

# Subcommittee Meeting: Income, Imputation, and the Self-Support Reserve

Date | time 4/25/2019 9:00 AM | Location via WebEx

## WebEx Information:

[WebEx Meeting Link](#)

Meeting number: 806 281 137

-or-

Call the audio connection: (240) 454-0887

Facilitator	Matthew Parascand	Attendees [Attendees] Janelle Wilson Anneliese Vance-Sherman Kris Amblad Terry Price Jeff Manson Chrissy Anderson Rep. Christine Kilduff Sen. Claire Wilson
-------------	-------------------	---

**RE: previous discussion of closure of TANF cases organized by circumstance, those numbers were passed out to participants and put in the Dropbox.**

Discussion turned to defining full-time.

AVS—In Dropbox, data by occupation was now submitted. Do people tend to work 36 hours or 40 hours, or more or less? This is a resource to break down by hours worked by job.

KA—there's a question of where to put definitions. Do we include additional factors from the Federal Flexibility Rule into the statute? And where?

KW—That is what the Federal government wants. It helps classes of people, such as those helped by self-support reserve (SSR), such as newly incarcerated, those off TANF, pregnant women, etc. But there are still people on minimum wage hurt by the SSR.

KA—when you earn minimum wage with the increases (?), people are hurt by the SSR. We can revisit the jump from 125% FPL to 150%.

JW—this results in variable orders.

KA—for example, 150% FPL—with the SSR and a one person household.

JW—SSR is in RCW 26.19.065.

KA—150% FPL is better. It addresses the problem of having lots of Federal needs-based programs use 150%. In legal services, we can flex to 20% FPL.

CA—We have to be aware that the Legislature will pick and choose.

KA—the 2017 changes brought unexpected results.

JW—Agreed—there were unexpected results. For instance, why did they only go to \$12,000?

KA—If you look at the economic data between \$12K and \$20K, the data levels out. FLEC/WAPA/Kris/custodial parents saw no harm going to \$20K, but that was the minority voice. It is equitable to raise the level to 150% FPL.

MP—if the group is saying needs on FPL, is it worth considering SSR level by rule?

JW—If the changed statute does not list it, then it would be ok to change by rule using WA statistics. So it is not stuck in statute.

KA—how quickly can that information be broadcasted? Problem with the administrative process—it is easier to find the statute than the administrative rules. We can discuss this with the big group.

#### GROUP DISCUSSION ABOUT THE MULTIPLE SCENARIOS

MP—I will run scenarios and place them in the Dropbox, changing variables by hours worked per week and by changes in minimum wage.

#### **DISCUSSION CHANGED TO STATUTORY CHANGE WITH THE FEDERAL FLEXIBILITY RULE**

JM—DCS has no jurisdiction over a 50/50 parenting plan because the administrative hearing requires a single “custodian.”

MP—the Legislature does not want us to use “custodian” and “non-custodian.”

## **DISCUSSION OF THE PRIORITY LIST**

JW—what is driving the wage rate?

MP—Is it ok to say “full-time 32 hours”?

JW—remove 32 hours. We cannot get to subsection (f) if there’s something else in the statute.

## **WHERE TO PUT THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME?**

KA—In subsection (6) of RCW 26.19.071 or RCW 26.19.011?

JM—we’re agreed on the language. “Full-time” appears only in the imputation statute.

TP—it belongs in RCW 26.19.011 definitions.

POSSIBLE LANGUAGE: “Full-time is not necessarily 40 hours per week.”