

Minutes

Child Support Schedule Workgroup

Subcommittee: Economic Table

Friday April 28, 2023, 11:35am – 1:50pm

Green River College

12401 SE 320th St, Auburn, WA 98092

Mel Lindbloom Student Union Building

To access the meeting online and to register: [Teams Webinar](#) | [Miro](#)

Attendance

Members Appearing:

Anneliese Vance-Sherman	Janelle Wilson	Kimberly Loges
Sharon Redmond		<i>Facilitator: Janina Oestreich</i>
		<i>Note taker: Jana Ekstrom</i>

Public Attendees: None

Agenda Details

1. Report Out From Sub-Subcommittee Group - Anneliese (12:01pm)

- a. Based off of graph's Jim provided in previous meeting ([Graphs](#))
 - Two different ways of extending the table as a proposed/working idea for discussion
 - Lowest end of the table doesn't make a difference because it will default at \$50 per month
 - Table drops off at \$12,800
 - Not sure that would be a good expansion of the table if it starts to decrease after that.
 - If that was extended out, anyone earning above that would be paying the same amount of child support
 - In King and Snohomish Counties, they are heavily populated, easy for obligee and obligor to earn \$10k or \$12k. The whole goal is to make sure someone who is earning \$15k-\$16k per month is paying child support reflective of their income and not the maxed out economic table
 - a. Anneliese looked at some proportions, but will look at other ones based on a fixed threshold. Will try a couple different ways and will also hold steady the proportion. Will also make a large scale table to view and then can modify downwards from there.
 - b. Something to keep in mind is that the current economic table was proposed in 2011 and not implemented until 2019, so may take time in the future to increase, so higher number could be better
 - i. \$50k might be too high, but leaves room for discussion
 - ii. There could be a middle ground
 - iii. Getting into wealth vs. basic needs
 - iv. Collectively supportive of exploring the expansion cap

2. Group Discussion (12:22pm)

- a. Was there anything that was discussed in the full workgroup for the report out from this group to discuss?
- Focusing on the relationship from the worksheets versus the economic table and where the initial calculation comes from
 - Focusing on how we can do something to the economic table where the legislatures will be comfortable adopting the recommendation. Afraid that changing too much on the economic table may not have the legislatures on board with the recommendations.
 - Would like to think table is based on the needs of the child, but seems it is based more on the incomes of the parents.
 - More experience on the lower income population, so recalculating this table based on needs when a lot of the table isn't actually based on that
 - How much of a parents income is a child entitled to
 - When looking at residential credits with lower income families, it can detrimentally impact the child
 - Washington economic table shows that a child should have the resources similar to if the family was still intact. Child should have the living situation as if the parents were together. This isn't realistic because now child has two households and two of everything else. That's why the table should go up to \$30k-\$50k – based on child getting to live off of an intact family.
 - a. Based on this, cost of living should then not apply, as it is based on the income.
 - b. Cost of living is based on the lived experience / income based table
 - a. Making sure that there is consensus and not held up on people questioning the formula for purposes of the table. Is there a way to create an explanation for that?
 - c. Consensus needs to be made within the subcommittee
 - d. It may be a very challenging conversation to show what each number on the chart reflects. Individuals are concerned about the financial situations they encounter and is child support keeping up with that.
 - i. If we can show the numbers/figures, this could help get consensus
 - e. Is there data on child support orders and child support payments throughout Washington in terms of what is being established?
 - a. How much of an income can you take from an individual that incentivizes someone to truly pay? (data is likely 20+ years old)
 - i. 20-24% of income, people more likely to pay
 - ii. If set too high, had a correlation to nonpayment
 - b. Can't state we have an average order amount as there are different situations (different states, being paid to DCS, paying directly, etc.)
 - i. If possible to gather the data, can see if can get that information. Trying to think of what type of data could be gathered to show that
- b. Question: Do we know how often other states update their own economic tables?
- Answer: No information at this time – This can be researched?
 - The reason why the economic table was picked up in 2019 is because it had been a very long time since the table was updated. Would suggest other states don't update economic tables every four years as it can be a high expenses

- c. Question: When the last change to the economic table was done, how much did obligations change?
 - Answer: No information at this time – This can be researched?
 - Janelle had some cases when the table switched and lower income paid a lot more and higher income paid a lot less. The new table in 2019 made higher earners pay less and lower earners to pay more
- d. Legislative contacts will be important regardless of what is recommended

Break 12:51pm-1:00pm

3. Decisions, Tasks and Next Steps (1:00pm)

- a. Talking Points
 - Reporting out to full workgroup and address concerns we might be hearing to try and get past the concerns.
 - When we received research about other states models and tables in the full workgroup, we came to the conclusion that redoing the entire table was out of scope
 - The subcommittee's focus has been on expanding and discussing the lower end, but the full workgroup keeps going back to changing the table
 - Trying to get appeal for barriers to consensus as the due date is coming up
 - a. One thing that may be of concern for the parents that are on the workgroup are aspects that may not be in scope of what is being addressed
 - Discussion on an understanding on what specific role the economic table serves
- b. Next subcommittee meeting Friday May 5, 2023 from 1:00pm-2:30pm

Meeting Adjourned 1:19pm