WI Child Support Guidelines Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes
September 2, 2021
Virtual Meeting

Attendance

Jill Mueller (DCF), Mark Schmitt (DCF), Connie Chesnik (DFES), Maggie Renno (BAR), Debra Barnes (BCS), Phyllis Fuller (BCS), Katie Marek (BCS), Nicole Price (BCS), Jenny Laufer (BCS), Alicia Breininger (BCS), Aviva Gellman (BCS), Brian McReavy (BCS), Adrienne Gilbert Ramirez (Wisconsin Women's Network), Marylee Richmond (Walworth County), Katie Murphy (Milwaukee County), Commissioner Mark Fremgen (WIFCCA), Karyn Youso (WI State Law Family Section Board), Daniel Meyer (IRP), Steven Cook (IRP), Lisa Klein Vogel (IRP), Leslie Hodges (IRP), Judith Bartfeld (IRP), Steve Blake (Dads of Wisconsin), Keith Wessel (Dads of Wisconsin), Lia Ocasio (End Abuse WI), Robert Held (Legal Action of WI), Thomas Walsh (WI Circuit Court Judge), Benjamin Kain (Involved Fathers of WI), Jonathan Koch (WFCF), Tony Bickel (WFCF), and Lynn Davis (WI State Bar)

Welcome & Introductions

Nicole Price, WI Bureau of Child Support Program and Policy Analyst – Advanced

Nicole welcomed meeting participants at 1 p.m.

She shared that the meeting is being recorded solely for the purpose of minute taking, and that once the minutes have been compiled, the recording will be destroyed. No objections were raised to this.

Nicole took attendance of Committee Members and asked other meeting attendees to enter their names in chat for attendance purposes.

Racial Disproportionality in Child Support

DCF's Division of Family and Economic Security Bureau of Analytics and Research

Maggie Renno, the WI Department of Children and Families (DCF) Division of Family and Economic Security Bureau of Analytics and Research (BAR) Bureau Director. BAR provides business analytics to the DCF Division of Family and Economic Security colleagues including the WI Bureau of Child Support (BCS). Maggie presented the *Racial Disparity and Disproportionality in Child Support* presentation.

It is recognized these topics need more discussion than what information is in the presentation, and the information is building on topics from the last Guidelines Review Meeting. The information is from the Kids Information Data System (KIDS), where there is a lot of unknown race information.

Additional information and clarifications not on the slides:

- Slide four is a visualization of the Wisconsin population breakdown by race, rather than by the child support system, and helps reflect the disproportionate racial representation shown in other slides
- Slide five shows disproportionate representation of black individuals in child support as non-custodial parents (NCPs) and those in arrears; if there was equality with proportional representation, the proportions would stay the same
- The Disproportionality Index on slide seven is also known as a risk ratio, and is meant to gain insight into the smaller WI populations
    - Numbers that exceed one indicate that demographic group is overrepresented
    - Numbers below one indicate that demographic group is underrepresented
    - This formula is often used in education literature and is not something created by BAR

- Maggie specifically mentioned driver's license (DL) and professional license suspension information as shown on slide nine as being counter to the ultimate goals of the child support system as those can prevent NCPs from working
- A couple interpretations are offered on slide 11, however, it is acknowledged there are a number of ways to interpret the data

QUESTIONS, RESPONSES AND CONVERSATION:

Mark Fremgen asked if the data represents all child support NCP payors, or if it represents just I-VD NCPs.

Maggie responded that this is all child support, both IV-D and NIVD cases, from 2019 because 2020's data includes a lot of abnormalities such as federal government stimulus payments.

Mark followed-up by asking if the data is broken down by IV-D and NIVD cases, and if so, is there any difference in disproportionality or proportionality?

Maggie responded that has not yet been done.

Adrienne Ramirez asked for clarification about the difference between IV-D and NIVD. Maggie explained the IV-D caseload is subject to administrative enforcement actions and the NIVD caseload is the private child support cases. Connie Chesnik further clarified that IV-D refers to the federal Social Security Act where the child support program was created. An IV-D case receives IV-D program services because the recipient is on public assistance, or because the recipient applied for child support services. NIVD cases do not receive IV-D program services and are often pro se or represented by a private attorney.

Connie thanked Maggie for the presentation acknowledging the child support program needs to address these realities.

The Use of Child Support Guidelines in Wisconsin: 2010 and 2013

Steven Cook, Institute for Research on Poverty

Federal Guidelines regulations were amended in 2016 to change the scope of the guidelines review. This was incorporated into some of the research agreements with the Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP). One of those was for IRP to specifically research how income imputation is being used, and in low-income cases, whether the WI Low Income Guidelines complies with federal requirements. The IRP researchers were additionally asked to provide alternative approaches to imputing income.

Connie introduced Steven Cook from IRP who presented *The Use of Child Support Guidelines in Wisconsin* between 2010 and 2013.

Additional information and clarifications not on the slides:

- Court Record Data (CRD), as mentioned on slide three, was obtained by assessment of select samples of divorce and paternity cases in 21 WI counties that had the potential to become child support cases.
- Slide three refers to two cohorts that filed cases with the court either in 2010 or in 2013 and were followed for three years in order to obtain data. Cases filed during these years (2009 or 2010, and 2013) had a one-year entry point.
- The court record information on slide four reflects the information available about deviations in the written court record. Researchers do not review court transcripts, so they do not have access to deviations that were stated verbally. Multipart orders on slide six refers to orders that change and are

different at different points of time. IRP excludes those types of cases because they do not know what part of the order should apply at any given time.

- Slide eight reflects 3,241 paternity and divorce cases. IRP reports consistently/historically show paternity and divorce case data. There are circumstances under which consistency is unknown, which include when income is not written in the court record, or when the time placement with each parent is not known. The right column indicates the percentage of cases consistent with the Guidelines.
- Slide nine shows that consistency is unknown in 17.6% of paternity cases. These are mostly situations in which the NCP is not in court, so no information about their income is recorded. Consistency is much higher in paternity cases where it is known, but it differs considerably by placement arrangement. This affects divorce cases because the majority of paternity cases become mother sole placement cases. IRP has not broken those down by the type of placement.
- Steven mentioned that shared placement will become the presumptive standard in December 2021, and given the data reflecting lower levels of consistency with the Guidelines in those situations, there is concern there could be even lower levels of consistency with Guidelines after that change occurs (Slide 10)
- Slide 11 presents information about lower levels of consistency when the father has legal representation in court. This is true regardless of whether the mother also has legal representation.

QUESTIONS, RESPONSES AND CONVERSATION:

Are the majority of the decisions at the Family Court Commissioner (FCC) level, rather than those of a Judge? In most of the counties Karyn Youso practices in, temporary support orders start with the FCC. Karyn assumes most people do not appeal de novo when those are being incorporated into the final order. Is IRP mostly tracking FCC orders?

Steven stated that is not something IRP explicitly reviewed, but that it might be something for IRP to research. The presentation information shows that the court makes the decision, whether it is a FCC or Judge.

Karyn responded that if IRP is not able to obtain enough information from the written records, and if it is known who is making those decisions, then gaps in the written record could be corrected moving forward. Karyn thinks these are mostly FCC orders that come from temporary hearings and are incorporated into a final judgment. She suggests that a solution could be to have the orders state that findings must clearly indicate the reason for deviation.

Steven's response is IRP explicitly looked at final judgements. He shared IRP should have records on the temporary orders or preliminary actions put on the case, so it is likely possible to go back and determine whether an FCC was involved early on or not.

Connie replied that the statutes require that any reason for a deviation be on the record but does not explicitly require that it be in writing, and IRP typically does not have access to the transcripts.

Karyn responded by asking if there is a benefit to changing the legislation to require a written explanation of deviation.

Connie responded that it would make research easier. There is a high cost involved with obtaining transcripts. The amount of information in each transcript, along with the high volume of cases to review, makes transcript review impractical.

Karyn clarified that she is not asking from a research point of view, but rather from an accountability point of view, and this would provide written documentation as far as appeals are concerned.

Connie responded with support for that recommendation.

Jill Mueller shared the following in the Zoom chat:
s. 767.511(1n): (1n) DEVIATION FROM STANDARD; RECORD.
If the court finds under sub.(1m) that use of the percentage standard is unfair to the child or the requesting party, the court shall state in writing or on the record the amount of support that would be required by using the percentage standard, the amount by which the court's order deviates from that amount, its reasons for finding that use of the percentage standard is unfair to the child or the party, its reasons for the amount of the modification and the basis for the modification.

Marylee Richmond added that having that written in the record when an argument for a substantial change in circumstances needs to be made makes handling these cases much easier for Child Support Agencies (CSAs).

Marylee asked assuming most paternity cases are brought by the State, as most paternity cases are, when the cases were inconsistent, were they generally below or above the Guidelines amounts?

Steven went back to slide nine to show they were below the Guidelines about twice as often as they were above.

Marylee's perspective is that this indicates that the attorneys for these paternity cases are cognizant of the amounts of the orders they set and are erring on the side of caution to go below the Guidelines.

Steven commented IRP does not have more explicit information from the written court records regarding reasons for higher or lower orders, however the data supports what Marylee stated.

Tony Bickel asked if it is possible that there are deviations, and instead of being associated with a single year's income, they are instead associated with multiple years' worth of income. Many people have incomes that fluctuate from year to year based on outside circumstances, so that could be seen as a deviation based on the previous year's income. Could it be based on information from a two- or three-year period of averaged income, and perhaps that is what the child support obligation was based on?

Steven responded that yes, that is possible, as courts could be taking that information and/or other information and making adjustments to the income they are using. IRP does not have enough information to know what the reasons are.

Johnathon Koch asked, would cases where the order is higher than the Guidelines account for cases where medical or say educational expenses and variable expenses were added by the judge, or is that information excluded from the calculations?

Steven responded that IRP does not see that in their determination of what the Guidelines ought to be, so it is possible that the court adjusted what the order should be based on factors like that. This might account for some situations when higher orders are present. Explicit reasons for deviations are fairly limited, but when seen in divorce cases, that is the most common adjustment, especially regarding health costs. Adjustments can be made to lower or raise costs. This type of information is not broken down.

Johnathan asked if that is broken out quantitatively in the data, or would that be included into a single child support payment for the IRP calculations?

Steven explained the actual order is used in IRP calculations, and IRP does not have a way to determine what the order would be without the adjustment.

Johnathan asked if some would come directly from Guidelines, some would come from health costs, and some maybe from educational or other variable expenses?

Steven confirmed that is correct. The full report, available on the DCF website page where Guidelines materials are located, has more information on the explicit deviations.

Child Support Payments, Income Imputation, and the Low-Income Guidelines

Daniel R. Meyer, Institute for Research on Poverty

Daniel Meyer from IRP presented the *Child Support Payments, Income Imputation, and Default Orders* presentation

Additional information and clarifications not on the slides:

- Slide three reflects motivations for performing this research. This data reflects the time period before the aforementioned changes occurring in December 2021. Adjustments are made when NCP income was high or low. The formula is presumptive and not mandatory, and deviations are possible; Guidelines are silent on points under second bullet point, and the response when prior or current income may not reflect potential income (such as erratic income) has typically been to impute income.
- Slide five reflects that this information is looking at imputed income orders, orders set by default, their frequency, and relationship to payments and compliance
- On slide seven, IN is Indiana and MD is Maryland
- Slide eight is intentionally blank because so little is known about default judgements
- Slide 10 compliance refers to how much the NCP pays compared to what the order is – example: if NCP pays half of ordered amount, then that is 50% compliance
- On slide 12, the 21 WI counties include Dane and rural counties; this is the same data as the report Steven presented above
- Information on slide 13 is produced by a data collector and coder who reads through the court record documents and assigns variables to enter into corresponding fields, such as the bullet points listed under Imputed Income on that slide
- On slide 14, FPL is Federal Poverty Level
- The (NS) on slide 17 means no longer statistically significant

QUESTIONS, RESPONSES AND CONVERSATION:

Katie Murphy asked if wage assignment was one of the factors that was controlled for. Katie's view is that when actual income is known, there can often be a wage assignment, which makes compliance much more likely.

Daniel shared that is not one of IRP's factors. In the data, IRP can see when there are formal earnings, such as in the Unemployment Insurance database, there is almost always a wage assignment, so they go together. It is known that wage assignments are effective in collections and Daniel thinks Katie is correct that the path to collections often runs through formal employment. Cases with imputed income, at the time of the order, are less likely to have formal employment later, and therefore less likely to have payment. Daniel agrees with Katie's reasoning, but the research did not follow that in favor of reviewing the more basic question.

The full report is available online or the DCF guidelines website and committee members may reach out to IRP with questions.

Alternative Approaches to Income Imputation in Setting Child Support Orders

Leslie Hodges, Institute for Research on Poverty

Leslie Hodges from IRP presented the *Alternative Approaches to Income Imputation in Setting Child Support Orders* presentation.

Additional information and clarifications not on the slides:

- On slide four, if the amount of income assigned because of imputation is much greater than the parent's actual income earnings, that can lead to owing a much higher percentage of their earnings than the WI Guidelines or percentage standard would assign. The higher debt also equates to more work and higher costs for CSAs, among other consequences The December 2016 ruling lists a number of factors to consider, but IRP recognizes that courts may not have the information, so the primary focus for the report was on information the courts may have available, such as level of education, occupation, area where NCP lives, sex, and race.
- On slide five, the first bullet point refers to taking more factors into account instead of assigning the same full-time federal minimum wage amount to all. An order set does not equate to an order paid, so setting order to align with specific NCP circumstances can help ensure financial contributions are made.
- Slide seven varied the hours worked for imputation and it closely resembles the current imputation approach, though it can incorporate hours available to work, which offers more variation
- On slide eight, it is important to note that earnings vary across labor market, occupations, and industries, etc. This approach offers more variation than the current approach which could result in imputation well above the low-income threshold standard because federal minimum wage for one year is significantly less than WI median's annual earnings. This approach could be appropriate if aligns with NCP actual earnings or earning capacity.
- This report uses the same data as the report Daniel presented above. The information on earnings shown includes only formal employment in WI as IRP does not have information beyond that (Slide 9)
- Additional information on slide 10 is that child support policy is to remain sex and race neutral when determining orders, and IRP recognizes courts may not be able to take these factors into account. It is recognized people of color and women are disadvantaged in the Labor Market because they typically earn less than white males, even when performing the same work. Taking these factors into account may help algin orders with actual earnings capacity.

QUESTIONS, RESPONSES AND CONVERSATION:

Jill Mueller shared the following in the Zoom chat:
Wis. Admin. Code DCF 150.03(3): "...If evidence is presented that due diligence has been exercised to ascertain information on the parent's actual income or ability to earn and that information is unavailable, the court may impute to the parent the income that a person would earn by working 35 hours per week for the higher of the federal minimum hourly wage under 29 USC 206 (a) (1) or the state minimum wage in s. DWD 272.03..."

WI Child Support Guidelines Advisory Panel Meeting Minutes
September 2, 2021
Virtual Meeting

Imputing Wage Discussion

Connie Chesnik, Division of Family and Economic Security Administrator
Jill Mueller, Department of Children and Families Attorney

Nicole introduced Connie Chesnik and Jill Mueller to facilitate this discussion, with the reminder it is limited to committee members. First, Connie presented the DCF 150 Imputation of Income informational slides.

Additional information and clarifications not on the slides:

- The 45 CFR 302.56 Guidelines for Setting Child Support Orders first slide reflects what the federal regulations provide
- Slide two includes specific information from the first slide, and it is noted that residence means whether the person owns a home or not, and that employment barriers can include mental health and/or substance abuse issues, etc.
- Slide three reflects what the 2016 Guidelines Review Committee recommendations were. Courts can follow a sliding scale of 10 to 35 hours per week for imputation based on circumstances now, however, adding the language to the rule would make it more explicit
- The fourth slide reflects the justifications the 2016 Guidelines Review Committee had to move forward with the suggested changes. The administration at that time did not allow DCF to proceed with rule changes commensurate with these recommendations because the federal regulations did not require DCF to address Guidelines requirements until the next quadrennial review (which is now).

QUESTIONS, RESPONSES AND CONVERSATION:

Connie invited discussion, noting that recommendations will be used to craft language for this committee's review, and that more than one option to consider is possible.

Jill added that the committee can consider whether there is interest in creating a rebuttable presumption for people who, perhaps, should not have imputed income. Examples include those receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) through Wisconsin Works (W-2), or someone who needs to stay home to care for many young children and/or a disabled child. This is not being advocated for but may be part of the considerations.

Katie Murphy mentioned that in Milwaukee County, a lack of actual income information is common. Katie mentioned DCF 150.03(3) was previously shown and summarized by stating it says if it is necessary to have due diligence to ascertain information on actual parental income or ability to earn. Milwaukee County often uses an ability to earn standard based on past income evidence. This often results in significantly less than the 35 hours per week federal minimum wage imputation orders. Milwaukee County does not impute when the parent is receiving Social Security. SSI indicates that the Federal Government declares the person as having no ability to earn income. There are also other circumstances. Katie stated this information seems to fit in with the 2016 Guidelines Committee's recommendations regarding different characteristics, indicating that imputed income based on those standards basically does the same thing. Milwaukee County is always presenting evidence on ability to earn and absent that information, the order is based on what they know about the person's circumstances if the person is not present.

Connie mentioned that Katie raised a valuable point when discussing those who do not appear in court and when there is no information about the individual. These are difficult situations, especially given the high volume of cases. The rules are meant to ensure individual circumstances of all cases are reviewed before

setting an order. It is also about not relying on a 40 hours worked per week at federal minimum wage standard to impute income, and to instead find a 'middle ground' approach, acknowledging there is not always an ability to review individual circumstances. A goal is to move away from using a standard to consider circumstances that low-income payors are often faced with.

Mark Fremgen commented he is uncertain what the goal for this Committee is for today. If the question is what is wrong with the current Administrative Rule, his response might be he does not think anything is wrong with it. As a Court Commissioner, his perspective is that it works well and shares that enforcement attorneys do a good job of considering all of the factors in the Rule, as well as always raising low-income issues. In private cases, he seldom imputes income if there is proof of actual income. He asked whether the goal is looking for a solution for a problem that does not exist.

Connie responded that the concern is the Rule has what could be considered a standard. If there is no actual income information, then the default is to impute at 35 hours per week worked at the federal minimum wage. There may be cases where there are barriers to employment that prevent parents from working that much. Given the Federal Regulation parameters, there is some concern that the language could be interpreted as setting a standard for how income is imputed, rather than reviewing individual circumstances in order to establish support.

Mark Fremgen shared he sees the use of that language a potential problem because of those who do not come to court. There is no way for the court to know what factors impair a person's ability to work when the person does not come to court. Mark would like the factors to be as broad-based as possible to give the court as much discretion as possible. He does not support using 35 hours worked per week, but also sees people come to court with a work history, but who are not working currently, so 40 hours per week could be imputed. If a person is attending part time school, for example, income could be imputed at 20 hours per week. Mark stated perhaps it is not the structure of the rule, but rather have it be more broad-based to give the court more discretion.

Thomas Walsh agrees with Mark Fremgen and does not want someone who does not come to court who earns $40,000 a year to get an imputed order for $7.25 per hour. That is not fair. He also does not want someone who comes in and cannot earn the $7.25 per hour at 40 hours worked per week to be ordered to pay at that rate. The key is that individuals need to attend court, and all too often the imputed cases occur when someone does not appear in court. Thomas mentioned that these topics were discussed during the last Guidelines Review Committee meetings, as Connie previously mentioned, pointing out that the recommendations were not adopted because they were directed to wait for this current round of meetings, and he feels those proposals are still valid. He does not think there is anything 'broken' about the current situation, indicating the 2016 proposals have some merit and flexibility. Thomas also stated if there is more data available, that is helpful to the court when setting support orders. He suggested that the data from the reports shared above should include in the Guidelines so the courts can review. He does not think much needs to change and suggested this group reviews what was proposed last time. He feels that the topics were appropriately discussed during the 2016 meetings.

Connie responded that she is interested in providing the data from the reports presented during this meeting to the court but is not certain how that could be incorporated into the Guidelines. She invited others to share their thoughts.

Thomas followed-up by stating he receives additional materials in a 'soft bound' book that includes the poverty guidelines. He is not suggesting the information has to be formally embedded in the Guidelines, but it can be included with materials that are distributed to courts so that the information is used during

hearings. That said, this could be problematic because it is not evidence, but it is information that can be reviewed when deciding how to apply the Guidelines.

Marylee Richmond agrees the best available information in CSAs is the DILHR income information. She agrees with Thomas Walsh that if someone is not at court, then DILHR is the best evidence, and the order should be based on that information. Marylee routinely sees that if there is no DILHR information that shows someone is working for cash or not capable of working, the standard used in Walworth County is 32 hours worked per week at the federal minimum wage using low-income guidelines. This provides them something to use as the mother often appears in court, maybe taking time off work to do so, and this approach prevents multiple court appearances or the custodial parent protesting a ruling stating the NCP has inability to pay. The mother or custodial parent might be the sole caretaker for the child and is often working. She sees an issue with low-income serial family payors and recommends reviewing the Guidelines with this in mind. There are situations in which there are three children with different mothers, and the order is 30% or 43% of a payor's income. She does not feel that an order that high is in line with the goals here.

Connie responded that the Rule does currently allow for combination of serial family payor and low-income formula. This information can still be separately reviewed, information about this can be made available for the September 14, 2021 meeting.

Marylee acknowledged that information is in the Rule, but does not see the courts using this, or overnight equivalency information. She feels the information is confusing, even for those who frequently use the information, and states there is difficulty explaining the information to those who do not have high school degrees.

Connie asked if it would help to have an example of a low-income serial family payor in the Rule. Part of the discussion at the last Guidelines Review meetings was equivalent care, but that is infrequently used because there is no example available under which it should be used.

Marylee confirmed that would be helpful. In Walworth County, they have noticed that numbers for equivalent care mostly come out the same in private cases, so an example for this may not be needed. Marylee feels these topics can create more arguments, which is why examples can be helpful. She shared that many questions concerning how the information should be applied were raised at a county bar meeting, which further indicates an example would help.

Katie Murphy stated that for low income and serial payors, there will be different results depending on how the numbers are run and how many children are included. Katie mentioned it may be more helpful to separate out actual income and ability to earn and these factors. She stated that the ability to earn is a different scenario than imputing with no information. DCF 150.03(3) states that ability to earn is a different category, and Katie thinks this could be separated out to say only impute if there is no information about any ability to earn. Katie indicates ability to earn would be Social Security information, high school information and other such factors about what an individual could earn.

Connie responded that this comes back to cases where payors are not appearing in court. Connie mentioned Jackie, when on this Committee, shared about people being afraid to come to court, even when they want to support their families, but have no ability to pay and are facing numerous barriers to employment. While these are tough cases, if income is imputed based on presumed ability to earn, then that is problematic.

Katie replied that this is when no-one is in court, and if there is no information, Milwaukee County then uses the low-income approach and significantly less than 35 hours worked per week to impute. In these situations, the only information known is there have never been any income records, which reflects the

likelihood of not working in the future, and this is when Milwaukee County imputes with perhaps $10 a week orders.

Connie asked Katie if this is the approach to situations when individuals do not come to court, so income is imputed based on the fact that there is no wage record.

Katie clarified that if individuals do not come to court and do not have a wage record, then Milwaukee County knows they cannot earn income and then have hold open zero-dollar orders. If there is any proof of ability to work, then they impute based on actual information.

Thomas Walsh stated if the purpose here is to accommodate some of the concerns discussed during this meeting, then he requests a copy of what this Committee discussed in 2016 be provided to this Committee by the September 14, 2021 meeting so that proposal can be reviewed. He stated that can be reviewed for aspects such as ability to earn scenarios and racial impacts, etc. to see how well the 2016 proposal accommodates those scenarios is it may already address these topics.

Connie confirmed the 2016 proposal can be made available. It is now on the DCF website page where Guidelines materials are located on.

Mark Fremgen agrees with Katie Murphy's proposal and states that this is how he handles a lot of child support cases in Dane County. He agrees there is a difference between imputing income and ability to earn, as there is some record available to determine ability to earn and supports differentiating between these in the Rule. He is concerned about having any Rule suggesting that the courts might not set any or set hold open orders on parties who do not appear in court when there is no sufficient evidence to support what their income is, as it may encourage non-appearances. Parties may not appear if they know the result is that no child support order will be set. Mark thinks there is some utility to imputing income and having imputation orders. He shared his view there may be a fourth category regarding those who are unreasonably employed, unemployed or underemployed. His view is that there are three considerations and supports differentiating among them. One is actual income evidence, W-2, or some income and expense statement reflecting income. The second is showing ability to earn, DILHR, or someone appears with testimony stating they are transitioning from a prior job earning $10 per hour. The third is imputed income.

Connie responded that this provides information on what can be prepared for the September 14, 2021 meeting and invited other Committee members to share their views.

Robert Held offered his support for the differentiation for ability to pay. Robert sees cases where someone is determined as unable to pay but does get paid. There are cases seen where the person is receiving benefits, which determines their inability to pay, yet are still ordered to pay child support despite their income being very, very low. While this may be warranted in some situations, there is differentiation and feels that is important. In cases where there is a modification motion, and if there is an original order about ability to pay, then the modification can reflect how that has changed. He supports focusing on this moving forward.

Connie responds agreeing those are good points.

Adjourn

Connie states these comments will be reviewed and information will be brought back for the September 14, 2021 meeting.

Nicole closed by thanking everyone and stated these requests and suggestions will be brought back to DCF to prepare for the September 14, 2021 meeting. Further comments from Committee members can be emailed to

Nicole Price. Committee members are encouraged to review all materials on the DCF website page to continue informed discussions during the September 14 and 30, 2021 meetings encouraging all to share their thoughts. The meeting ended at 3:28 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Jenny Laufer with contributing edits from other BCS staff.