

CHILD SUPPORT SCHEDULE WORKGROUP SUBCOMMITTEE

UNIT OF MEASUREMENT GROUP REPORT

May 14, 2015

MEMBERS: DR. ROBERT PLOTNICK, STEVEN LARSON, MELORA SHARTS, CHARLES SZURSZEWski, AND WALLY MCCLURE | **FACILITATOR:** MATTHEW PARASCAND

Key Issues

- Overnights vs. other measurements
- Greater percent of the day with CP or NCP
- Threshold
 - Should there be a minimum number of overnights or absolute?

Principles and goals

1. **The child/ren should have access to the same level of resources regardless of the residential arrangements made by the parents.**
2. **Avoid “cliffs,” whereby a small change in the share of time at the non-custodial parent’s home leads to a large change in that parent’s credit, which may generate conflict between the parents.**
3. **Simplicity – the structure of the credit and how it takes account of the amount of residential time with the non-custodial parent should be easy to understand.**

Assumptions

1. **The resources needed for adequate support of the child/ren are not affected by the share of time spent with each parent. (In practice this is almost surely not true in many cases, most notably if the NCP needs a larger house or apartment to accommodate the child. Note that Washington does not have a separate support schedule for split-residence children.)**
2. **The total basic support obligation is shared by the parents in proportion to each parent’s share of total income.**

Recommendations

- **The unit of measure should be overnights**
- **This subcommittee recommends the use of a formula where there is no cliff.**
- **This subcommittee recommends the use of a formula which is easy to understand and compute, and is readily accessible.**