve was for one household
    - iii. Units of measurement
      - 1. Defines overnights as the measure of custody
- XI. Public Comment**
  - a. No members of the public available for comment
- XII. Wrap Up and Planning**
  - a. Members agree to subcommittee meeting schedules; Discuss future workgroup dates; Finalize travel documentation
- XIII. Meeting Adjourned at 2:45 pm.**