

To: Economic Table Sub-workgroup Members & Staff-Nancy Koptur

From: Kathleen E. Schmidt-Co-Chair of Subgroup

Date: 9/7/09

We are scheduled to continue the work of the subgroup during a telephone conference call that has been scheduled for Monday September 8, 2008 at 5:00 p.m.

Sample Guidelines from Other Jurisdictions:

Jason had expressed an interest in seeing what the child support table would look like if it were extended beyond the \$7,000 combined net income that is the current guideline in Washington. I volunteered to pull together some sample guidelines from other states but I have to say that I had some difficulty due to the number of income shares' states that use gross rather than net income. I have attached to the email that includes this memorandum the guidelines for the following states and would make the following observations:

Arizona Effective 1/1/2005 Adopted by Supreme Court relied on Policy Studies Report 2/6/03. (guidelines are at about pages 20-end)

Income Shares-Gross Income-\$700-\$20,000 in \$100 increments up to 6 children

\$10,000 combined gross 1 child-1094 2 children-1462 3 children-1624

\$12,000 combined gross 1 child-1215 2 children-1616 3 children-1787

\$15,000 combined gross 1 child-1360 2 children-1802 3 children-1990

Colorado Revised January 2008 Adopted by Colorado General Assembly. (guidelines are at about pages 8-11)

Income Shares-Gross Income-\$850-20,000 in \$50 increments up to more than 5 children

\$10,000 combined gross 1 child- 1179 2 children-1697 3 children-1988

\$12,000 combined gross 1 child-1338 2 children-1929 3 children-2263

\$15,000 combined gross 1 child-1574 2 children-2277 3 children-2682

Memorandum to Economic Table Subgroup-9/7/08

Schmidt-1

Idaho Revised 2008 effective July 1, 2008 Adopted by Idaho Legislature (guidelines are at about pages 14-22)

Income Shares-Gross Income-\$500-25,000- in \$100 increments up to 5 children

\$10,000 combined gross 1 child-1133 2 children-1683 3 children-2025

\$12,000 combined gross 1 child-1233 2 children-1843 3 children-2245

\$15,000 combined gross 1 child-1383 2 children-2083 3 children-2586

New Mexico Unsure when last changed. Adopted by New Mexico Legislature (guidelines are at about pages 2-17)

Income Shares-Gross Income \$800-\$30,000 in \$50 increments up to 6 children

\$10,000 combined gross 1 child-1083 2 children-1575 3 children-1836

\$12,000 combined gross 1 child-1278 2 children-1859 3 children-2166

\$15,000 combined gross 1 child-1560 2 children-2267 3 children-2640

Oregon Revised 2/2007 based on David Betson updated obligation scale B (guidelines only in the attachment). PSI Report June 2006 was relied on.

Income Shares-Gross Income \$1000-30,000 in \$50 increments up to 10 children

\$10,001 combined gross 1 child-1085 2 children-1546 3 children-1794

\$12,001 combined gross 1 child-1210 2 children-1721 3 children-1994

\$15,001 combined gross 1 child-1339 2 children-1902 3 children-2200

Estimates of Child Rearing Expenditures:

While there has been considerable debate about the use of economic data that is based on the spending of in tact families unless Washington intends to move away from the income shares model "in tact" family spending would appear to be the measuring stick for an income shares model.

We need to discuss the various studies regarding child-rearing expenditures but I would like to limit the time we spend on this topic to determining if we as a subgroup can reach an agreement about which method to suggest be the basis for the updates to the Washington table or if we want to submit 2-3 alternatives to the workgroup for their consideration.

Memorandum to Economic Table Subgroup-9/7/08

Schmidt-2

There are several succinct explanations of the following studies including the 2006 Oregon PSI report that can be viewed in its entirety at http://dcs.state.or.us/oregon_admin_rules/psi_guidelines_review_2006.pdf.

In 2006 the following information was accurate as to the studies and how many states used the studies as noted; time has passed and states keep updating so this may be a bit out of date but gives us the general picture.

Van der Gaag (1981) range of assessments (5 states)

Espenshade (1984) Engel (8 states)

Betson (1990) Engel (0 states) and Rothbarth (14 states)

Betson (2001) Engel (0 states) and Rothbarth (8 states)

Virginia (2000) & Rogers (2002) Average Use (0 states)

McCaleb (Florida State University) 2004 Engel (0 states)

USDA (Lino 2005) USDA (1 state w/ adjustments)

Betson (2006) Rothbarth (Oregon adopted)

Report to Workgroup 9/13/08:

It is important that we be prepared to report to the workgroup on Saturday 9/13/08 when we meet in Vancouver.

Are Nancy's minutes of the meetings to be submitted as our "report?"

We appear to have several matters that we agree up as noted in the minutes of the first subcommittee telephone conference-should Judge Krabill present our positions to the workgroup?

How do we want to approach the outcomes of the 2nd subgroup meeting? Minutes as the report? Kathleen Schmidt to present our positions to the workgroup with minority views presented as needed?

Does someone else want to volunteer to speak for the subcommittee on any part of this topic from a majority point of view?

Memorandum to Economic Table Subgroup-9/7/08

Schmidt-3