

Child Support Schedule Workgroup

Subcommittee: Self Support Reserve and Adding Deductions

May 5, 2023

To access the meeting online and to register: Microsoft Teams Link

Attendance

Members Appearing:		
Joy Moore	Raymond Allen	Terry Price
Amy Roark	Kaha Arte	Facilitator: Rachelle Jennings
		Notetaker: Lucas Camacho

Public Attendees:

Agenda Details

1. Welcome

- a. Jennifer leaving the subcommittee due to outside conflicts and responsibilities
- b. Rachelle has scheduling conflict for the Thursday, 5/12 meeting and asked the group for permission to shorten the meeting to 3:00 4:30.
 - i. Group okay with ending meeting 30 minutes early.
- c. Ray would prefer 3:15 or 3:30 start times for meetings due to scheduling conflicts.

2. Ice Breaker

3. Focus Area 1: Self-Support Reserve Calculation

- a. Research on cost to support a single person household
 - i. Ray reported using the US Bureau of Labor Statistics website for research. Research is a work in progress. He would like assistance with this research.
 - 1. Amy volunteered to help Ray with this research.
 - ii. In our previous meeting, Joy recommended Labor & Industries and the Consumer Price Index sites for additional information.
 - iii. Amy provided the following link: livingwage.mit.edu/states/53
 - iv. If we want to tie SSR to WA's minimum wage, do we still need Anneliese to do analysis on alternative models?
 - 1. It would be helpful for comparison's sake, but not sure how much work goes into that analysis.
 - Anneliese was originally asked to analyze Jannelle's pro-rata model and a county-based SSR
 - 3. Unsure if it's in scope to change how we calculate support on a broad level, but if it is, group should not do a bunch of research that the legislature is not going to pay attention to.
 - a. Q: Do we have any indication who our legislators will be?
 - i. A: Senator Matt Boehnke was present at the last workgroup meeting.
- b. Why did Arizona choose 80% of full time monthly minimum wage as their SSR threshold?
 - i. Joy has not yet made progress on researching this.

4. Focus Area 2: Worksheet Deductions

- a. Joy has drafted language for paid family leave deductions.
- b. Ian is working on extracting data to pull case info regarding maintenance. We're only able to get IV-D case information (only cases that DCS is involved in). He should have more info by the next meeting.
 - i. Q: This research won't capture private cases? Won't that skew results?
 - 1. A: Correct, data is only available for cases that DCS is working, which does have the potential to skew results, as maintenance isn't terribly common in the DCS caseload.
- c. Deductions for treatment programs and associated costs? Do we want to build a recommendation out of that?
 - i. The group continued the discussion of how to facilitate short-term modifications for noncustodial parents going through court-mandated treatment programs.
 - ii. Rachelle asked policy what language would need to be in place for DCS to be able to enforce deductions. They responded that the main problem is not that DCS lacks the authority, it's that there isn't a standard calculation such deviations.
 - 1. DCS Policy avoids making case-by-case determinations as an agency. If we proposed this, there would need to be a standard calculation along with that proposal so that it's not case-by-case.
 - iii. This idea seems difficult. It's hard to do a standard calculation for something that varies to such a degree.
 - 1. Kaha and Joy agree that it sounds difficult.
 - 2. Would it work if there was a maximum amount you could deduct?
 - iv. If this is something we are targeting as a concern, how do we formulate a recommendation that is clear in addressing this?
 - v. Q: Are we trying to make modifications easier for DCS?
 - 1. A: Modifications in and of themselves are outside of our scope.
 - vi. Argument that accumulation of arrears during inpatient treatment negatively affects credit.
 - 1. Enforcement tools are also out of scope.
 - vii. The overall concept is more akin to abatement rather than modification, but whether or not that is in scope is questionable. But, if the group wants to do it, DCS support staff isn't here to shoot down people's ideas.
 - 1. The 2019 workgroup made a recommendation regarding abatement and that was deemed in scope.
 - 2. Can we add court-ordered inpatient treatment to RCW 26.09.325 (existing incarceration abatement policy)?
 - a. <u>Group wants to move forward with this Ray volunteered to draft language to</u> add to this RCW, with Brady to assist.

5. Defining BSO in RCW 26.19.011

- a. Current definition: The Basic Support Obligation is the monthly support obligation determined from the economic table based on parties' combined monthly net income and the number of children for whom support is owed.
 - i. Is clarifying this definition more relevant for the economic table subcommittee?
 - ii. The BSO in itself does not incorporate childcare, long distance transportation, or medical care. Who pays for school supplies? Is that part of the BSO?
 - iii. Idea: Under RCW 26.19.011 and WACs, education expenses are not clearly defined, so can we create a definition for what that entails that includes other things?
 - 1. Group will do more research on this and discuss further in the future.
- 6. Decisions, Tasks, and Next Steps

- a. Ray and Amy will research the cost of a single person household in WA
- b. Joy will continue to research how Arizona arrived at their 80% full time monthly minimum wage threshold.
- Ray will work with Brady on drafting language to add to RCW 26.09.325.
 Next Meeting: Thursday, May 11th, 3:15pm 4:30pm