

**Report To The
Secretary of Health and Human Resources,
The Honorable Jane H. Woods**

**and the
General Assembly of Virginia**



***REVIEW of
CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE
§§ 20-108.1 & 20-108.2***

**Secretary's Triennial Child Support
Guideline Review Panel
Joseph S. Crane, Chair**

October 31, 2002



**Secretary of Health and Human Resources'
CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE REVIEW PANEL
730 East Broad Street – MSU - 4th Floor
Richmond, Virginia 23219**

*Joseph S. Crane, Chairman
Bill Brownfield, Staff Director*

*804/692-1401; jsc900@dcse.dss.state.va.us
804/692-2403; whb900@dcse.dss.state.va.us*

October 31, 2002

TO: The Honorable Jane H. Woods
Secretary of Health and Human Resources, and

Members of the Virginia General Assembly

FROM: Joseph S. Crane *Joseph S. Crane*
Chairman, Secretary's Triennial Child Support Guideline Review Panel

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Panel Report

Federal regulations and the *Code of Virginia* require a periodic review of the Commonwealth's Guideline for determining the parental financial support obligations, whether determined judicially or administratively, in child support cases, with recommendations to the Secretary and the General Assembly for consideration in the next following Assembly session. I am hereby respectfully submitting the final report of the review for 2001 – 2002.

The Guideline is contained in *Code* §§ 20-108.1 and .2. The requirement for periodic review (triennial in Virginia) is in §20-108.2H. That section also specifies that the review panel is to include a representative each of a juvenile and domestic relations court and a circuit court, a representative of the executive branch, a member each of the House and Senate, members of the bar, two each custodial and non-custodial parents, and a child advocate. The two General Assembly members are to be appointed by the Chairs of the respective House and Senate Courts of Justice Committees. All other panel members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources.

In the triennial year 2001, completion of the appointment process occupied more time than anticipated, such that there remained opportunity to hold only a single Panel meeting in that year. An interim report was rendered on October 31, 2001, with the specification that the substantive review would be completed during 2002, including additional recommendations for consideration by the Secretary and the General Assembly relative to the 2003 Assembly Session. There are no budget implications in adoption of these recommendations.

That review has been completed, with the outcome including a number of important recommendations, most requiring legislative action. Probably the most

important recommendation is the enactment of a new Guideline Schedule (providing the presumptive amounts of child support to be awarded in various combinations of total parental income and the number of children in the case). This Schedule, developed under the Panel's direction by an economist of the College of William and Mary in accordance with recommendations of the Joint Legislative Audit Review Commission, will if approved constitute the first update of the Schedule since 1988, and will both bring support awards into better alignment with child raising costs and protect the ability of low-income noncustodial parents to support themselves.

On behalf of the Panel members, thank you for the opportunity to serve.

Enclosure: Panel Report

c: Maurice A. Jones, Commissioner of Social Services
Nathaniel L. Young, Jr., Deputy Commissioner
and Director, Child Support Enforcement
Panel Members

**Report To The
Secretary of Health and Human Resources,
The Honorable Jane H. Woods**

**and the
General Assembly of Virginia**



***REVIEW of
CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE
§§ 20-108.1 & 20-108.2***

**Secretary's Triennial Child Support
Guideline Review Panel
Joseph S. Crane, Chair**

October 31, 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VIRGINIA'S CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE REPORT

October 31, 2002

The Requirement for this Report

Title IV-D of the federal Social Security Act established the Child Support Enforcement program in 1975, with substantial modifications over the years following. The program, though state-administered, is heavily regulated and largely financed by the federal government, using little or no Virginia General Funds.

One of the federal requirements is that states utilize “guidelines” to set the criteria for determination of parental obligations to provide financial support for their child(ren) when their cases come before either a court or an administrative child support enforcement office. In Virginia, these guidelines are in *Code* § 20-108.2H, with the specific obligation criteria located in §§ 20-108.1 and 20-108.2.

The federal government requires that states conduct substantive reviews of, and make appropriate adjustments in, their respective guidelines on at least a quadrennial basis. Virginia law, in the Code sections just cited, requires such a review triennially, to be conducted by a Panel with membership including specified interest groups. Except for one member each from the Virginia House and Senate, appointed by the Chairs of their respective Courts of Justice Committees, Panel members are appointed by, and report to, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources.

The last previous Panel was appointed late in 1998, and because of that lateness made an interim report that year, completing its deliberations and rendering its final report in October 1999. With 2001 being the actual triennial year, the appointment process again was completed too late to allow completion of substantive review in the triennial year. An interim report was rendered in October 2001, and the review continued into 2002. The document now before the reader is the result of that review.

Some Background Information

The cited *Code* sections include a Schedule of presumed total financial support award amounts for the possible combinations of total parental gross income and number of covered children, and legislative prescriptions for the Schedule's use by both the courts and the Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE). The prescriptions include definitions of deviation factors by which courts or DCSE may adjust Schedule amounts when warranted in particular cases. In practice, DCSE offices are authorized limited discretion to deviate from the Schedule when they are the ones who set the child support obligations, whereas the courts may apply all of them.

Virginia is one of the more than three-fourths of states utilizing variants of the “Income Shares” method of determining child support obligations. Several additional states that have used other methods have also determined, or are considering, to convert to Income Shares (e.g., Minnesota and Wisconsin). Under this approach, the combined gross income of the parents is used, along with the number of children to be supported, to calculate the presumed child support obligation. That obligation is then pro-rated between the parents according to their proportion of the total income.

The Commonwealth’s present Schedule was enacted in 1988, utilizing data and research findings from a decade or more earlier. Data for determining obligation amounts is based on national studies of the costs of raising children in intact families, with the underlying philosophy that to the maximum possible extent, the child(ren) affected by the dissolution of whatever relationship gave them life, should continue to be maintained insofar as possible at the same standard of living they would have enjoyed if the family were intact.

A number of groups and individuals representing the interests of non-custodial parents (NCPs) oppose the income shares approach. Among other concerns, they maintain that basing child support on data for intact families discriminates against NCPs and ignores the additional costs of their having to maintain separate households and support the costs of such part-time custody and visitation that they may have. While continuing to support income shares, the Panel has attempted to offset the additional household and custody/visitation costs in its proposed new Schedule, in addition to increasing the accommodation for self-support of lower income NCPs above the present Schedule.

Data and Methodology Issues

The present Panel, and its two predecessors, have struggled with the fact that the data available for computation of child support obligations is based on intact families, interpolated to apply to the separate households in the child support enforcement caseload. The data are also national rather than Virginia-specific. The 1999 Panel report recommended that the General Assembly authorize and fund a Virginia-specific study of the cost of raising children in non-intact families.

Senate Joint Resolution 192 of the 2000 General Assembly Session directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to examine “the costs of raising children in Virginia when parents live in separate households,” and to “develop data that can [be] used to determine appropriate child support amounts.” In Senate Document 9, its *Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children*, dated November 7, 2000, JLARC concluded that “it would not be cost-effective for the General Assembly to attempt a new, Virginia-specific data collection effort.”

The JLARC report provided a methodology for using current nationwide data to estimate expenditures on children, and to help evaluate present Guidelines or develop new ones. Its recommendations, which the current Panel adopted and used, were to

continue the use of the income shares approach; to continue the use of data on husband-wife households as the most comprehensive and accurate available; and to utilize a number of technical estimating models for estimating expenditures on children.

Philosophy/Public Policy Issues

There is a perhaps-inescapable tension between the perspectives of custodial and non-custodial parents. Although child support enforcement does not include the determination of custody, visitation or other aspects of the dissolution of the relationship that ensued in one or more children, it gets caught up in the aftermath of such determinations.

The Panel struggled with these conflicting outlooks and interests. While proponents on either side often see issues with few gray tones, the child support enforcement mission must focus on the children, and what, in an imperfect world with finite resources, incomplete information and huge caseloads, are the best available decisions to protect their interests.

Synopsis of the Panel's Legislative Recommendations

1. That the General Assembly approve and adopt a newly developed-for-Virginia, income shares based Schedule of Monthly Child Support Obligations and that with adoption, legislative language be included stating that the new Schedule shall be implemented prospectively, and that, for purposes of review or modification, implementation of the new Schedule shall not be considered, of itself, a material change of circumstances. [At the Panel's direction, the new Schedule reflects a discount for the separate or second household.]
2. That § 20-108.1(B) be amended:
 - (B)(3) [Clarification of criteria for imputation of income to either parent]
 - (B)(19) [Clarification of criteria for inclusion or exclusion of income from overtime or a second job in determining the child support obligation]
- 3 That the following language be inserted in § 20-108.2(A) to accompany the new Schedule as an aid to understanding it:

This Schedule is based upon the rationale that there are fixed housing and utility costs, variable transportation costs, and the assumption of 'exercised' visitation by the noncustodial parent to be between 60 to 90 days annually.
4. That the Schedule parameters or key assumptions be inserted as the opening statements in § 20-108.2(A). [itemized in main body of this report]
5. That §20-108.2(C) be amended to address a self-support reserve.

[Updating the criteria for a self-support reserve to accord with present federal poverty level

6. That § 20-108.2 (C) be amended:

[Refining the definition of “gross income”]

7. That § 20-108.2(D) be amended:

[Amplifying what is covered among uninsured medical and dental expenses in excess of \$250/year/child. If the proposed Schedule is not adopted, the dollar amount above will need to be reduced to \$100.]

8. That Section 20-108.2(F) be amended:

[Clarifying the rules on treatment of child care costs]

The Panel’s Non-Legislative Recommendations

9. That the Secretary direct the Department of Social Services to produce and distribute a video recording explaining Virginia’s child support Guideline, and that this recording be distributed to each court and child support office in the Commonwealth. The intent of the video is to explain Virginia’s child support guideline to all parties, including the statutory deviations for the Schedule. *[Note: the DCSE of the Department of Social Services has agreed to pursue this recommendation.]*
10. That the Secretary encourage the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia to provide continuing education to courts relative to specific child support issues, including application of the child support Guideline, the various tax consequences, deviation factors, and other relevant aspects.
11. That the Department of Social Services study the feasibility of changing its automated child support case management system, and of seeking legislation to allow for the inclusion of all deviations to insure consistency of the automated monthly guideline calculation used by the courts and the administrative agency.
12. That the remaining “issues” not addressed by this Panel, with copies of all minutes of the Panel’s meetings be provided to the next Panel. Two issues remained: 1) Minimum order (\$65) for Court-ordered child support for unemployed NCPs; and 2) The means of identifying the support, e.g. food, shelter, transportation, etc.

VIRGINIA'S CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINE REVIEW REPORT

October 31, 2002

This report sets forth the Secretary's Child Support Guideline Review Panel's (Panel) recommendations on Virginia's child support Guideline. The Panel recognizes the impact of the Guideline on the lives of children and their parents, and the need for ongoing, regular review of the social and economic research in this critical area. The issues and questions presented to the Panel in writing and at the public hearing, along with the Panel's own deliberations, identify many important but complex issues related to the child support Guideline and the ways by which children, custodial and noncustodial parents are affected by it.

The Panel's legislative recommendations are to amend §§ 20-108.1 and 20-108.2, which comprise Virginia's child support Guideline. The child support Guideline (Guideline) and Schedule of Monthly Basic Child Support of Obligations (Schedule), deviations and definitions, affect a substantial number of Virginia's citizens. It has been said that producing a child support guideline that is satisfactory to all is impossible. However, every effort has been made to ensure that all but the most exceptional child support situations can relate to the proposed recommendations. These recommendations, when implemented by the General Assembly, represent a significant improvement in efforts to establish or modify appropriate child support obligation amounts based upon the most recent data available.

These recommendations support public policy that rearing a child with both parents involved maximizes the opportunities for the child. The Panel recommends that the Secretary seek and the General Assembly adopt these recommendations, ensuring more positive and equitable treatment for Virginia's children and their parent's in the determination of child support obligation amounts.

We recognize that these recommendations and the proposed legislative language shall be more appropriately drafted by the Division of Legislative Services to ensure consistency and accuracy with the *Code of Virginia*, as well as with legislative protocol and nomenclature.

PANEL'S AUTHORITY AND CHARTER

Pursuant to § 20-108.2H and as required by federal regulation, the Commonwealth's Secretary of Health and Human Resources appointed a Child Support Guideline Review Panel between April and August, 2001, with the assignment of reviewing Virginia's child support Guideline as set forth in the *Code of Virginia*, §§ 20-108.1 and 20-108.2.

The child support Guideline was established to provide those who determine or approve child support obligations, including the courts, attorneys, mediators and staff of the Division of Child Support Enforcement (DCSE) within the Department of Social Services (Department), with a uniform, objective and economically-based method of establishing fair, adequate and consistent child support obligations throughout Virginia.

PANEL COMPOSITION.

The Panel membership complies with federal and state statutory requirements that the review organization include representation of the General Assembly, courts, the executive branch, the bar, two each custodial and noncustodial parents, and child advocates. The Panel members representing the General Assembly were appointed by the respective chairmen of the House and Senate Courts of Justice committees. All other members were appointed by then Secretaries of Health and Human Resources Claude A. Allen and Louis F. Rossiter. The members and the interests they represent are:

1	Ms. Amy Atkinson, Child Advocate	8	Ms. Stephanie Sulmer, Custodial Parent
2	Ms. Cathy Burch, Custodial Parent	9	Senator Frederick Quayle, Senate
3	Anne Brakke Campfield, Esq., Bar	10	Delegate Vivian Watts, House of Delegates
4	Mr. Maxie Cannon, Noncustodial Parent	11	Judge Patricia West, Circuit Courts
5	Lawrence D. Diehl, Esq., Bar	12	Judge A. Ellen White, J & DR Courts
6	Cynthia L. Ewing, Esq., Bar	13	Mr. Joseph S. Crane, Chairman
7	Mr. Murray Steinberg, Noncustodial parent		Executive Branch

THE REVIEW PROCESS.

The current Guideline was last reviewed in 1998-1999 with recommendations for the 2000 Virginia General Assembly. That General Assembly took no action on most Panel recommendations. The General Assembly did charge the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to “examine the ‘costs of raising children in Virginia when parents live in separate households’ and to ‘develop data that can [be] used to determine appropriate child support amounts.’” The results of that charge are contained in Senate Document 9 (2001) entitled JLARC’s *Technical Report: The Cost of Raising Children* (JLARC Report), issued on November 7, 2000.

The present Panel began its deliberations in September, 2001, submitting a brief report to the Secretary and to the General Assembly on October 31, 2001. That report incorporated two recommendations from the 1998-1999 Guideline Review Panel Report. One of the recommendations addressing FICA payments by self-employed was enacted by the General Assembly. The second recommendation is again included in this report. This Panel continued the review of the Guideline and related child support issues through October, 2002.

The Panel received written public comments from November 1, 2001 through March 1, 2002. The Panel later extended this period through May 1, 2002, and then continued to receive comments on child support guideline matters throughout the entire period of its deliberations.

Extensive written comments and suggestions relative to changes to the Guideline were received from citizens from across the Commonwealth, as well as from some interested parties throughout the United States. On March 20, 2002, a public hearing was held in the General Assembly building. All persons who requested time to be heard were noncustodial parents, and each was able to address the panel with his/her concerns.

The Panel asked that one or more Virginia economists and Georgia economist Mark Rogers, who has testified before several other states' guideline review panels, be invited to address the Panel. The economists were asked to study Virginia's current Guideline and address the Panel at its May, 2002 meeting, as to their opinions of the adequacy of the Guideline. The Panel also requested a presentation from Mr. Robert Raymond, a Richmond Certified Public Accountant, on tax consequences related to child support. Mr. Mark Rogers, Dr. John Knapp of the University of Virginia, and Dr. William Rodgers of the College of William and Mary subsequently made presentations to the Panel.

Mr. Raymond presented to the Panel at its June 4, 2002 and July 1, 2002 meetings. In the latter meeting, he distributed copies of a chart he had prepared showing tax consequences of the four federal tax features that the Panel asked him to examine. Lengthy discussion followed this presentation, with varying points of view espoused by different panel members. The Panel was concerned about the reported inconsistency among the courts and their providing or not providing deviations for tax consequences on court-ordered child support obligations.

Senior Assistant Attorney General Craig Burshem indicated in a letter to Mr. Crane that there was no requirement for or prohibition against counting tax benefits received by a custodial parent as income for purposes of calculating child support obligation amounts. One judge and at least one attorney on the Panel, as well as Mr. Raymond, all said they have direct knowledge of a number of courts that are currently counting some tax benefits as income.

Dr. William Rodgers, the Francis and Edwin L. Cummings Associate Professor of Economics at The College of William and Mary, was requested by the Panel to develop a new Schedule by the Panel's August 19, 2002 meeting, using the JLARC report as a guide. In subsequent discussions with Dr. Rodgers, the Panel members asked that he develop and provide for their consideration several different versions of his Schedule.

DEVELOPING THE NEW VIRGINIA SCHEDULE

Income Shares Model

The income shares-produced schedule, in use by Virginia and approximately 35 other states and territories, is predicated on the concept that the child should receive support in the same proportion of parental income that he or she would have received if the parents lived together.

Each state using an income shares child support guideline model has adapted it to meet its own criteria. Other child support guideline models currently in use in the United States include the Delaware Melson formula (three states), similar in principal to the income shares model, and the Percentage of Obligor Income Standard (17 states). It should be noted that in at least two states, Georgia and Minnesota, the courts have found the Percentage of Obligor Income Standard to be unconstitutional, inasmuch as it considers only the income of the noncustodial parent (NCP or obligor.) We understand both Georgia and Minnesota, as well as Wisconsin; have now adopted the income shares model for their guideline Schedule. Other states using the Percent of Obligor Income approach are closely reviewing their own model.

The basic economic data used in the income shares model, including the costs of raising a child or children, are derived from overall expenditures in "intact" families. There are no valid data currently available which address the cost of raising a child(ren) where parents are in separate households (and, as affirmed in the JLARC Report, the cost of producing such data would be prohibitive.) The absence of such data, essential to realistic determination of child

support, is the principal reason for the use of expenditures on children in intact families in the income shares models in a majority of states. While many, if not most, members of the Panel have concerns about the absence of data on non-intact families, the overwhelming majority see no preferable alternate approach as being available, now or for the foreseeable future.

The JLARC Report, while recommending continued use of income shares and acknowledging the limitations on direct data regarding non-intact families, made a number of technical recommendations to guide economists in developing a new schedule to replace the existing model developed in 1986/1987.

Data Availability, Cost of Raising Children

In the 1998-1999 Guideline Panel report, there was considerable concern that data available were national only, and as applicable to the costs of raising children, were based on two-parent or intact family groups. The Panel recommended that the Assembly charter and fund a Virginia-specific study of the costs of raising children in non-intact families. Because of prohibitive costs of such a study, the Assembly instead directed JLARC to study the subject, which ensued in the Special Report cited above.

For this 2001-2002 Panel, the JLARC Report and recommendations, which were based upon data from the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) 1997-98 Consumer Expenditure Survey, have been carefully followed. Dr. William Rodgers has used those recommendations and the 2001 USDA Consumer Expenditures Survey along with the Panel's specific directives. (For more information on Dr. Rodgers' approach, please see Exhibit B.) The Panel notes the current Schedule is based on data from the early 1970s.

Data availability accordingly requires the economist to take measures to ensure that as combined parental income figures increase in the schedule, the increments of change in support levels progress in a logical progression. Dr. Rodgers has done this by selecting a number of "key" income levels for application of the economic formula derived from the child raising expense components. Between these key income levels (established at combined parental

monthly gross incomes of \$3,550, \$4,550, and \$8,500), he has then tempered the formula data to assure a reasonable progression of support levels, and to reflect the Panel's awareness that there are some duplicated costs when the noncustodial parent exercises visitation with the child/ren, causing a shifting of some costs. This process has been followed for various numbers of children in particular child support cases.

Not surprisingly given the many years since the existing Schedule was developed, Dr. Rodgers found that expenditures relevant to raising children are substantially higher than those reflected in the current Schedule. Citing just one example, the current Schedule for combined parental gross monthly income of \$3,550 with one child, calls for support equaling 14% of that income. For the same support requirements, the more recent consumer expenditure data at that income level would call for 24% of income, a difference amounting to an extra 10% of parental income. The equivalent differences for the other key income levels would be different percentages but similarly large increases.

The Panel and Dr. Rodgers recognize the very substantial impact that such increases would have, particularly if applied to all existing child support cases. They also recognize that the available data do not take into account either the fact of there now being two separate households, or the costs to the noncustodial parent relative to visitation with or part-time custody of his/her child(ren).

Further, it appears from the data that the costs of raising children, based on the assumptions and thirty year-old expenditure information comprising the current schedule, have resulted in underestimating these costs in intact families. The JLARC study and the use of current expenditure data by Dr. Rodgers appear to indicate that the cost of raising children in an intact family have been underestimated over the years, based upon the data available in the early 1970's.

The Panel notes Dr. Rodgers' report addresses, between the current versus the proposed schedules, the changes in percentages of combined gross monthly income required for a given level of support. At the very lowest levels of combined gross monthly income, these percentages

are reduced in the proposed schedule. In the majority of levels, the percentages of combined gross monthly income comparison increase from only one percent to five percent.

Converting the percentage of combined gross monthly incomes into monthly child support dollar obligations, there is, in most instances, an increase in the dollar amounts. For example, while the percentage increase of combined gross monthly income at the \$3550 level for one child rose from 14% to 17% or three percent after application of the discount, the change in the monthly child support obligation to be shared between the parents increases from \$502 to \$604. The dollar increases at the higher levels of combined gross monthly income are proportionately less. At the very lowest levels of monthly income of the Proposed Schedule compared with the current Schedule, there is both a decrease in percentage and in the monthly obligation dollar amounts. The proposed schedule results in an increase of monthly child support dollar obligations for almost all levels of income and number of children.

The Panel acknowledges the absence of national or Virginia-specific cost or expenditure data on raising children in single parent or non-intact families. This is why more than three-fourths of the states and territories use the income shares approach and base their child support obligation calculations on data for intact families.

Second Household Discount

Based on additional research by Dr. Rodgers, the Panel determined to mitigate what would be a very substantial increase in monthly obligation amounts, based upon his estimated costs of raising children derived from the most recent USDA Consumer Expenditure Survey data. For example, for parents with a combined gross monthly income of \$3550 with one child, a new schedule would require 24% of that combined income. The current Schedule requires 14% of the combined income. Thus, basing a new schedule on the estimated current costs would consume an additional ten percent (10%) of the combined monthly income. The Panel deemed such an increase not feasible.

Dr. Rodgers provided for the Panel's consideration a number of proposed schedule options. The Panel agreed upon what is referred to as the "70% discount" schedule option. To use the example mentioned in the previous paragraph, implementing the schedule just described would result in a ten percent (10%) increase in the amount of combined monthly income devoted to child support. The "70% discount" schedule reduces the ten percent (10%) increase by 70%. In this instance, the proposed new Schedule will increase the percentage of combined monthly income by only three percent (3%). [For more details on the "discounted" schedule, see Exhibit B, Dr. Rodgers report to the Panel.]

A primary purpose of the discount is to recognize the costs of the noncustodial parent in maintaining a separate household and to his or her having visitation involving part-time custody of the child (ren). The Panel chose to follow a presumption which averages such visitation at between 60 and 90 days annually.

The resulting proposed Schedule utilizes the best available data and makes what the Panel believes are the most reasonable, feasible adjustments to provide fair treatment of both parents and their child(ren). For those cases where the obligations are established by courts rather than DCSE, the judges are also empowered to apply deviation factors to accommodate unusual circumstances or situations.

There are sometimes variables in individual child support cases that no schedule can take into account. The *Code of Virginia* contains a number of "deviation" factors for adjusting for these variables in particular cases. With administratively-determined child support obligations, the DCSE staffs use limited "deviation" authority; all deviations listed in the Code may be applied in court-determined obligations. Some examples of the 19 deviations in the *Code* include; support for other family members, the age of the child, custody arrangements, and "such other factors, including tax consequences to each party, as are necessary to consider the equities for the parents and children." [§ 20-108.1 (B) (18)]

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly approve and adopt a newly developed-for-Virginia, income shares based Schedule of Monthly Child Support Obligations and that with adoption, legislative language be included stating that the new Schedule shall be implemented prospectively, and that, for purposes of review or modification, implementation of the new Schedule shall not be considered, of itself, a material change of circumstances. At the Panel's direction, the new Schedule reflects a discount for the separate or second household. The Schedule was developed for the Panel by Dr. William Rodgers.

(The complete, recommended Schedule is attached to and is a part of this report, as Exhibit A. The Schedule includes the monthly income brackets and proposed monthly child support obligations. Which are shared proportionately between the two parents based upon their income shares. Note that Dr. Rodgers report, (see Exhibit B) provides a side by side comparison of the current monthly obligation Schedule amounts and the monthly obligation amounts of the proposed new Schedule. As this recommendation of a new Schedule was the single most controversial issue deliberated by the Panel, one member submitted a Dissenting Opinion. That document, endorsed by two other Panel members, is appended to this Report as Exhibit D.)

2. That § 20-108.1(B) be amended to add the following:

(B)(3) *In considering the imputation of income to either party pursuant to this subdivision, the court shall include in its consideration the following factors: (1) the earnings capacity, including the skills, education and training of the parties; (2) the present employment opportunities for persons possessing such earning capacity; (3) the extent to which the age, physical or mental condition or special circumstances of any child of the parties would make it appropriate that a party not seek employment outside of the home; and (4) the decisions regarding employment, career, economics, education and parenting arrangements made by the parties and their effect on present and future earning potential, including the length of time one or both of the parties have been absent from the job market.*

(B)(19) *Income of the parties obtained from overtime or a second job be considered for inclusion or non-inclusion based upon the history of receipt of said income, purpose of said income, and any agreement of the parties related to it.*

3. That the following language be inserted in § 20-108.2(A) to accompany the new Schedule as an aid to understanding it:

This Schedule is based upon the rationale that there are fixed housing and utility costs, variable transportation costs, and the assumption of ‘exercised’ visitation by the noncustodial parent to be between 60 to 90 days annually.

4. That the Schedule parameters or key assumptions be inserted as the opening statements in § 20-108.2(A).

[The design of the Schedule of Basic Child Support Obligations is based on a number of key economic decisions and assumptions that are documented throughout the text of the report and the technical appendix. These Key Assumptions highlight the design assumptions that may be the most significant for application of the guidelines to individual cases.]

Key Assumptions

(1) The Guidelines are based on gross income. These guidelines are designed to provide child support as a specified proportion of an obligor’s gross monthly income. The tables are in gross income for three reasons:

- *Use of gross income simplifies the use of the child support guidelines because it obviates the need for a complex gross to net calculation in individual cases;*
- *Use of gross income can be more equitable because it avoids non-comparable deductions; and*
- *Use of gross income does not cause child support to be increased when an obligor acquires additional dependents, claims more exemptions, and therefore has a higher net income for a given level of gross income.*

(2) Incorporated into the Schedule is a “self-support reserve” for obligors. This concept allows low-income obligors to retain enough income after payment of taxes and child support to maintain at a least a subsistence level of living (i.e., the self-support reserve.)

(3) The Schedule does not include expenditures on child care, extraordinary medical, and children’s share of health insurance costs. The Schedule is based on economic data that represent estimates of total expenditures on child-rearing costs up to age 18. The major categories of expenditures include food, housing, home furnishings, utilities,

transportation, clothing, education, and recreation. Excluded from these figures are average expenditures for child care, children's extraordinary medical care, and the children's share of health insurance. These costs are deducted from the base amounts used to establish the Schedule because they are added to child support obligations as actually incurred in individual cases. Deducting these expenditures from the base amounts avoids double-counting them in the child support calculation.

(4) The Schedule includes expenditures on ordinary medical care. Although expenditures for the children's extraordinary medical care and the children's share of health insurance are to be added to the child support obligation as actually incurred in individual cases, it is assumed that parents will make some expenditures on behalf of the children's ordinary (i.e., out-of-pocket expenses not covered by insurance) medical care. The Schedule amounts in this report are based on the assumption that expenditures on ordinary medical care are \$250 per year per child.

(5) The Schedule is based on modified versions of JLARC's Average Use in Vehicles approach for one and two children and their Per Capita approach for three children. Detailed discussion of these approaches can be found in "Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children." Child expenditures for households with four, five, and six children are constructed by multiplying the obligations of households with three children by 1.1274, 1.2293, and 1.3142. These factors are used in the current schedule.

(6) A "separate household discount" is provided. The discount has two purposes. The first is to reserve income for an obligor to spend directly on their children during parenting time. The rationale for doing this is based on expenditures that might occur during the non-custodial parent's 60 to 90 days of visitation. The second is to provide non-custodial parents with income to cover the "fixed cost" of operating a second household. Fixed cost is defined as expenditures on shelter, household equipment and fixed transportation (net outlays on new and used cars and trucks, vehicle insurance and vehicle finance charges).

(7) Gross monthly income excludes Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). This maintains consistency with the State's practice of excluding these components of income.

5. That §20-108.2(C) be amended to add the following language addressing a self-support reserve.

"An obligation of child support under this title shall not reduce the NCP's residual income to an amount less than 150 percent of the federal poverty level promulgated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. However, any calculation under this subdivision shall not create or reduce a support obligation to an amount which seriously impairs either party's ability to maintain minimal adequate housing for him or herself

and provide other basic necessities for the child.”

6. That § 20-108.2 (C) be amended as follows:

For purposes of this section, “gross income” means income from all sources, and shall include, but not be limited to, income from salaries, wages, commissions, royalties, bonuses, dividends, severance pay, pensions, interest, trust income, capital gains, social security benefits except as listed below, workers’ compensation benefits, veterans’ benefits, spousal support rental income, gifts, prizes or obligations. *Gross income shall not include income received by the payor parent from secondary employment income, whether from an additional job, from self-employment, or from overtime income not previously included in “gross income,” where such income has been received in a good faith effort by the payor to discharge a child support arrearage established by a court or administrative order relating to the child or children who are subject to the proceeding and such parent is actually paying the arrearage in accordance with the terms of the order. In such event, such secondary income, or the cessation of such income upon the payment of the arrearage, shall not be the basis for material change in circumstances upon which a modification of child support may be based.*

7. That § 20-108.2(D) be amended as follows:

“Except for good cause shown or the agreement of the parties, in addition to any other child support obligation made pursuant to this section, any child support order shall provide that the parents pay in proportion to their gross incomes, as used for the monthly support obligation, any reasonable and necessary uninsured medical or dental expenses which are in excess of the sum of \$250 for any calendar year for each child who is the subject of the obligation. For the purposes of this section, medical or dental expenses shall include but not be limited to eyeglasses, prescription medication, prosthetics, orthodontics, and mental health or developmental disabilities services, including but not limited to services provided by a social worker, psychologist, psychiatrist, counselor, or therapist.” [Note: If the proposed Schedule is not adopted, the dollar amount above will need to be reduced to \$100.]

8. That Section 20-108.2(F) be amended as follows:

Any child-care costs incurred on behalf of the child or children due to the employment of the custodial parent shall be added to the basic child support obligation as follows:

(1) When the monthly gross income of the custodial parent paying such costs falls below the level indicated below, 100% of the child care costs shall be added to the basic child support obligations.

<i>1 child</i>	<i>= \$1,100</i>	<i>4 children=\$1,900</i>
<i>2 children</i>	<i>= \$1,500</i>	<i>5 children=\$2,100</i>

3 children = \$1,700

6 children=\$2,300

(2) *When the monthly gross income of the custodial parent paying such costs exceeds the level set forth in subsection (F) (1) above, 75% of the child care costs shall be added to the basic child support obligation. The sum of 100% of the child-care costs exceeding the amount allowed the custodial parent as a child care tax credit shall be added to the basic child support obligation. The Court or administrative agency shall consider tax returns or any other relevant evidence presented in order to rebut the presumption of the percentage of childcare costs to be used.*

(3) Child-care costs shall not exceed the amount required to provide quality care from a licensed source. When requested by the noncustodial parent, the court may require the custodial parent to present documentation to verify the costs incurred for child care under this subsection. Where appropriate, the court shall consider the willingness and availability of the noncustodial parent to provide child care personally in determining whether child-care costs are necessary or excessive.

Non-Legislative Recommendations of the Panel

9. That the Secretary direct the Department of Social Services to produce and distribute a video recording explaining Virginia's child support Guideline, and that this recording be distributed to each court and child support office in the Commonwealth. The intent of the video is to explain Virginia's child support guideline to all parties, including the statutory deviations for the Schedule. *[Note: the DCSE of the Department of Social Services has agreed to pursue this recommendation.]*

10. That the Secretary encourage the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia to provide continuing education to courts relative to specific child support issues, including application of the child support Guideline, the various tax consequences, deviation factors, and other relevant aspects.

11. That the Department of Social Services study the feasibility of changing its automated

child support case management system, and of seeking legislation to allow for the inclusion of all deviations to insure consistency of the automated monthly guideline calculation used by the courts and the administrative agency.

12. That the remaining “issues” not addressed by this Panel, with copies of all minutes of the Panel’s meetings be provided to the next Panel. Two issues remained: 1) Minimum order (\$65) for Court-ordered child support for unemployed NCP’s; and 2) The means of identifying the support, e.g. food, shelter, transportation, etc.

EXHIBITS:

- A. The proposed new Schedule with cells for monthly child support for one through six children
- B. Dr. William Rodgers Report to the Panel, with Appendix [*Note: The proposed new schedule from Dr. Rodgers was revised by the Panel to limit the combined gross monthly income to a maximum of \$10,000, and to retain, for incomes above that level, the current Schedule percentages.*]
- C. Biographical information on Dr. Rodgers
- D. Dissenting Opinion by Panel Member Steinberg

EXHIBIT A**Proposed Schedule of Child Support Monthly Obligations
(Amounts to be proportionally shared)**

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
1200	83	84	85	96	104	112
1250	111	113	114	129	140	150
1300	139	142	143	161	176	188
1350	167	171	172	194	211	226
1400	195	200	201	227	247	264
1450	223	229	230	259	283	302
1500	251	258	259	292	318	340
1550	279	287	288	325	354	378
1600	293	316	317	357	390	417
1650	307	345	346	390	425	455
1700	321	374	375	423	461	493
1750	329	403	404	455	497	531
1800	338	423	433	488	523	569
1850	346	461	462	521	568	607
1900	355	490	491	554	604	645
1950	363	519	520	586	639	683
2000	371	548	549	619	675	721
2050	380	577	578	652	711	760
2100	388	606	607	684	746	798
2150	396	623	636	717	782	836
2200	404	636	665	750	817	874
2250	412	648	694	782	853	912
2300	420	660	723	815	889	950
2350	428	672	752	848	924	988
2400	436	684	781	880	960	1026
2450	444	696	810	913	996	1065
2500	452	707	839	946	1031	1103
2550	459	719	868	979	1067	1141
2600	467	731	897	1011	1103	1179
2650	475	742	926	1044	1138	1217
2700	482	753	955	1077	1174	1255
2750	490	764	972	1095	1194	1277
2800	497	776	986	1111	1212	1296
2850	505	787	1000	1127	1229	1314
2900	512	797	1014	1143	1247	1333
2950	520	808	1028	1159	1264	1351
3000	527	819	1042	1175	1281	1369
3050	534	830	1056	1190	1298	1387
3100	541	840	1069	1205	1314	1405
3150	549	850	1083	1221	1331	1423
3200	556	861	1096	1236	1347	1440
3250	563	871	1109	1250	1364	1458
3300	570	881	1122	1265	1380	1475
3350	577	891	1135	1280	1396	1492
3400	584	901	1148	1294	1411	1509

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
3450	590	911	1161	1309	1427	1526
3500	597	920	1173	1323	1443	1542
3550	604	930	1186	1337	1458	1559
3600	610	938	1195	1347	1469	1570
3650	616	946	1204	1358	1480	1582
3700	622	954	1213	1368	1491	1594
3750	629	962	1222	1377	1502	1606
3800	635	969	1230	1387	1512	1617
3850	641	976	1239	1396	1523	1628
3900	647	984	1247	1405	1532	1638
3950	653	991	1255	1414	1542	1649
4000	658	998	1262	1423	1552	1659
4050	664	1004	1270	1431	1561	1669
4100	670	1011	1277	1440	1570	1678
4150	676	1018	1284	1448	1578	1687
4200	681	1024	1291	1455	1587	1696
4250	687	1030	1298	1463	1595	1705
4300	692	1036	1304	1470	1603	1714
4350	698	1042	1310	1477	1611	1722
4400	703	1048	1316	1484	1618	1730
4450	708	1054	1322	1491	1625	1737
4500	714	1059	1328	1497	1632	1745
4550	719	1065	1333	1503	1639	1752
4600	724	1073	1344	1515	1652	1766
4650	730	1081	1354	1526	1664	1779
4700	735	1089	1364	1538	1677	1793
4750	740	1097	1374	1549	1689	1806
4800	746	1105	1384	1561	1702	1819
4850	751	1112	1394	1572	1714	1832
4900	756	1120	1404	1583	1726	1845
4950	761	1128	1414	1594	1738	1858
5000	766	1135	1423	1605	1750	1871
5050	771	1143	1433	1616	1762	1883
5100	776	1150	1442	1626	1773	1896
5150	781	1157	1452	1637	1785	1908
5200	786	1165	1461	1647	1796	1920
5250	790	1172	1470	1658	1807	1932
5300	795	1179	1479	1668	1819	1944
5350	800	1186	1488	1678	1830	1956
5400	804	1193	1497	1688	1841	1968
5450	809	1200	1506	1698	1852	1979
5500	813	1206	1515	1708	1862	1991
5550	818	1213	1524	1718	1873	2002
5600	822	1220	1532	1727	1883	2014
5650	827	1226	1541	1737	1894	2025
5700	831	1233	1549	1746	1904	2036
5750	835	1239	1557	1756	1914	2047
5800	839	1245	1565	1765	1924	2057
5850	843	1251	1574	1774	1934	2068

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
5900	848	1258	1581	1783	1944	2078
5950	852	1264	1589	1792	1954	2089
6000	855	1270	1597	1801	1963	2099
6050	859	1276	1605	1809	1973	2109
6100	863	1281	1613	1818	1982	2119
6150	867	1287	1620	1826	1992	2129
6200	871	1293	1628	1835	2001	2139
6250	875	1298	1635	1843	2010	2149
6300	878	1304	1642	1851	2019	2158
6350	882	1309	1649	1859	2027	2168
6400	885	1315	1656	1867	2036	2177
6450	889	1320	1663	1875	2045	2186
6500	892	1325	1670	1883	2053	2195
6550	896	1330	1677	1891	2062	2204
6600	899	1335	1684	1898	2070	2213
6650	902	1340	1690	1906	2078	2221
6700	905	1345	1697	1913	2086	2230
6750	909	1350	1703	1920	2094	2238
6800	912	1355	1710	1927	2102	2247
6850	915	1360	1716	1934	2109	2255
6900	918	1364	1722	1941	2117	2263
6950	921	1369	1728	1948	2124	2271
7000	924	1373	1734	1955	2132	2279
7050	926	1378	1740	1962	2139	2287
7100	929	1382	1746	1968	2146	2294
7150	932	1386	1751	1975	2153	2302
7200	935	1390	1757	1981	2160	2309
7250	937	1394	1762	1987	2167	2316
7300	940	1398	1768	1993	2173	2323
7350	942	1402	1773	1999	2180	2330
7400	945	1406	1778	2005	2186	2337
7450	947	1410	1784	2011	2193	2344
7500	950	1413	1789	2016	2199	2351
7550	952	1417	1794	2022	2205	2357
7600	954	1420	1798	2028	2211	2363
7650	957	1424	1803	2033	2217	2370
7700	959	1427	1808	2038	2222	2376
7750	961	1431	1812	2043	2228	2382
7800	963	1434	1817	2048	2234	2388
7850	965	1437	1821	2053	2239	2394
7900	967	1440	1826	2058	2244	2399
7950	969	1443	1830	2063	2249	2405
8000	971	1446	1834	2068	2254	2410
8050	972	1449	1838	2072	2259	2415
8100	974	1451	1842	2077	2264	2421
8150	976	1454	1846	2081	2269	2426
8200	977	1457	1849	2085	2274	2431
8250	979	1459	1853	2089	2278	2435
8300	980	1462	1857	2093	2282	2440

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
8350	982	1464	1860	2097	2287	2445
8400	983	1466	1864	2101	2291	2449
8450	985	1468	1867	2105	2295	2453
8500	986	1470	1870	2108	2299	2458
8550	992	1479	1878	2117	2308	2468
8600	996	1485	1886	2126	2318	2478
8650	1001	1492	1893	2134	2327	2488
8700	1005	1498	1901	2143	2337	2498
8750	1009	1504	1909	2152	2346	2508
8800	1014	1511	1916	2160	2355	2518
8850	1018	1517	1924	2169	2365	2528
8900	1022	1523	1931	2177	2374	2538
8950	1027	1529	1939	2186	2383	2548
9000	1031	1535	1946	2194	2392	2558
9050	1035	1541	1953	2202	2401	2567
9100	1039	1547	1961	2211	2410	2577
9150	1044	1553	1968	2219	2419	2587
9200	1048	1559	1975	2227	2428	2596
9250	1052	1565	1983	2235	2437	2606
9300	1056	1571	1990	2243	2446	2615
9350	1060	1577	1997	2252	2455	2625
9400	1065	1583	2004	2260	2464	2634
9450	1069	1589	2011	2268	2473	2643
9500	1073	1595	2018	2276	2481	2653
9550	1077	1601	2025	2283	2490	2662
9600	1081	1607	2032	2291	2498	2671
9650	1085	1612	2039	2299	2507	2680
9700	1089	1618	2046	2307	2515	2689
9750	1093	1624	2053	2315	2524	2698
9800	1097	1629	2060	2322	2532	2707
9850	1101	1635	2067	2330	2541	2716
9900	1105	1641	2074	2338	2549	2725
9950	1109	1646	2080	2345	2557	2734
10000	1113	1652	2087	2353	2565	2743

For gross monthly income between \$10,000 and \$20,000, add the amount of child support for \$10,000 to the following percentages of gross income above \$10,000:

ONE CHILD	TWO CHILDREN	THREE CHILDREN	FOUR CHILDREN	FIVE CHILDREN	SIX CHILDREN
3.1%	5.1%	6.8%	7.8%	8.8%	9.5%

For gross monthly income between \$20,000 and \$50,000, add the amount of child support for \$20,000 to the following percentages of gross income above \$20,000:

ONE CHILD	TWO CHILDREN	THREE CHILDREN	FOUR CHILDREN	FIVE CHILDREN	SIX CHILDREN
2%	3.5%	5%	6%	6.9%	7.8%

For gross monthly income over \$50,000, add the amount of child support for \$50,000 to the following percentages of gross income above \$50,000:

ONE CHILD	TWO CHILDREN	THREE CHILDREN	FOUR CHILDREN	FIVE CHILDREN	SIX CHILDREN
1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%

EXHIBIT B

Determining the Level of Child Support

The Commonwealth of Virginia

November 2002

For Discussion Purposes Only

Submitted to:

The Commonwealth of Virginia

Secretary's Child Support Guideline Review Panel

730 East Broad Street – Management Services Unit

Richmond, Virginia 23219

Submitted by:

William M. Rodgers III

Frances L. and Edwin L. Cummings Associate Professor of Economics

Director, Center for the Study of Equality

The College of William and Mary

Williamsburg, Virginia

1. Introduction

The Commonwealth's Schedule of Child Support has not been updated since the mid-1980s. The schedule is based on a study of child-rearing expenditures published in 1984 that used the 1972-1973 Consumer Expenditure Survey. Since the schedule's creation a variety of changes have occurred that strengthen the rationale for updating the schedule. First, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' data collection process for the Consumer Expenditure Survey from which the schedule is developed has improved. The Survey's number of households, level of information and detail has grown, providing better expenditure and income data. Concepts and definitions have changed so much that Bureau of Labor Statistics officials caution users when comparing current survey data with data from earlier surveys, especially with years prior to 1984.¹ It is also important to note that prior to 1984, data from the surveys covered only the urban portion of the U.S. population.

Second, from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, the earnings of less-skilled and less-educated Americans failed to keep pace with inflation. During the late-1990s, earnings began to keep pace with inflation, but have not made up the ground that was lost during the previous decades.² Over this period, incarceration rates for less-educated and

¹ See FAQ #11 at <http://www.bls.gov/cex/csxfaqs.htm#q15>.

² For example, the real value of the U.S. Federal minimum wage has fallen by 13 percent since it was last increased in 1997. Further, inflation-adjusted (2001 dollars) average hourly earnings fell from \$15.45 in 1978 to \$14.80 in 1984. They fell further to \$13.28 in 1994. Since then they have risen to \$14.31, but still well below its peak in 1978. Much of the stagnation and decline is due to earnings not keeping up among less-educated workers. For example, the median annual earnings of men with 4 years of high school fell from \$33,204 in 1984 to \$32,245 in 1990. Over this period, the median annual earnings of men with 4 years of college jumped from \$56,320 to \$61,674. In 1991, the Bureau of Labor Statistics changed its educational attainment question. Thus, data since then are not directly comparable to data prior to 1990. However, the pattern of a growing gap between college and high school educated men continued during the 1990s. The median real annual earnings of male high school graduates increased from \$28,495 in 1991 to \$30,659 in 2001. Figures for males with at least a college degree increased from \$50,143 to \$55,230 over the same period. All figures are in 2001 dollars (<http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/incperdet.html>).

less-skilled Americans grew dramatically, having adverse impacts on their current and future earnings.³ Studies have begun to show that at the national level, the growth in incarcerations has contributed to a growth in the arrearages of less-educated and less-skilled workers.⁴ Although, specific data on this relationship does not exist for Virginia, nationally unpaid child support rose by 50 percent from 1997 through 2001.⁵

Third, today the majority of obligors are fathers who are more involved in child-rearing than they were 20 years ago.⁶ In addition to paying or receiving child support, many obligors spend money on their children during parenting time. In the last five to ten years, Arizona, New Jersey and Missouri have each implemented adjustments for parenting time.⁷

Collectively, the improvements in measuring expenditures on children, the deterioration in labor market opportunities of less-skilled and less-educated Americans, and the negative impacts that incarceration have on an individual's ability to meet child support obligations provide sound rationale for updating the schedule.

Our charge from the Secretary's' Child Support Guideline Review Panel was to develop a new Child Support Guideline Schedule that incorporates the following factors

³ See Richard B. Freeman, "The Economics of Crime," Handbook of Labor Economics, Volume 3C, Edited by Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, Elsevier: New York; and Harry Holzer, Steven Raphael and Michael Stoll, "How Do Crime and Incarceration Affect the Employment Prospects of Less-Educated Black Men?" Georgetown University, University of California, Berkeley and University of California, Los Angeles, 2002.

⁴ In the report "Exploration of Alternative Ways of Subsidizing the Earnings of Low-Income Non-Resident Fathers," The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities illustrates this point by using child support guidelines in Maryland, California and Texas.

⁵ The data come from the Virginia Division of Child Support Enforcement.

⁶ See the discussion in "The Shared Responsibility Child Support Guidelines: Rationale and Research Support," Minnesota Department of Human Services (March 2001).

⁷ See Jane C. Venohr and Robert G. Williams, "The Implementation and Periodic Review of State Child Support Guidelines," Family Law Quarterly, Volume 33, Number 1, Spring 1999.

and data, 1) child-rearing costs as determined appropriate and recommended in the JLARC report entitled “Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children” released in November 2000; 2) new economic data; and 3) changes in treatment (including addition or deletion) of factors in the existing Schedule which may be recommended by the Review Panel.

The proposed schedule has the following features. The most recent research methods and data are used to construct estimates of the expenditures of parents on their children. The schedule maintains fairness to both parents. The proposed schedule takes into account the fact that two households need resources. The schedule is more affordable for low-income parents. The schedule is easy to understand and awards are easy to calculate. Most important, the schedule is a closer representation of what parents typically spend on their children.

2. Why does the Commonwealth need a new child support schedule?

The current schedule is not fully consistent with recommendations for child support guidelines from the National Advisory Panel on Child Support Guidelines. In 1987, the Guideline Review Task Force recommended that 1) both parents share legal responsibility for supporting their children. The economic responsibility should be divided in proportion to available income; 2) the subsistence needs of each parent should be taken into account in setting child support, but in virtually no event should the child support obligation be set at zero; and 3) a guideline should take into account the financial support provided directly by parents [during parenting time].

The Commonwealth’s current schedule which is an income shares model satisfies the panel’s first recommendation. The income shares model is the most widely used

model in the United States. Over 30 states use the approach and Minnesota recently developed a proposal that would shift how they develop child support orders to an income shares model.⁸

The Commonwealth's schedule partially satisfies the second recommendation. The Commonwealth has a self-support reserve; however, it is at the 1987 poverty line for a single individual.⁹ Because of this, the current guidelines do not take into account the deterioration in the labor market outcomes of less-skilled and less-educated Americans. Holzer and Offner (2002) document a continued decline in the long-term erosion in the employment rates of young, less-educated men, especially for black men. Rodgers (2002) takes a forward looking view of the labor market opportunities of young, less-skilled men and women and concludes that their employment rates will be well below their averages during the 1990s boom.¹⁰

Further, the current guidelines are not sensitive to the dramatic decline in the inflation-adjusted earnings of low-skilled and less-educated Americans that took place from the mid-1970s to mid-1990s. The deterioration in inflation-adjusted wages was so large that even the 1990s economic boom was not able to fully recover the losses. Today, many less-educated and low-skilled men have difficulty meeting their child support obligations.

The current schedule does not satisfy the third recommendation. To my knowledge there are no studies that provide estimates of parental expenditures that occur

⁸ The schedule was developed with the input of all the major stakeholders. The poor fiscal climate has been the key factor that has prevented the proposed schedule from being implemented.

⁹ "Updated Child Support Schedule: State of Virginia," PSI (1999).

¹⁰ Harry Holzer and Paul Offner, "Trends in Employment Outcomes of Young Less-Educated Men, 1979-2000," Georgetown University, 2002 and William M. Rodgers III, "What are the Future Labor Market Prospects of Less-Educated Adults, Youth and Minorities?" The College of William and Mary, 2002.

during parenting time, even though it is accepted that these expenditures take place.¹¹

During Minnesota's development of its "Shared Responsibility" schedule of support, they found that a wide "variation exists in the ways obligors spend both time and money with their children." To respond to the occurrence of these expenditures, the State's Taskforce developed a "separate household discount". The discount which was built into the schedule enables non-custodial parents to keep some of their income but reserve a portion for expenditures on their children during parenting time.

The Commonwealth's schedule is not tied to the most recent and best quality data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey. It is based on data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey prior to 1984.¹² At that time, the household data was the best available; however, since then, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made significant improvements in the quality of its data collection and added greater detail in the data that it collects.

In summary, our research attempts to create a schedule of support that addresses these deficiencies in the schedule. The schedule that we developed is grounded in the most current economic and statistical research on household expenditures on children and is consistent with the recommendations of the National Advisory Panel on Child Support Guidelines. The schedule is sensitive to the fact that all non-custodial parents need resources to operate and maintain his or her household. The schedule is also sensitive to

¹¹ Minnesota's review of its guideline created a "discount" in the schedule to account for expenditures that occur during parenting time.

¹² In its annual report, "Expenditures on Children by Families: 2001 Annual Report", the U.S. Department of Agriculture in estimating expenditures on children uses the 1990-91 Consumer Expenditure Survey and converts both expenditures and income data to 2001 dollars. JLARC's report titled, "The Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children" use the 1997-98 Consumer Expenditure Survey.

the adverse impact that changes in the labor market have had on lower-income obligors' ability to financially contribute to improving the welfare of their children.

We believe that implementation of the schedule presented in this report, or at a minimum a schedule that contains its features will be better for the Commonwealth's children, fairer to parents, and easy to administer. Most important, it will provide a closer representation of what parents spend on children today.

3. Values informing the Construction of the Proposed Schedule

The goals of Virginia's guidelines are to establish as state policy an adequate standard of support for Virginia's children, subject to the ability of parents to pay; make support obligations more equitable by ensuring more consistent treatment of persons in similar circumstances; and improve the efficiency of the court and administrative processes by providing guidance in establishing the level of child support awards. These values provide the underlying policy framework that guided us in the development of the proposed schedule.

4. The Process for Developing a Schedule of Child Support

Considerable debate centers around how best to estimate expenditures on children. The JLARC report "Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children" concluded that child expenditures in husband-wife households should be used to develop the child support schedule. The following summarizes their argument.

Table 12 of the JLARC report shows that on average when there are one or two children in the household, single-parent households spend more on children than husband-wife households. For example, at \$30,000 and one child, JLARC's per capita approach to estimating monthly expenditures are \$879 in a husband-wife household,

compared to \$1,018 in a single-parent household. Their average use approach generates values of \$483 in a husband-wife household and \$526 in a single-parent household. When there are three children, expenditures in a husband-wife household are slightly more, on average. Similar patterns exist at \$50,000.

JLARC attributes the higher expenditures in single-parent households with one and two children to two sources of bias. First, the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) data include expenditure information on single parents (custodial parents) with children who live in the household. The data contains no information on the non-custodial parents' expenditures on those children. As a result, using the CES estimated expenditures of single-parent custodial households may understate the full expenditures on these children (p. 33, JLARC 2001).

Second, observed custodial single-parent expenditure estimates may reflect the fact that some non-custodial parents may not be making full child support payments. JLARC found that 77 percent of single-parent households in the CES did not receive any child support payments. If enough custodial parents fail to receive any or all of their child support payments to which they are entitled, then average single-parent expenditures in the CES will be biased downwards.

If corrections for these biases were made, the expenditures on children in single-parent households would be even larger than the expenditures in husband-wife households. The major implication of JLARC's finding is that even if data were available in the CES that corrected for these two biases, the levels of support would most likely be larger than if they were generated using expenditures in husband-wife households.

Finally, Virginia's income shares approach is more consistent with current labor force statistics. The 2000 Decennial Census indicates that 65.6 percent of Virginia mothers with own children under six years of age work outside the home, meaning they contribute income to their households. The comparable figure for the United States is 61.9 percent.¹³ The income shares approach acknowledges this empirical reality and is well suited to the variation in the distribution of income between men and women in different families. As a result, using husband-wife households in the CES to estimate expenditures on children is most appropriate.

Since one of our charges was to implement JLARC's recommendation that expenditures on children be developed using CES data from husband-wife households and that approach seems the most sensible and feasible, we use husband-wife households with one to three children in the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey to estimate a household's expenditures on their children. We explored using husband-wife households with four to six children, but the sample sizes were too small to generate reliable estimates.

The major expenditure categories are food, housing, clothing, transportation, education, miscellaneous expenditures, and non-extraordinary health expenditures. In Virginia, the level of support excludes extraordinary health expenditures, child care costs, and health insurance premiums for the child/ren. They are determined after the level of support based on food, housing, clothing, transportation, education, miscellaneous expenditures and non-extraordinary health expenditures is established.

¹³http://factfinder.census.gov/bf/_lang=en_vt_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_GCTP12_US9_geo_id=01000US.html.

Using the JLARC study “Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children” as an initial framework, we then estimate the statistical relationship between household expenditures on children and combined gross income (e.g., for a husband-wife household with one child, we find that a 10 percent increase in gross income is associated with an average increase of 2.4 percent in expenditures on that child). Since Virginia excludes Supplemental Security Income and welfare assistance including income from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), we exclude these components from our measure of gross income.

To convert the statistical relationship between expenditures on children and gross income to a schedule of support, we create a “separate household discount”. The discount has two purposes. The first is to reserve income for an obligor to spend directly on their children during parenting time. The rationale for doing this is based on expenditures that might occur during the non-custodial parent’s 60 to 90 days of visitation. The second is to provide non-custodial parents with income to cover the “fixed cost” of operating a second household. We define “fixed cost” as expenditures on shelter, household equipment, and fixed transportation (net outlays on new and used cars and trucks, vehicle insurance and vehicle finance charges).

We also raise the self-support reserve threshold to 150 percent of the 2002 poverty line for one person. This means that if the combined gross monthly income of the parents does not exceed this threshold, then the payment schedule is not used to compute the order. A minimum award of \$65 is applied to the non-custodial parent. A minimum award is also applied to the non-custodial parent if their own income does not exceed the threshold even though the combined gross income exceeds the threshold.

We also phase in the obligations at incomes just above the self-support threshold. Doing this prevents large jumps in the schedule, which could weaken the incentive to work. It is further acknowledgement that wages among low-skilled and less-educated workers fell over much of the period since the mid to late 1970s.

5. Features of the Commonwealth's Current Schedule

Even though the schedule of support needs to be updated, several features of the existing schedule are retained.

- The schedule is based on expenditure and income data of husband-wife households in the Consumer Expenditure Survey.
- The schedule contains a self-support reserve.
- Husband-wife households with three children are utilized to estimate expenditures on children in households with 4, 5, and 6 children.¹⁴
- The proportion of income spent on children falls as income rises, but the dollar amount increases.

Several new features are added to the schedule of support. We estimate expenditures on children using detailed information on housing, food, clothing, and transportation in the Consumer Expenditure Survey. Although our estimates have a few modifications, they build on the JLARC study, "Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children."

We set the self-support threshold at a gross income of \$1,107.50 per month or \$13,025 annually (150 percent of the poverty level for one person in February 2002). At

¹⁴ The number of single-parent households and the number of husband-wife households in the Consumer Expenditure Survey that report having four or more children is too small generate reliable estimates of the relationship between expenditures on children and household income.

or below this value, the minimum order is set at \$65 a month. A self-support reserve at 150 percent of the poverty level for one person still reflects the expectation that all parents contribute financially to their children, but insures that the order will not cause the obligor to fall below poverty. Further, a self-support threshold set at 150 percent of the poverty level will make it easier for obligors who want to support their children financially, but are low-skilled and/or less educated workers and have arrears. Research has shown that low-income obligors are more likely to have arrears, thus making it harder to make “predictable and stable” payments.¹⁵

To minimize work disincentives that might occur at the self-support reserve’s threshold, we slowly phase in the level of support just above the cut off. Doing this prevents a large discrete jump in the order from \$65.

Economic data and the statistical relationship between monthly expenditures on children and gross monthly income are used to generate estimates of expenditures on children in households with gross incomes that range from \$1,200 to \$8,500 per month. Due to the Consumer Expenditure Survey’s focus on lower and middle income families, the Bureau of Labor Statistics cautions researchers in making statistical inferences on the expenditures of households with monthly gross incomes in excess of \$8,500. To generate estimates of the cost of children in households with incomes that exceed \$8,500 per month we apply the expenditure share at \$8,500 per month to incomes that exceed \$8,500 per month. The proposed schedule contains an easily adjustable “separate household discount”. The purpose of this discount is to provide obligors with resources for

¹⁵ See James A. Hennessey and Jane Venohr, “Exploring Options: Child Support Arrears Forgiveness and Passthrough of Payments to Custodial Families,” Policy Studies, Inc. (2000).

expenditures that occur on their children during parenting time and for expenditures on the “fixed cost” associated with operating a second household.

Our rationale for building a schedule with these features reflects changes in parenting, the difficulty that low-income parents have with providing “stable and predictable” payments, and the challenges associated with maintaining a second household. Our proposed schedule will help strengthen the ability of the Division of Child Support Enforcement to achieve its mission.

6. Estimating the Relationship between Expenditures on Children and Income

We use the micro data files of the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey to estimate the costs of raising children. To be included in our sample, each husband-wife household must report at least one child of their own under age 18 living in the household and report positive household income for the past year. Given these sample restrictions, we identify 5,902 husband-wife households with 1,987 reporting 1 child, 2,557 reporting two children, and 990 reporting three children. The number of husband-wife households with four children falls to 288, too few to generate reliable estimates of expenditures on children, a conclusion that JLARC also came to in its analysis.¹⁶

There are several steps to estimating a household’s expenditures on children. The first involves identifying their total expenditures on food, housing, transportation, clothing, child care, and miscellaneous costs. Child care expenditures are excluded from

¹⁶ Data collection is carried out by the Bureau of the Census under contract with BLS. In the Interview Survey, each consumer unit is interviewed every 3 months over five calendar quarters. In the initial interview, information is collected on demographic and family characteristics and on the inventory of major durable goods of the consumer unit. Expenditure information is also collected in this interview, but is used only to prevent duplicate reporting in subsequent interviews. Expenditure information is collected in the second through the fifth interviews using uniform questionnaires. Income and employment information is collected in the second and fifth interviews. In the fifth interview, a supplement is used to account for changes in assets and liabilities.

the list because when developing a child support order, the Commonwealth first establishes the level of support. Child care costs, health insurance premiums for the child/ren, and unreimbursed medical expenses in excess of \$250 per child per year, are treated as add-ons. Health care expenditures are excluded from the expenditure list because the Commonwealth assumes for each child an amount of \$250 per year to cover ordinary health expenditures.

Table 1 presents expenditure distributions for husband-wife households by the number of children. Our results are very similar to published Bureau of Labor Statistics from the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey. The table shows that housing, variable transportation, and food expenditures comprise 70 percent of total expenditures in our sample of husband-wife households. It is important to note that expenditures on housing in the Consumer Expenditure Survey are underestimated because the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) treats mortgage principal payments as a part of savings rather than as expenditures. Since a large portion of an obligor's direct expenditures on his or her children is likely to be in housing costs, BLS's treatment of mortgage payments generates lower expenditures on children. This lower level of expenditures can be thought of as a discount that all homeowners receive and since higher-income obligors tend to own more expensive homes, BLS's treatment of the housing data generates a larger discount for higher-income obligors.

Second, we determine in each expense category the proportion of expenditures attributable to children. Table 2 lists the expense categories on which the Commonwealth defines support. For some categories (such as clothing), the Consumer Expenditure Survey data are reported separately for children, so that 100 percent of these expenditures

can be attributed to children. But for other categories, for which the expenditure data (such as for housing, transportation, and food) are not reported separately by family member, assumptions must be made regarding what proportion is due to children. The most common approaches that are used can be summarized as follows:

- Allocations based on averages calculated for children and adults, from federal studies (such as USDA food plans, or results from the National Medical Expenditure Survey);
- The “per capita” approach divides household expenditures by the number of family members;
- The “average use” approach bases allocations on the amount of a certain commodity (e.g. housing or transportation) that households with different numbers of children are observed to use on average, compared to households without children.

The JLARC report estimated the statistical relationship between expenditures on children that include health and child care expenditures and gross income that include Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and welfare assistance including income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). To generate a statistical relationship that can be converted into a schedule of child support, expenditures on children must exclude the reported health and child care expenditures, and gross monthly income must exclude SSI and income from TANF. For health care, we simulate the practice found in a number of income shares states by adding \$250 per year for each child to cover ordinary health expenses.

We now describe the methods used to attribute household expenditures to children. For estimating the proportion of food expenditures attributable to children, we use an updated version of the proportions published in the JLARC report. The proportion of food expenditures attributable to children are based on official U.S. Department of Agriculture food plans for May 2002. These proportions are shown in Table 3. The average of the four plans is multiplied by household expenditures on food. The resulting product is the estimate of food expenditures on children.

With respect to housing, we estimate expenditures for four subcategories of housing costs: shelter, utilities, household operations and household equipment, and furnishings. Housing is a perfect example of the difficulty in assigning an expenditure amount attributable to children. If JLARC's per capita proportions are used, then 33.3 percent of expenditures in a one child household are attributable to that child, compared to only 1.0 percent if JLARC's average use proportion is applied to the expenditures of a household with one child (Panel A, Table 4). This simple comparison illustrates why the per capita approach generates larger expenditures on children.

Transportation expenditures must be treated similarly to housing expenditures. Assumptions must be made on how to estimate expenditures on children. JLARC constructed two types of transportation costs: fixed vehicle and variable costs. Fixed vehicle costs capture spending on new and used cars and trucks, spending on vehicle financing, and spending on vehicle insurance. JLARC intended that this expense component capture the entry price for operating a vehicle. Their analysis concluded that the fraction of fixed vehicle costs that can be attributed to having children is 8.0 percent.

Variable transportation costs capture spending on gas and oil, licenses, other vehicles, maintenance and repairs, and public transportation. This component measures the incremental expenses of operating a car or truck. JLARC's per capita proportions shown in Panel B of Table 4 attributes 33.3 percent of transportation expenses to children in a one child household, compared to 24.0 percent if the average use proportion is used. JLARC's average use proportion comes from their analysis of the National Personal Transportation Survey (NPTS) which contains information about a household's number of vehicles and estimates of the number of miles driven. Panel B of Table 4 shows that the average use proportion starts at 24.0 percent for husband-wife households with 1 child, jumps to 44.0 percent in households with 2 children, and falls to 38.0 percent for households with 3 children. All proportions are well below the per capita proportions.

Clothing expenditures are divided into clothes and footwear and other apparel products and services (such as dry cleaning, repairs, and alterations). Clothes expenditures are reported for infants up to age 16 in the Consumer Expenditure Survey. Thus, 100 percent of these expenditures are attributed to children. However, expenditures for 16 and 17 year olds are not separately reported from expenditures for adult men and women in the household. We identified households with children 16 and 17 years of age and pro-rated the clothing expenditures for men and women age 16 and older on a per capita basis. Footwear and other apparel products and services are not reported separately for children. Proportions based on the per capita approach are used for this expense category.

Education expenditures are fully identifiable for children in the Consumer Expenditure Survey. Miscellaneous items cover entertainment, personal care items,

reading materials, and other items. The latter category includes a sub category of expenditures on pets, toys and playground equipment. JLARC removed all of the expenses on these items from the miscellaneous total and assumed that 100 percent were spent on children, while the per capita approach is applied to the remaining expense categories.

For descriptive purposes, Tables 5 and 6 show average quarterly expenditures on children by expense category. The housing and transportation summary statistics further illustrate the variation in expenditures that the approaches create. Child care expenditures are low because they include households with children older than five years of age, which may not have work related child care costs or the costs are very small.

7. The Preferred Approach for Estimating the Costs of Children

Our preferred approach for estimating the costs of children in husband-wife households with one and two children is the following. Food expenditures are allocated based on averages calculated for children and adults from the USDA food plans (Official USDA Food Plans: Cost of Food at Home at Four Levels, U.S. Average, May 2002). The “Average Use” proportions shown in Table 4 are applied to generating fixed transportation expenditures (Cars and trucks, new and used (net outlay), Vehicle Insurance, Vehicle Finance charges). The per capita proportions in Table 4 are applied to variable transportation (Gasoline and motor oil, Maintenance and repairs, Vehicle rental, leases, licenses, and other charges, Public Transportation) expenditures and housing (Shelter, Utilities, Equipment and furnishings, Operations). Footwear and other apparel products and services, entertainment, personal care items, reading materials, and other miscellaneous items expenditures on children are based on a per capita approach.

Expenditures on clothing (per capita for children 16 and 17 years of age), pets, toys and playground equipment, and education are assumed to be solely on children.

Our preferred method for estimating expenditures on children in husband-wife households with three children is the per capita approach. The per capita proportions developed by JLARC are applied to our housing and transportation expenditures. The proportions are shown in Table 4. To compute estimated costs for households with four, five, and six children we multiplied the obligations of households with three children by 1.1274, 1.2293, and 1.3142.

8. Identifying the Relationship between Expenditures and Gross Income

To identify the relationship between expenditures on children and household income, we regress the logarithm of average monthly expenditures on children on the logarithm of average monthly gross income. Table 7 lists the components of gross monthly income. As a reminder we exclude Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and welfare assistance including income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) since the Commonwealth's current practice is to exclude them from gross income. To convert expenditures from a quarterly to a monthly rate, we divide by three and to convert annual income into a monthly rate we divide by twelve.

To predict expenditures on children at a particular level of income we evaluate the regression model at that level of income and then take the exponential of the value. For example, the estimated average use model for a husband-wife household with one child is

$$1) \quad \ln(\text{Expenditures}_i) = 4.839 + 0.235 \ln(\text{Income}_i).$$

The estimate of 0.235 is interpreted as follows. A 10 percent increase in gross income is associated with an approximate 2.35 percent increase in expenditures on the

child. Table 8 presents regression estimates for the per capita and average use vehicles approaches for each husband-wife household with one, two, and three children. To predict a household's level of child expenditures at a given income, such as \$5,000, we take the natural logarithm of \$5,000 and obtain a value of 8.52. We then multiply 8.52 by 0.235, yielding a product of 2.001. The sum of 2.001 and 4.839 is calculated. The value of 6.84 has the interpretation of being the predicted logarithm of monthly expenditures for a household with gross income of \$5,000. To convert the value into dollars we apply the inverse of the natural logarithm. When done to 6.84, a value of \$934.49 is obtained. Thus a household with one child and \$5,000 in gross monthly income is predicted to spend just under \$1000 dollars on the child. In \$50 increments, we apply this data transformation to incomes that range from \$1,200 to \$8,500 per month.

Table 9 contains these expenditure outcomes or estimates of the costs of raising children. The average use in vehicles approach is used for one and two children and the per capita approach is used for three children. Table 9 also includes a self-support reserve of \$1107.50 per month, which is equivalent to 150 percent of the February 2002 poverty guidelines. Below that minimum, the economic data is not used to estimate the relationship between expenditures on children and income. The **bold** entries incorporate an adjustment. At gross incomes just above the self-support reserve the estimate from the economic data is compared to a series of phased in costs. The process is as follows. If gross income exceeds 150 percent of the poverty level by \$65 or more, then compute the difference between gross income and the self-support reserve. Multiply the difference by 0.90 if the household has one child, 0.91 for two children, and 0.92 for three, four, five, and six children. Compare this obligation to the obligation that the estimated coefficients

in Table 8 would predict. The lower amount is used as the estimated costs. These are the **bold** figures in Table 9.

In each column of Table 9, the costs listed after the **bold** entries are constructed from the regression models shown in Table 8. Estimates of expenditures on children in households with one and two children are based on the *Average Use in Vehicles* approach, while estimates for households with three or more children are based on the per capita approach. When compared to the Commonwealth's current schedules, the "Average Use in Vehicles" model does the best job at all levels of gross income in describing expenditures on children in households with one and two children. When compared to the state's current schedule, the per capita approach does the best job at all levels of income in describing expenditures in households with three children.

To compute estimated costs for households with four, five, and six children we multiplied the obligations of households with three children by 1.1274, 1.2293, and 1.3142. These factors are used in the current schedule.

9. Creating a Schedule of Support

The key step needed to convert our estimates of child expenditures into a schedule of child support payments is the creation of a "separate household discount". The discount which lowers the values in Table 9 was created to reserve income for obligors to spend directly on their children during parenting time and for the "fixed costs" associated with operating a second household. The approach also helps to smooth the expenditure estimates in Table 9 by lessening the size of jumps in support that might induce reductions in hours worked or the shielding of income.

The proposed schedule contains discounts of 70 percent at \$3,550, \$4,550, and \$8,500. The schedule is developed as follows. For households with one child, compute the shares of expenditures in children under the current schedule and in the estimated costs of children at 1) the median household income of \$4550, 2) \$1,000 below median income, and 3) \$8,500, the maximum income in which reliable estimates of expenditures on children can be obtained from a regression model.

For example, a household with one child that reports \$4,550 in gross monthly income, the current schedule sets the order at 14 percent of combined gross monthly income, compared to a CES estimate of 20 percent. In essence by setting the proportion at 15.8 percent, a discount of 4.2 percentage points is offered, creating an income reserve that can be spent directly on children during parenting time and the operation of a second household.

Table 10 presents the current, actual, and proposed shares at \$3,550, \$4,550 and \$8,500. Starting at the actual shares, the proposed shares are seven-tenths of the distance between the actual and current share.

The following describes how the proportions are connected across the income scale to create our proposed schedule of support shown in Table 11. Starting at \$3,550 and moving down to \$1,200 in \$50 increments, the proportions were adjusted upward for each income level and additional child by very small increments:

- 1) The discounted percentage for a family with one child was increased by .05 percentage points for each \$50 decrease in income.
- 2) The discounted percentage for a family with two children was increased by .10 percentage points for each \$50 decrease in income.

- 3) The discounted percentage for a family with three children was increased by .12 percentage points for each \$50 decrease in income.

One problem with the “phase in” approach shown in Table 9 is that large increases in the order occur from \$1,200 to \$1,400. To address the potential work disincentive problem that this generates, we constructed the following phase in. We start with the levels of support at \$1,200. While moving up the schedule in \$50 increments, we increase support levels by no more than \$30 until they equal the levels of support predicted by the regression model. A similar smoothing approach appears to have been used in the current schedule. More specifically, at a combined gross monthly income of \$1,200:

- 1) For one child, we start at \$83 and move up the schedule in \$50 increments. We increase support levels by \$28 for the first 7 increments and \$14 for the next 8 increments.
- 2) For two children, we start at \$84 and move up the schedule in \$50 increments. We increase support levels by \$29 for the first 19 increments and \$14 for the next 7 increments.
- 3) For three children, we start at \$85 and move up the schedule in \$50 increments. We increase support levels by \$29 for the first 30 increments and \$20 for the next 5 increments.
- 4) For four, five and six children, multiply the obligations of households with three children by 1.1274, 1.2293 and 1.3142. These factors are used in the current schedule.

The intuition behind this approach is to provide larger discounts for lower income obligors and for obligors with more children, but the approach maintains the inverse relationship between the size of household income and the proportion of household income spent on children. In other words, it reflects the statistical reality that families with less money spend a larger percentage of their income on their children, but it acknowledges that separated families cannot afford to spend as much on their children as they would spend if they lived together.

The proportions from the median household income (approximately \$4,550) to \$8,500 were reduced as follows:

- 1) For one child the proposed proportion falls by 4.2 percentage points from 15.8 percent at the median (\$4,550) to 11.6 percent at \$8,500. Over this range there are 79 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 4.2 percentage points across these 79 increments.
- 2) For two children the proposed proportion falls by 6.1 percentage points from 23.4 percent at the median (\$4,550) to 17.3 percent at \$8,500. Over this range there are 79 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 6.1 percentage points across these 79 increments.
- 3) For three children the proposed proportion falls by 7.3 percentage points from 29.3 percent at the median (\$4,550) to 22.0 percent at \$8,500. Over this range there are 79 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 7.3 percentage points across these 79 increments.

The discount proportions at \$8,500 to \$15,000 were reduced as follows:

- 1) For one child the proposed proportion falls by 2.1 percentage points from 11.6 to 9.5 percent. Over this range there are 130 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 2.1 percentage points across these 130 increments.
- 2) For two children the proposed proportion falls by 3.5 percentage points from 17.3 percent to 13.8 percent. Over this range there are 130 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 3.5 percentage points across these 130 increments.
- 3) For three children the proposed proportion falls by 4.9 percentage points from 22.0 percent to 17.1 percent. Over this range there are 130 increments of \$50. To generate a smooth transition across this range, we equally divide the 4.9 percentage points across these 130 increments.

The discount proportions for different-sized families with gross monthly incomes of \$4,050, the mid-point between \$3,550 and \$4,550 were calculated by averaging the discounted percentages for similar-sized families. Doing this provides a smooth transition for incomes between these two endpoints.

Table 12 compares the current and proposed schedules by showing the shares of combined gross monthly income for each schedule. For one child at incomes below \$1,600, the order in the proposed schedule is less than the order in the current schedule. From \$1,600 to \$3,550, the proposed schedule's orders range from nearly equal to 3 percentage points above the current schedule's orders. From \$3,550 to \$4,550, the difference falls to 2 to 3 percentage points. At gross incomes above \$4,550, the proposed schedule's orders are 1 to 2 percentage points higher than current amounts.

The proposed and current schedules for two children exhibit a similar pattern. At combined gross income below \$1,950, the current schedule order exceeds the proposed order. From \$1,950 to \$3,550, the proposed schedule's order exceeds the current order by 1 to 5 percentage points and 2 to 4 percentage points from \$3,550 to \$4,550. At combined gross incomes in excess of \$4,550, the proposed schedule's orders are higher than the current's orders by 1 to 2 percentage points.

Tables 13 and 14 show that for three to six children in households with income less than \$2,300, proposed orders are less than current orders. From these values up to \$3,550, the proposed orders of support range from nearly equal to 8 percentage points above current orders. From \$3,550 to \$4,550 (the median income), the proposed shares are 3 to 7 percentage points above current orders. Proposed orders above \$4,550 range from being 0 to 4 percentage points higher than the current orders.

10. Summary and Conclusions

The schedule developed and recommended is tied to statistical estimates of what families spend on children. They reflect both parents' ability to pay and are informed by extensive research. The schedule retains many features of the Commonwealth's current child support schedule while addressing several key concerns of parents and practitioners. Finally, the schedule is consistent with the recommendations of the Panel.

Table 1: Distribution of Total Expenditures by Number of Children

Component	Less Health Care and Child Care			With Health Care and Child Care		
	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children
Shelter	0.225	0.225	0.221	0.211	0.210	0.208
Utilities	0.078	0.078	0.085	0.072	0.073	0.079
Operations	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.007
Equipment	0.034	0.036	0.033	0.032	0.033	0.031
Food	0.167	0.170	0.187	0.156	0.159	0.176
Alcohol and Tobacco	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.016	0.015	0.016
Fixed Transportation	0.092	0.083	0.081	0.088	0.079	0.077
Variable Transportation	0.090	0.087	0.085	0.084	0.082	0.080
Clothing	0.013	0.017	0.022	0.012	0.016	0.020
Adult Clothing	0.019	0.016	0.013	0.018	0.015	0.013
Apparel	0.012	0.012	0.013	0.011	0.011	0.012
Education	0.016	0.011	0.013	0.015	0.010	0.012
Entertainment	0.052	0.062	0.060	0.049	0.058	0.057
Personal Care	0.010	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.008
Read	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.003
Cash Contributions	0.006	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.006
Personal Insurance	0.148	0.149	0.131	0.138	0.138	0.122
Miscellaneous	0.009	0.009	0.011	0.009	0.009	0.011
Child Care	-	-	-	0.018	0.023	0.014
Health Care	-	-	-	0.045	0.043	0.046
Total	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Notes: Author's calculations from the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey.

Food = Food at Home + Food away from Home

Alcohol and Tobacco = Alcoholic Beverage + Tobacco

Total House = Shelter + Utilities + Equipment + Operations (less day care)

Operations (less day care) = Operations – Baby daycare

Fixed Transportation = Cars and trucks, new and used (net outlay) + Vehicle Insurance + Vehicle Finance charges

Variable Transportation = Gasoline and motor oil + Maintenance and repairs + Vehicle rental, leases, licenses, and other charges + Public Transportation

Health = Health insurance + Medical Services and Supplies + Prescription drugs

Clothes = Clothing for boys and girls (2 to 15) + Clothing for children under 2

Adult Clothing = Clothing for men and women (16 and over)

Apparel = Footwear + Other apparel

Child care = Baby daycare

Education = Education

Miscellaneous = Entertainment + Personal Care + Reading + Other Misc. + Pets, toys, and playground equipment + Cash contributions + Personal Insurance and pensions

Table 2: Expense Category Definitions used in the Analysis

Food, Alcohol, and Tobacco Expenditures

Food = Food at Home + Food away from Home

Alcohol and Tobacco = Alcoholic Beverage + Tobacco

Housing Expenditures

Total House = Shelter + Utilities + Equipment + Operations (less day care)

Operations (less day care) = Operations – Baby daycare

Transportation Expenditures

Fixed = Cars and trucks, new and used (net outlay) + Vehicle Insurance + Vehicle Finance charges

Variable = Gasoline and motor oil + Maintenance and repairs + Vehicle rental, leases, licenses, and other charges + Public Transportation

Health Care Expenditures

Ordinary Health = \$250 divided by 4* Number of Children

Clothing and Apparel Expenditures

Clothes = Clothing for boys and girls (2 to 15) + Clothing for children under 2

Adult Clothing = Clothing for men and women (16 and over)

Apparel = Footwear + Other apparel

Education Expenditures

Education = Education

Miscellaneous Costs less pets, toys and playground equipment

Miscellaneous = Entertainment + Personal Care + Reading + Miscellaneous + Pets, toys, and playground equipment + Cash contributions + Personal Insurance and pensions

Table 2 continued: Expense Category Definitions used in the Analysis

Total Expenditures (less child care)

Total Expenditures (less child care) = Food + Alcohol/Tobacco + Shelter +
Utilities + Operations + Equipment + Fixed + Variable
+ Entertainment + Personal Care + Read + Education + Miscellaneous + Cash
Contributions + Personal Insurance and Pensions + Clothes + Adult Clothing +
Apparel + Ordinary Health Care

Notes: Due to the nature of the Consumer Expenditure Survey, to create average monthly expenditures we must first add a household's information in a previous quarter to its current quarter information and then divide by three.

Table 3: Proportion of Food Expenditures Attributable to Children

Number Of Children	Thrifty Plan	Low-Cost Plan	Moderate-Cost Plan	Liberal Plan	Average Across Plans
1	0.292	0.294	0.295	0.284	0.291
2	0.452	0.454	0.455	0.442	0.451
3	0.553	0.555	0.556	0.543	0.552
4	0.622	0.624	0.626	0.613	0.621
5	0.673	0.675	0.676	0.664	0.672
6	0.712	0.714	0.715	0.704	0.711

Notes: Based on Official USDA Food Plans: Cost of Food at Home at Four Levels, U.S. Average, May 2002.

Table 4: Expenditures Attributable to Children

Panel A: Housing		
Number of Children	Per Capita	Average Use
1	33.3	1.0
2	50.0	9.5
3	60.0	12.4
Panel B: Transportation		
Number of Children	Per Capita	Average Use
1	33.3	24.0
2	50.0	44.0
3	60.0	38.0

Sources: All values come from the JLARC report on estimating the costs of raising children. Values in Panels A and B come from Tables 4 and 7 on pages 15 and 19. Panel C values come from Table 11, p. 23 of the report.

Table 5: Average Housing and Transportation Expenditures

	Total Quarterly Expenditures			Child Related Quarterly Expenditures					
				1 Child		2 Children		3 Children	
	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	Per Capita	Average Use	Per Capita	Average Use	Per Capita	Average Use
Shelter	2458	2723	2515	811	25	1361	272	1509	302
Utilities	733	803	809	242	7	402	80	485	97
Operations	122	139	114	40	1	70	14	69	14
Equipment	475	551	432	157	5	275	55	259	52
Fixed Transportation	1758	1673	1516	580	141	836	134	910	121
Variable Transportation	987	1033	927	326	237	517	455	556	352

Notes: Author's calculations from the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey.

Table 6: Average Food, Clothing, Health and Child Care, Miscellaneous Expenditures

	Total Quarterly Expenditures			Child Related Quarterly Expenditures		
	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children
Clothing	122	191	220	140	187	205
Food	1599	1810	1836	466	816	1013
Alcohol and Tobacco	161	175	169	-	-	-
Adult Clothing	231	219	162	-	-	-
Apparel	153	168	158	51	42	32
Education	276	180	227	276	180	227
Entertainment	644	859	795	215	215	159
Personal Care	100	104	92	33	26	18
Read	46	53	46	15	13	9
Cash Contributions	103	76	95	-	-	-
Personal Insurance	1700	1859	1544	-	-	-
Pets and Toys	126	156	157	126	156	157
Miscellaneous	115	128	144	39	32	29
Child Care	224	335	190	224	335	190
Health Care	523	531	567	95	163	226

Notes: Author's calculations from the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey.

Table 7: Components of Before Tax Income Used in Analysis

Income before taxes in past 12 months (less Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and welfare assistance including income from the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)) =

Wage and salary income before deductions

Income or loss from nonfarm business, partnership or professional practice

Amount of income or loss from own farm

Social Security and Railroad Retirement income prior to deductions for medical insurance and Medicare

Unemployment compensation

Workers' compensation or veterans' benefits (including education benefits, but excluding military retirement)

Income from interest on savings accounts or bonds

Regular income from dividends, royalties, estates, or trusts

Income from pensions or annuities from private companies, military, Government, IRA, or Keogh

Net income or loss was received from roomers or boarders

Net income or loss was received from payments from other rental units

Child support payments in other than a lump sum amount

Regular contributions from alimony and other sources

Other money income including money received from cash scholarships and fellowships, stipends not based on working, or from the care of foster children

Value of Food Stamps

Less

Supplemental Security Income from all sources received

Public assistance or welfare including money received from job training grants

**Table 8: Coefficient Estimates of Expenditures on Children
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)**

Number of Children	Per Capita		Average Use in Vehicles	
	Constant	Log(Average Monthly Income)	Constant	Log(Average Monthly Income)
1	4.902 (0.107)	0.237 (0.013)	4.839 (0.113)	0.235 (0.014)
2	5.786 (0.080)	0.179 (0.010)	5.679 (0.085)	0.180 (0.010)
3	5.921 (0.122)	0.180 (0.015)	5.852 (0.127)	0.176 (0.015)

Notes: The estimates are based on husband-wife households from the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey micro data. To be included in the sample, they were required to have reported having at least one child of their own under age 18 living in the household and some positive amount of household income for the past year. This yielded 5,902 households, with 1,987 having one child, 2,557 having two children, and 990 having three children. The samples of households with 4, 5 and 6 children are too small to generate reliable results. For example there are only 288 husband-wife households with four children.

Table 9: Estimated Expenditures on Children in Husband-Wife Households

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
1200	83	84	85	96	104	112
1250	128	130	131	148	161	172
1300	173	175	177	200	218	233
1350	218	221	223	251	274	293
1400	263	266	269	303	331	354
1450	308	312	315	355	387	414
1500	353	357	361	407	444	474
1550	398	403	407	459	500	535
1600	443	448	453	511	557	595
1650	488	494	499	563	613	656
1700	533	539	545	614	670	716
1750	578	585	591	666	727	777
1800	623	630	637	718	783	837
1850	668	676	683	770	840	898
1900	713	721	729	822	896	958
1950	733	767	775	874	953	1019
2000	738	812	821	926	1009	1079
2050	743	858	867	977	1066	1139
2100	748	903	913	1029	1122	1200
2150	752	949	959	1081	1179	1260
2200	757	994	1005	1133	1235	1321
2250	761	1040	1051	1185	1292	1381
2300	765	1085	1097	1237	1349	1442
2350	770	1131	1143	1289	1405	1502
2400	774	1176	1189	1340	1462	1563
2450	778	1194	1235	1392	1518	1623
2500	782	1198	1281	1444	1575	1683
2550	786	1202	1327	1496	1631	1744
2600	790	1207	1373	1548	1688	1804
2650	794	1211	1419	1600	1744	1865
2700	798	1215	1465	1652	1801	1925
2750	802	1219	1511	1704	1857	1986
2800	805	1223	1557	1755	1914	2046
2850	809	1227	1568	1768	1928	2061
2900	813	1231	1573	1773	1934	2067
2950	816	1235	1578	1779	1940	2074
3000	820	1238	1582	1784	1945	2079
3050	823	1242	1587	1789	1951	2086
3100	827	1246	1592	1795	1957	2092
3150	830	1249	1596	1799	1962	2097
3200	834	1253	1600	1804	1967	2103
3250	837	1256	1605	1809	1973	2109
3300	840	1260	1609	1814	1978	2115
3350	844	1263	1613	1818	1983	2120

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
3400	847	1267	1618	1824	1989	2126
3450	850	1270	1622	1829	1994	2132
3500	853	1273	1626	1833	1999	2137
3550	856	1277	1630	1838	2004	2142
3600	860	1280	1634	1842	2009	2147
3650	863	1283	1638	1847	2014	2153
3700	866	1286	1642	1851	2019	2158
3750	869	1290	1646	1856	2023	2163
3800	872	1293	1649	1859	2027	2167
3850	875	1296	1653	1864	2032	2172
3900	878	1299	1657	1868	2037	2178
3950	880	1302	1661	1873	2042	2183
4000	883	1305	1664	1876	2046	2187
4050	886	1308	1668	1881	2050	2192
4100	889	1311	1672	1885	2055	2197
4150	892	1313	1675	1888	2059	2201
4200	895	1316	1679	1893	2064	2207
4250	897	1319	1682	1896	2068	2210
4300	900	1322	1686	1901	2073	2216
4350	903	1325	1689	1904	2076	2220
4400	905	1327	1692	1908	2080	2224
4450	908	1330	1696	1912	2085	2229
4500	911	1333	1699	1915	2089	2233
4550	913	1336	1702	1919	2092	2237
4600	916	1338	1706	1923	2097	2242
4650	918	1341	1709	1927	2101	2246
4700	921	1343	1712	1930	2105	2250
4750	924	1346	1715	1933	2108	2254
4800	926	1349	1718	1937	2112	2258
4850	929	1351	1722	1941	2117	2263
4900	931	1354	1725	1945	2121	2267
4950	933	1356	1728	1948	2124	2271
5000	936	1359	1731	1952	2128	2275
5050	938	1361	1734	1955	2132	2279
5100	941	1364	1737	1958	2135	2283
5150	943	1366	1740	1962	2139	2287
5200	945	1368	1743	1965	2143	2291
5250	948	1371	1746	1968	2146	2295
5300	950	1373	1749	1972	2150	2299
5350	952	1375	1751	1974	2153	2301
5400	955	1378	1754	1977	2156	2305
5450	957	1380	1757	1981	2160	2309
5500	959	1382	1760	1984	2164	2313
5550	962	1385	1763	1988	2167	2317
5600	964	1387	1765	1990	2170	2320

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
5650	966	1389	1768	1993	2173	2324
5700	968	1391	1771	1997	2177	2327
5750	970	1394	1774	2000	2181	2331
5800	973	1396	1776	2002	2183	2334
5850	975	1398	1779	2006	2187	2338
5900	977	1400	1782	2009	2191	2342
5950	979	1402	1784	2011	2193	2345
6000	981	1404	1787	2015	2197	2348
6050	983	1406	1790	2018	2200	2352
6100	985	1409	1792	2020	2203	2355
6150	987	1411	1795	2024	2207	2359
6200	990	1413	1797	2026	2209	2362
6250	992	1415	1800	2029	2213	2366
6300	994	1417	1802	2032	2215	2368
6350	996	1419	1805	2035	2219	2372
6400	998	1421	1807	2037	2221	2375
6450	1000	1423	1810	2041	2225	2379
6500	1002	1425	1812	2043	2227	2381
6550	1004	1427	1815	2046	2231	2385
6600	1006	1429	1817	2048	2234	2388
6650	1008	1431	1819	2051	2236	2391
6700	1010	1433	1822	2054	2240	2394
6750	1012	1435	1824	2056	2242	2397
6800	1014	1437	1827	2060	2246	2401
6850	1015	1439	1829	2062	2248	2404
6900	1017	1440	1831	2064	2251	2406
6950	1019	1442	1834	2068	2255	2410
7000	1021	1444	1836	2070	2257	2413
7050	1023	1446	1838	2072	2259	2415
7100	1025	1448	1840	2074	2262	2418
7150	1027	1450	1843	2078	2266	2422
7200	1029	1452	1845	2080	2268	2425
7250	1030	1453	1847	2082	2271	2427
7300	1032	1455	1849	2085	2273	2430
7350	1034	1457	1852	2088	2277	2434
7400	1036	1459	1854	2090	2279	2437
7450	1038	1461	1856	2092	2282	2439
7500	1040	1462	1858	2095	2284	2442
7550	1041	1464	1860	2097	2286	2444
7600	1043	1466	1863	2100	2290	2448
7650	1045	1468	1865	2103	2293	2451
7700	1047	1469	1867	2105	2295	2454
7750	1048	1471	1869	2107	2298	2456
7800	1050	1473	1871	2109	2300	2459
7850	1052	1475	1873	2112	2302	2461

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
7900	1054	1476	1875	2114	2305	2464
7950	1055	1478	1877	2116	2307	2467
8000	1057	1480	1879	2118	2310	2469
8050	1059	1481	1881	2121	2312	2472
8100	1061	1483	1883	2123	2315	2475
8150	1062	1485	1886	2126	2318	2479
8200	1064	1486	1888	2129	2321	2481
8250	1066	1488	1890	2131	2323	2484
8300	1067	1490	1892	2133	2326	2486
8350	1069	1491	1894	2135	2328	2489
8400	1071	1493	1896	2138	2331	2492
8450	1072	1494	1898	2140	2333	2494
8500	1074	1496	1899	2141	2334	2496
8550	1080	1505	1911	2154	2349	2511
8600	1086	1514	1922	2167	2363	2526
8650	1093	1522	1933	2179	2376	2540
8700	1099	1531	1944	2192	2390	2555
8750	1105	1540	1955	2204	2403	2569
8800	1112	1549	1967	2218	2418	2585
8850	1118	1558	1978	2230	2432	2599
8900	1124	1566	1989	2242	2445	2614
8950	1131	1575	2000	2255	2459	2628
9000	1137	1584	2011	2267	2472	2643
9050	1143	1593	2022	2280	2486	2657
9100	1150	1602	2034	2293	2500	2673
9150	1156	1610	2045	2306	2514	2688
9200	1162	1619	2056	2318	2527	2702
9250	1169	1628	2067	2330	2541	2716
9300	1175	1637	2078	2343	2554	2731
9350	1181	1646	2089	2355	2568	2745
9400	1188	1654	2101	2369	2583	2761
9450	1194	1663	2112	2381	2596	2776
9500	1200	1672	2123	2393	2610	2790
9550	1206	1681	2134	2406	2623	2805
9600	1213	1690	2145	2418	2637	2819
9650	1219	1698	2156	2431	2650	2833
9700	1225	1707	2168	2444	2665	2849
9750	1232	1716	2179	2457	2679	2864
9800	1238	1725	2190	2469	2692	2878
9850	1244	1734	2201	2481	2706	2893
9900	1251	1742	2212	2494	2719	2907
9950	1257	1751	2224	2507	2734	2923
10000	1263	1760	2235	2520	2747	2937
10050	1270	1769	2246	2532	2761	2952
10100	1276	1778	2257	2545	2775	2966

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
10150	1282	1786	2268	2557	2788	2981
10200	1289	1795	2279	2569	2802	2995
10250	1295	1804	2291	2583	2816	3011
10300	1301	1813	2302	2595	2830	3025
10350	1308	1822	2313	2608	2843	3040
10400	1314	1830	2324	2620	2857	3054
10450	1320	1839	2335	2632	2870	3069
10500	1327	1848	2346	2645	2884	3083
10550	1333	1857	2358	2658	2899	3099
10600	1339	1866	2369	2671	2912	3113
10650	1345	1874	2380	2683	2926	3128
10700	1352	1883	2391	2696	2939	3142
10750	1358	1892	2402	2708	2953	3157
10800	1364	1901	2413	2720	2966	3171
10850	1371	1910	2425	2734	2981	3187
10900	1377	1918	2436	2746	2995	3201
10950	1383	1927	2447	2759	3008	3216
11000	1390	1936	2458	2771	3022	3230
11050	1396	1945	2469	2784	3035	3245
11100	1402	1954	2481	2797	3050	3261
11150	1409	1962	2492	2809	3063	3275
11200	1415	1971	2503	2822	3077	3289
11250	1421	1980	2514	2834	3090	3304
11300	1428	1989	2525	2847	3104	3318
11350	1434	1998	2536	2859	3118	3333
11400	1440	2006	2548	2873	3132	3349
11450	1447	2015	2559	2885	3146	3363
11500	1453	2024	2570	2897	3159	3377
11550	1459	2033	2581	2910	3173	3392
11600	1465	2042	2592	2922	3186	3406
11650	1472	2050	2603	2935	3200	3421
11700	1478	2059	2615	2948	3215	3437
11750	1484	2068	2626	2961	3228	3451
11800	1491	2077	2637	2973	3242	3466
11850	1497	2086	2648	2985	3255	3480
11900	1503	2094	2659	2998	3269	3494
11950	1510	2103	2670	3010	3282	3509
12000	1516	2112	2682	3024	3297	3525
12050	1522	2121	2693	3036	3311	3539
12100	1529	2130	2704	3048	3324	3554
12150	1535	2138	2715	3061	3338	3568
12200	1541	2147	2726	3073	3351	3583
12250	1548	2156	2737	3086	3365	3597
12300	1554	2165	2749	3099	3379	3613
12350	1560	2174	2760	3112	3393	3627

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
12400	1567	2182	2771	3124	3406	3642
12450	1573	2191	2782	3136	3420	3656
12500	1579	2200	2793	3149	3433	3671
12550	1585	2209	2805	3162	3448	3686
12600	1592	2218	2816	3175	3462	3701
12650	1598	2226	2827	3187	3475	3715
12700	1604	2235	2838	3200	3489	3730
12750	1611	2244	2849	3212	3502	3744
12800	1617	2253	2860	3224	3516	3759
12850	1623	2262	2872	3238	3531	3774
12900	1630	2270	2883	3250	3544	3789
12950	1636	2279	2894	3263	3558	3803
13000	1642	2288	2905	3275	3571	3818
13050	1649	2297	2916	3287	3585	3832
13100	1655	2306	2927	3300	3598	3847
13150	1661	2314	2939	3313	3613	3862
13200	1668	2323	2950	3326	3626	3877
13250	1674	2332	2961	3338	3640	3891
13300	1680	2341	2972	3351	3653	3906
13350	1687	2350	2983	3363	3667	3920
13400	1693	2358	2994	3375	3681	3935
13450	1699	2367	3006	3389	3695	3950
13500	1706	2376	3017	3401	3709	3965
13550	1712	2385	3028	3414	3722	3979
13600	1718	2394	3039	3426	3736	3994
13650	1724	2402	3050	3439	3749	4008
13700	1731	2411	3062	3452	3764	4024
13750	1737	2420	3073	3465	3778	4039
13800	1743	2429	3084	3477	3791	4053
13850	1750	2438	3095	3489	3805	4067
13900	1756	2446	3106	3502	3818	4082
13950	1762	2455	3117	3514	3832	4096
14000	1769	2464	3129	3528	3846	4112
14050	1775	2473	3140	3540	3860	4127
14100	1781	2482	3151	3552	3874	4141
14150	1788	2490	3162	3565	3887	4156
14200	1794	2499	3173	3577	3901	4170
14250	1800	2508	3184	3590	3914	4184
14300	1807	2517	3196	3603	3929	4200
14350	1813	2526	3207	3616	3942	4215
14400	1819	2534	3218	3628	3956	4229
14450	1826	2543	3229	3640	3969	4244
14500	1832	2552	3240	3653	3983	4258
14550	1838	2561	3251	3665	3996	4272
14600	1844	2570	3263	3679	4011	4288

Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
14650	1851	2578	3274	3691	4025	4303
14700	1857	2587	3285	3704	4038	4317
14750	1863	2596	3296	3716	4052	4332
14800	1870	2605	3307	3728	4065	4346
14850	1876	2614	3319	3742	4080	4362
14900	1882	2622	3330	3754	4094	4376
14950	1889	2631	3341	3767	4107	4391
15000	1895	2640	3352	3779	4121	4405

Table 10: Expenditure Shares by Number of Children and Combined Gross Income

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Share of Combined Gross Income			(2) – (1) Actual – Current	(2) – (3) Actual – Proposed	(Actual-Proposed)/ (Actual-Current)
	(1) Current	(2) Actual	(3) Proposed			
One Child						
\$3,550	14.0%	24.0%	17.0%	10.0	7.0	7/10.0 = 0.70
\$4,550	14.0%	20.0%	15.8%	6.0	4.2	4.2/6.0 = 0.70
\$8,500	11.0%	13.0%	11.6%	2.0	1.4	1.4/2.0 = 0.70
Two Children						
\$3,550	22.0%	36.0%	26.2%	14.0	9.8	9.8/14.0 = 0.70
\$4,550	21.0%	29.0%	23.4%	8.0	5.6	5.6/8.0 = 0.70
\$8,500	17.0%	18.0%	17.3%	1.0	0.7	0.70/1.00 = 0.70
Three Children						
\$3,550	28.0%	46.0%	33.4%	18.0	12.6	12.6/18.0 = 0.70
\$4,550	26.0%	37.0%	29.3%	11.0	7.7	7.7/11.0 = 0.70
\$8,500	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%	0.0	0.0	-

Table 11: Proposed Schedule of Child Support

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
1200	83	84	85	96	104	112
1250	111	113	114	129	140	150
1300	139	142	143	161	176	188
1350	167	171	172	194	211	226
1400	195	200	201	227	247	264
1450	223	229	230	259	283	302
1500	251	258	259	292	318	340
1550	279	287	288	325	354	378
1600	293	316	317	357	390	417
1650	307	345	346	390	425	455
1700	321	374	375	423	461	493
1750	329	403	404	455	497	531
1800	338	432	433	488	532	569
1850	346	461	462	521	568	607
1900	355	490	491	554	604	645
1950	363	519	520	586	639	683
2000	371	548	549	619	675	721
2050	380	577	578	652	711	760
2100	388	606	607	684	746	798
2150	396	623	636	717	782	836
2200	404	636	665	750	817	874
2250	412	648	694	782	853	912
2300	420	660	723	815	889	950
2350	428	672	752	848	924	988
2400	436	684	781	880	960	1026
2450	444	696	810	913	996	1065
2500	452	707	839	946	1031	1103
2550	459	719	868	979	1067	1141
2600	467	731	897	1011	1103	1179
2650	475	742	926	1044	1138	1217
2700	482	753	955	1077	1174	1255
2750	490	764	972	1095	1194	1277
2800	497	776	986	1111	1212	1296
2850	505	787	1000	1127	1229	1314
2900	512	797	1014	1143	1247	1333
2950	520	808	1028	1159	1264	1351
3000	527	819	1042	1175	1281	1369
3050	534	830	1056	1190	1298	1387
3100	541	840	1069	1205	1314	1405
3150	549	850	1083	1221	1331	1423
3200	556	861	1096	1236	1347	1440
3250	563	871	1109	1250	1364	1458
3300	570	881	1122	1265	1380	1475
3350	577	891	1135	1280	1396	1492
3400	584	901	1148	1294	1411	1509
3450	590	911	1161	1309	1427	1526

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
3500	597	920	1173	1323	1443	1542
3550	604	930	1186	1337	1458	1559
3600	610	938	1195	1347	1469	1570
3650	616	946	1204	1358	1480	1582
3700	622	954	1213	1368	1491	1594
3750	629	962	1222	1377	1502	1606
3800	635	969	1230	1387	1512	1617
3850	641	976	1239	1396	1523	1628
3900	647	984	1247	1405	1532	1638
3950	653	991	1255	1414	1542	1649
4000	658	998	1262	1423	1552	1659
4050	664	1004	1270	1431	1561	1669
4100	670	1011	1277	1440	1570	1678
4150	676	1018	1284	1448	1578	1687
4200	681	1024	1291	1455	1587	1696
4250	687	1030	1298	1463	1595	1705
4300	692	1036	1304	1470	1603	1714
4350	698	1042	1310	1477	1611	1722
4400	703	1048	1316	1484	1618	1730
4450	708	1054	1322	1491	1625	1737
4500	714	1059	1328	1497	1632	1745
4550	719	1065	1333	1503	1639	1752
4600	724	1073	1344	1515	1652	1766
4650	730	1081	1354	1526	1664	1779
4700	735	1089	1364	1538	1677	1793
4750	740	1097	1374	1549	1689	1806
4800	746	1105	1384	1561	1702	1819
4850	751	1112	1394	1572	1714	1832
4900	756	1120	1404	1583	1726	1845
4950	761	1128	1414	1594	1738	1858
5000	766	1135	1423	1605	1750	1871
5050	771	1143	1433	1616	1762	1883
5100	776	1150	1442	1626	1773	1896
5150	781	1157	1452	1637	1785	1908
5200	786	1165	1461	1647	1796	1920
5250	790	1172	1470	1658	1807	1932
5300	795	1179	1479	1668	1819	1944
5350	800	1186	1488	1678	1830	1956
5400	804	1193	1497	1688	1841	1968
5450	809	1200	1506	1698	1852	1979
5500	813	1206	1515	1708	1862	1991
5550	818	1213	1524	1718	1873	2002
5600	822	1220	1532	1727	1883	2014
5650	827	1226	1541	1737	1894	2025
5700	831	1233	1549	1746	1904	2036
5750	835	1239	1557	1756	1914	2047
5800	839	1245	1565	1765	1924	2057

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
5850	843	1251	1574	1774	1934	2068
5900	848	1258	1581	1783	1944	2078
5950	852	1264	1589	1792	1954	2089
6000	855	1270	1597	1801	1963	2099
6050	859	1276	1605	1809	1973	2109
6100	863	1281	1613	1818	1982	2119
6150	867	1287	1620	1826	1992	2129
6200	871	1293	1628	1835	2001	2139
6250	875	1298	1635	1843	2010	2149
6300	878	1304	1642	1851	2019	2158
6350	882	1309	1649	1859	2027	2168
6400	885	1315	1656	1867	2036	2177
6450	889	1320	1663	1875	2045	2186
6500	892	1325	1670	1883	2053	2195
6550	896	1330	1677	1891	2062	2204
6600	899	1335	1684	1898	2070	2213
6650	902	1340	1690	1906	2078	2221
6700	905	1345	1697	1913	2086	2230
6750	909	1350	1703	1920	2094	2238
6800	912	1355	1710	1927	2102	2247
6850	915	1360	1716	1934	2109	2255
6900	918	1364	1722	1941	2117	2263
6950	921	1369	1728	1948	2124	2271
7000	924	1373	1734	1955	2132	2279
7050	926	1378	1740	1962	2139	2287
7100	929	1382	1746	1968	2146	2294
7150	932	1386	1751	1975	2153	2302
7200	935	1390	1757	1981	2160	2309
7250	937	1394	1762	1987	2167	2316
7300	940	1398	1768	1993	2173	2323
7350	942	1402	1773	1999	2180	2330
7400	945	1406	1778	2005	2186	2337
7450	947	1410	1784	2011	2193	2344
7500	950	1413	1789	2016	2199	2351
7550	952	1417	1794	2022	2205	2357
7600	954	1420	1798	2028	2211	2363
7650	957	1424	1803	2033	2217	2370
7700	959	1427	1808	2038	2222	2376
7750	961	1431	1812	2043	2228	2382
7800	963	1434	1817	2048	2234	2388
7850	965	1437	1821	2053	2239	2394
7900	967	1440	1826	2058	2244	2399
7950	969	1443	1830	2063	2249	2405
8000	971	1446	1834	2068	2254	2410
8050	972	1449	1838	2072	2259	2415
8100	974	1451	1842	2077	2264	2421
8150	976	1454	1846	2081	2269	2426

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
8200	977	1457	1849	2085	2274	2431
8250	979	1459	1853	2089	2278	2435
8300	980	1462	1857	2093	2282	2440
8350	982	1464	1860	2097	2287	2445
8400	983	1466	1864	2101	2291	2449
8450	985	1468	1867	2105	2295	2453
8500	986	1470	1870	2108	2299	2458
8550	992	1479	1878	2117	2308	2468
8600	996	1485	1886	2126	2318	2478
8650	1001	1492	1893	2134	2327	2488
8700	1005	1498	1901	2143	2337	2498
8750	1009	1504	1909	2152	2346	2508
8800	1014	1511	1916	2160	2355	2518
8850	1018	1517	1924	2169	2365	2528
8900	1022	1523	1931	2177	2374	2538
8950	1027	1529	1939	2186	2383	2548
9000	1031	1535	1946	2194	2392	2558
9050	1035	1541	1953	2202	2401	2567
9100	1039	1547	1961	2211	2410	2577
9150	1044	1553	1968	2219	2419	2587
9200	1048	1559	1975	2227	2428	2596
9250	1052	1565	1983	2235	2437	2606
9300	1056	1571	1990	2243	2446	2615
9350	1060	1577	1997	2252	2455	2625
9400	1065	1583	2004	2260	2464	2634
9450	1069	1589	2011	2268	2473	2643
9500	1073	1595	2018	2276	2481	2653
9550	1077	1601	2025	2283	2490	2662
9600	1081	1607	2032	2291	2498	2671
9650	1085	1612	2039	2299	2507	2680
9700	1089	1618	2046	2307	2515	2689
9750	1093	1624	2053	2315	2524	2698
9800	1097	1629	2060	2322	2532	2707
9850	1101	1635	2067	2330	2541	2716
9900	1105	1641	2074	2338	2549	2725
9950	1109	1646	2080	2345	2557	2734
10000	1113	1652	2087	2353	2565	2743
10050	1117	1657	2094	2360	2574	2751
10100	1121	1663	2100	2368	2582	2760
10150	1125	1669	2107	2375	2590	2769
10200	1129	1674	2113	2383	2598	2777
10250	1133	1679	2120	2390	2606	2786
10300	1137	1685	2126	2397	2614	2794
10350	1140	1690	2133	2404	2622	2803
10400	1144	1696	2139	2412	2630	2811
10450	1148	1701	2145	2419	2637	2819
10500	1152	1706	2152	2426	2645	2828

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
10550	1156	1712	2158	2433	2653	2836
10600	1159	1717	2164	2440	2660	2844
10650	1163	1722	2170	2447	2668	2852
10700	1167	1727	2177	2454	2676	2860
10750	1171	1732	2183	2461	2683	2868
10800	1174	1738	2189	2468	2691	2876
10850	1178	1743	2195	2474	2698	2884
10900	1182	1748	2201	2481	2705	2892
10950	1185	1753	2207	2488	2713	2900
11000	1189	1758	2213	2495	2720	2908
11050	1193	1763	2219	2501	2727	2916
11100	1196	1768	2224	2508	2735	2923
11150	1200	1773	2230	2514	2742	2931
11200	1203	1778	2236	2521	2749	2939
11250	1207	1783	2242	2527	2756	2946
11300	1210	1788	2247	2534	2763	2954
11350	1214	1792	2253	2540	2770	2961
11400	1217	1797	2259	2547	2777	2968
11450	1221	1802	2264	2553	2784	2976
11500	1224	1807	2270	2559	2790	2983
11550	1228	1812	2275	2565	2797	2990
11600	1231	1816	2281	2572	2804	2998
11650	1235	1821	2286	2578	2811	3005
11700	1238	1826	2292	2584	2817	3012
11750	1242	1830	2297	2590	2824	3019
11800	1245	1835	2302	2596	2830	3026
11850	1248	1839	2308	2602	2837	3033
11900	1252	1844	2313	2608	2843	3040
11950	1255	1849	2318	2614	2850	3047
12000	1258	1853	2323	2619	2856	3053
12050	1262	1858	2329	2625	2862	3060
12100	1265	1862	2334	2631	2869	3067
12150	1268	1866	2339	2637	2875	3074
12200	1271	1871	2344	2642	2881	3080
12250	1275	1875	2349	2648	2887	3087
12300	1278	1880	2354	2654	2893	3093
12350	1281	1884	2359	2659	2899	3100
12400	1284	1888	2363	2665	2905	3106
12450	1287	1892	2368	2670	2911	3112
12500	1290	1897	2373	2675	2917	3119
12550	1294	1901	2378	2681	2923	3125
12600	1297	1905	2383	2686	2929	3131
12650	1300	1909	2387	2691	2935	3137
12700	1303	1913	2392	2697	2940	3143
12750	1306	1917	2397	2702	2946	3149
12800	1309	1921	2401	2707	2952	3156
12850	1312	1926	2406	2712	2957	3161

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child	Two Children	Three Children	Four Children	Five Children	Six Children
12900	1315	1930	2410	2717	2963	3167
12950	1318	1934	2415	2722	2968	3173
13000	1321	1937	2419	2727	2974	3179
13050	1324	1941	2423	2732	2979	3185
13100	1327	1945	2428	2737	2984	3191
13150	1330	1949	2432	2742	2990	3196
13200	1333	1953	2436	2747	2995	3202
13250	1336	1957	2441	2751	3000	3207
13300	1339	1961	2445	2756	3005	3213
13350	1342	1965	2449	2761	3010	3218
13400	1344	1968	2453	2766	3016	3224
13450	1347	1972	2457	2770	3021	3229
13500	1350	1976	2461	2775	3025	3234
13550	1353	1979	2465	2779	3030	3240
13600	1356	1983	2469	2784	3035	3245
13650	1358	1987	2473	2788	3040	3250
13700	1361	1990	2477	2793	3045	3255
13750	1364	1994	2481	2797	3050	3260
13800	1367	1997	2485	2801	3054	3265
13850	1369	2001	2488	2805	3059	3270
13900	1372	2004	2492	2810	3064	3275
13950	1375	2008	2496	2814	3068	3280
14000	1377	2011	2500	2818	3073	3285
14050	1380	2015	2503	2822	3077	3290
14100	1383	2018	2507	2826	3082	3294
14150	1385	2021	2510	2830	3086	3299
14200	1388	2025	2514	2834	3090	3304
14250	1391	2028	2517	2838	3095	3308
14300	1393	2031	2521	2842	3099	3313
14350	1396	2034	2524	2846	3103	3317
14400	1398	2038	2528	2850	3107	3322
14450	1401	2041	2531	2853	3111	3326
14500	1403	2044	2534	2857	3115	3330
14550	1406	2047	2537	2861	3119	3335
14600	1408	2050	2541	2864	3123	3339
14650	1411	2053	2544	2868	3127	3343
14700	1413	2056	2547	2871	3131	3347
14750	1416	2059	2550	2875	3135	3351
14800	1418	2062	2553	2878	3139	3355
14850	1420	2065	2556	2882	3142	3359
14900	1423	2068	2559	2885	3146	3363
14950	1425	2071	2562	2888	3150	3367
15000	1427	2074	2565	2892	3153	3371

Notes: For combined gross monthly income that exceeds \$15,000, add the amount of child support for \$15,000 to the following percentages of combined gross monthly above \$15,000: one child: 3.1%; two children: 4.7%; three children: 6.0%; four children: 6.8%; five children: 7.4%; six children: 7.9%.

**Table 12: Comparison of Schedules: Current and Proposed
(One and Two Children)**

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
1200	225	83	19%	7%	348	84	29%	7%
1250	232	111	19%	9%	360	113	29%	9%
1300	241	139	19%	11%	373	142	29%	11%
1350	249	167	18%	12%	386	171	29%	13%
1400	257	195	18%	14%	398	200	28%	14%
1450	265	223	18%	15%	411	229	28%	16%
1500	274	251	18%	17%	426	258	28%	17%
1550	282	279	18%	18%	436	287	28%	19%
1600	289	293	18%	18%	447	316	28%	20%
1650	295	307	19%	19%	458	345	28%	21%
1700	302	321	19%	19%	468	374	28%	22%
1750	309	329	18%	19%	479	403	27%	23%
1800	315	338	18%	19%	488	432	27%	24%
1850	321	346	17%	19%	497	461	27%	25%
1900	326	355	17%	19%	506	490	27%	26%
1950	332	363	17%	19%	514	519	26%	27%
2000	338	371	17%	19%	523	548	26%	27%
2050	343	380	17%	19%	532	577	26%	28%
2100	349	388	17%	19%	540	606	26%	29%
2150	355	396	17%	18%	549	623	26%	29%
2200	360	404	16%	18%	558	636	25%	29%
2250	366	412	16%	18%	567	648	25%	29%
2300	371	420	16%	18%	575	660	25%	29%
2350	377	428	16%	18%	584	672	25%	29%
2400	383	436	16%	18%	593	684	25%	29%
2450	388	444	16%	18%	601	696	25%	28%
2500	394	452	16%	18%	610	707	24%	28%
2550	399	459	16%	18%	619	719	24%	28%
2600	405	467	16%	18%	627	731	24%	28%
2650	410	475	15%	18%	635	742	24%	28%
2700	415	482	15%	18%	643	753	24%	28%
2750	420	490	15%	18%	651	764	24%	28%
2800	425	497	15%	18%	658	776	24%	28%
2850	430	505	15%	18%	667	787	23%	28%
2900	435	512	15%	18%	675	797	23%	28%
2950	440	520	15%	18%	683	808	23%	27%
3000	445	527	15%	18%	691	819	23%	27%
3050	450	534	15%	18%	699	830	23%	27%
3100	456	541	15%	18%	707	840	23%	27%
3150	461	549	15%	17%	715	850	23%	27%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
3200	466	556	15%	17%	723	861	23%	27%
3250	471	563	14%	17%	732	871	23%	27%
3300	476	570	14%	17%	740	881	22%	27%
3350	481	577	14%	17%	748	891	22%	27%
3400	486	584	14%	17%	756	901	22%	27%
3450	492	590	14%	17%	764	911	22%	26%
3500	497	597	14%	17%	772	920	22%	26%
3550	502	604	14%	17%	780	930	22%	26%
3600	507	610	14%	17%	788	938	22%	26%
3650	512	616	14%	17%	797	946	22%	26%
3700	518	622	14%	17%	806	954	22%	26%
3750	524	629	14%	17%	815	962	22%	26%
3800	530	635	14%	17%	824	969	22%	26%
3850	536	641	14%	17%	834	976	22%	25%
3900	542	647	14%	17%	843	984	22%	25%
3950	547	653	14%	17%	852	991	22%	25%
4000	553	658	14%	16%	861	998	22%	25%
4050	559	664	14%	16%	871	1004	22%	25%
4100	565	670	14%	16%	880	1011	21%	25%
4150	571	676	14%	16%	889	1018	21%	25%
4200	577	681	14%	16%	898	1024	21%	24%
4250	583	687	14%	16%	907	1030	21%	24%
4300	589	692	14%	16%	917	1036	21%	24%
4350	594	698	14%	16%	926	1042	21%	24%
4400	600	703	14%	16%	935	1048	21%	24%
4450	606	708	14%	16%	944	1054	21%	24%
4500	612	714	14%	16%	954	1059	21%	24%
4550	618	719	14%	16%	963	1065	21%	23%
4600	624	724	14%	16%	972	1073	21%	23%
4650	630	730	14%	16%	981	1081	21%	23%
4700	635	735	14%	16%	989	1089	21%	23%
4750	641	740	13%	16%	997	1097	21%	23%
4800	646	746	13%	16%	1005	1105	21%	23%
4850	651	751	13%	15%	1013	1112	21%	23%
4900	656	756	13%	15%	1021	1120	21%	23%
4950	661	761	13%	15%	1028	1128	21%	23%
5000	666	766	13%	15%	1036	1135	21%	23%
5050	671	771	13%	15%	1043	1143	21%	23%
5100	675	776	13%	15%	1051	1150	21%	23%
5150	680	781	13%	15%	1058	1157	21%	22%
5200	685	786	13%	15%	1066	1165	21%	22%
5250	690	790	13%	15%	1073	1172	20%	22%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
5300	695	795	13%	15%	1081	1179	20%	22%
5350	700	800	13%	15%	1088	1186	20%	22%
5400	705	804	13%	15%	1096	1193	20%	22%
5450	710	809	13%	15%	1103	1200	20%	22%
5500	714	813	13%	15%	1111	1206	20%	22%
5550	719	818	13%	15%	1118	1213	20%	22%
5600	724	822	13%	15%	1126	1220	20%	22%
5650	729	827	13%	15%	1133	1226	20%	22%
5700	734	831	13%	15%	1141	1233	20%	22%
5750	739	835	13%	15%	1148	1239	20%	22%
5800	744	839	13%	14%	1156	1245	20%	21%
5850	749	843	13%	14%	1163	1251	20%	21%
5900	753	848	13%	14%	1171	1258	20%	21%
5950	758	852	13%	14%	1178	1264	20%	21%
6000	763	855	13%	14%	1186	1270	20%	21%
6050	768	859	13%	14%	1193	1276	20%	21%
6100	773	863	13%	14%	1201	1281	20%	21%
6150	778	867	13%	14%	1208	1287	20%	21%
6200	783	871	13%	14%	1216	1293	20%	21%
6250	788	875	13%	14%	1223	1298	20%	21%
6300	792	878	13%	14%	1231	1304	20%	21%
6350	797	882	13%	14%	1238	1309	19%	21%
6400	802	885	13%	14%	1246	1315	19%	21%
6450	807	889	13%	14%	1253	1320	19%	20%
6500	812	892	12%	14%	1261	1325	19%	20%
6550	816	896	12%	14%	1267	1330	19%	20%
6600	820	899	12%	14%	1272	1335	19%	20%
6650	823	902	12%	14%	1277	1340	19%	20%
6700	827	905	12%	14%	1283	1345	19%	20%
6750	830	909	12%	13%	1288	1350	19%	20%
6800	834	912	12%	13%	1293	1355	19%	20%
6850	837	915	12%	13%	1299	1360	19%	20%
6900	841	918	12%	13%	1304	1364	19%	20%
6950	845	921	12%	13%	1309	1369	19%	20%
7000	848	924	12%	13%	1315	1373	19%	20%
7050	852	926	12%	13%	1320	1378	19%	20%
7100	855	929	12%	13%	1325	1382	19%	19%
7150	859	932	12%	13%	1331	1386	19%	19%
7200	862	935	12%	13%	1336	1390	19%	19%
7250	866	937	12%	13%	1341	1394	18%	19%
7300	870	940	12%	13%	1347	1398	18%	19%
7350	873	942	12%	13%	1352	1402	18%	19%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
7400	877	945	12%	13%	1358	1406	18%	19%
7450	880	947	12%	13%	1363	1410	18%	19%
7500	884	950	12%	13%	1368	1413	18%	19%
7550	887	952	12%	13%	1374	1417	18%	19%
7600	891	954	12%	13%	1379	1420	18%	19%
7650	895	957	12%	13%	1384	1424	18%	19%
7700	898	959	12%	12%	1390	1427	18%	19%
7750	902	961	12%	12%	1395	1431	18%	18%
7800	905	963	12%	12%	1400	1434	18%	18%
7850	908	965	12%	12%	1405	1437	18%	18%
7900	910	967	12%	12%	1409	1440	18%	18%
7950	913	969	11%	12%	1414	1443	18%	18%
8000	916	971	11%	12%	1418	1446	18%	18%
8050	918	972	11%	12%	1423	1449	18%	18%
8100	921	974	11%	12%	1428	1451	18%	18%
8150	924	976	11%	12%	1432	1454	18%	18%
8200	927	977	11%	12%	1437	1457	18%	18%
8250	929	979	11%	12%	1441	1459	17%	18%
8300	932	980	11%	12%	1446	1462	17%	18%
8350	935	982	11%	12%	1450	1464	17%	18%
8400	937	983	11%	12%	1455	1466	17%	17%
8450	940	985	11%	12%	1459	1468	17%	17%
8500	943	986	11%	12%	1464	1470	17%	17%
8550	945	992	11%	12%	1468	1479	17%	17%
8600	948	996	11%	12%	1473	1485	17%	17%
8650	951	1001	11%	12%	1478	1492	17%	17%
8700	954	1005	11%	12%	1482	1498	17%	17%
8750	956	1009	11%	12%	1487	1504	17%	17%
8800	959	1014	11%	12%	1491	1511	17%	17%
8850	962	1018	11%	12%	1496	1517	17%	17%
8900	964	1022	11%	11%	1500	1523	17%	17%
8950	967	1027	11%	11%	1505	1529	17%	17%
9000	970	1031	11%	11%	1509	1535	17%	17%
9050	973	1035	11%	11%	1514	1541	17%	17%
9100	975	1039	11%	11%	1517	1547	17%	17%
9150	977	1044	11%	11%	1521	1553	17%	17%
9200	979	1048	11%	11%	1524	1559	17%	17%
9250	982	1052	11%	11%	1527	1565	17%	17%
9300	984	1056	11%	11%	1531	1571	16%	17%
9350	986	1060	11%	11%	1534	1577	16%	17%
9400	988	1065	11%	11%	1537	1583	16%	17%
9450	990	1069	10%	11%	1541	1589	16%	17%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
9500	993	1073	10%	11%	1544	1595	16%	17%
9550	995	1077	10%	11%	1547	1601	16%	17%
9600	997	1081	10%	11%	1551	1607	16%	17%
9650	999	1085	10%	11%	1554	1612	16%	17%
9700	1001	1089	10%	11%	1557	1618	16%	17%
9750	1003	1093	10%	11%	1561	1624	16%	17%
9800	1006	1097	10%	11%	1564	1629	16%	17%
9850	1008	1101	10%	11%	1567	1635	16%	17%
9900	1010	1105	10%	11%	1571	1641	16%	17%
9950	1012	1109	10%	11%	1574	1646	16%	17%
10000	1014	1113	10%	11%	1577	1652	16%	17%
10050	1016	1117	10%	11%	1580	1657	16%	16%
10100	1017	1121	10%	11%	1582	1663	16%	16%
10150	1019	1125	10%	11%	1585	1669	16%	16%
10200	1020	1129	10%	11%	1587	1674	16%	16%
10250	1022	1133	10%	11%	1590	1679	16%	16%
10300	1023	1137	10%	11%	1592	1685	15%	16%
10350	1025	1140	10%	11%	1595	1690	15%	16%
10400	1026	1144	10%	11%	1597	1696	15%	16%
10450	1028	1148	10%	11%	1600	1701	15%	16%
10500	1030	1152	10%	11%	1603	1706	15%	16%
10550	1031	1156	10%	11%	1605	1712	15%	16%
10600	1033	1159	10%	11%	1608	1717	15%	16%
10650	1034	1163	10%	11%	1610	1722	15%	16%
10700	1036	1167	10%	11%	1613	1727	15%	16%
10750	1037	1171	10%	11%	1615	1732	15%	16%
10800	1039	1174	10%	11%	1618	1738	15%	16%
10850	1040	1178	10%	11%	1620	1743	15%	16%
10900	1042	1182	10%	11%	1623	1748	15%	16%
10950	1043	1185	10%	11%	1625	1753	15%	16%
11000	1045	1189	10%	11%	1628	1758	15%	16%
11050	1047	1193	9%	11%	1631	1763	15%	16%
11100	1048	1196	9%	11%	1633	1768	15%	16%
11150	1050	1200	9%	11%	1636	1773	15%	16%
11200	1051	1203	9%	11%	1638	1778	15%	16%
11250	1053	1207	9%	11%	1641	1783	15%	16%
11300	1054	1210	9%	11%	1643	1788	15%	16%
11350	1056	1214	9%	11%	1646	1792	15%	16%
11400	1057	1217	9%	11%	1648	1797	14%	16%
11450	1059	1221	9%	11%	1651	1802	14%	16%
11500	1061	1224	9%	11%	1654	1807	14%	16%
11550	1062	1228	9%	11%	1656	1812	14%	16%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
11600	1064	1231	9%	11%	1659	1816	14%	16%
11650	1065	1235	9%	11%	1661	1821	14%	16%
11700	1067	1238	9%	11%	1664	1826	14%	16%
11750	1068	1242	9%	11%	1666	1830	14%	16%
11800	1070	1245	9%	11%	1669	1835	14%	16%
11850	1071	1248	9%	11%	1671	1839	14%	16%
11900	1073	1252	9%	11%	1674	1844	14%	15%
11950	1074	1255	9%	11%	1676	1849	14%	15%
12000	1076	1258	9%	10%	1679	1853	14%	15%
12050	1078	1262	9%	10%	1682	1858	14%	15%
12100	1079	1265	9%	10%	1684	1862	14%	15%
12150	1081	1268	9%	10%	1687	1866	14%	15%
12200	1082	1271	9%	10%	1689	1871	14%	15%
12250	1084	1275	9%	10%	1692	1875	14%	15%
12300	1085	1278	9%	10%	1694	1880	14%	15%
12350	1087	1281	9%	10%	1697	1884	14%	15%
12400	1088	1284	9%	10%	1699	1888	14%	15%
12450	1090	1287	9%	10%	1702	1892	14%	15%
12500	1092	1290	9%	10%	1705	1897	14%	15%
12550	1093	1294	9%	10%	1707	1901	14%	15%
12600	1095	1297	9%	10%	1710	1905	14%	15%
12650	1096	1300	9%	10%	1712	1909	14%	15%
12700	1098	1303	9%	10%	1715	1913	14%	15%
12750	1099	1306	9%	10%	1717	1917	13%	15%
12800	1101	1309	9%	10%	1720	1921	13%	15%
12850	1102	1312	9%	10%	1722	1926	13%	15%
12900	1104	1315	9%	10%	1725	1930	13%	15%
12950	1105	1318	9%	10%	1727	1934	13%	15%
13000	1107	1321	9%	10%	1730	1937	13%	15%
13050	1109	1324	8%	10%	1733	1941	13%	15%
13100	1110	1327	8%	10%	1735	1945	13%	15%
13150	1112	1330	8%	10%	1738	1949	13%	15%
13200	1113	1333	8%	10%	1740	1953	13%	15%
13250	1115	1336	8%	10%	1743	1957	13%	15%
13300	1116	1339	8%	10%	1745	1961	13%	15%
13350	1118	1342	8%	10%	1748	1965	13%	15%
13400	1119	1344	8%	10%	1750	1968	13%	15%
13450	1121	1347	8%	10%	1753	1972	13%	15%
13500	1123	1350	8%	10%	1756	1976	13%	15%
13550	1124	1353	8%	10%	1758	1979	13%	15%
13600	1126	1356	8%	10%	1761	1983	13%	15%
13650	1127	1358	8%	10%	1763	1987	13%	15%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	One Child				Two Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
13700	1129	1361	8%	10%	1766	1990	13%	15%
13750	1130	1364	8%	10%	1768	1994	13%	15%
13800	1132	1367	8%	10%	1771	1997	13%	14%
13850	1133	1369	8%	10%	1773	2001	13%	14%
13900	1135	1372	8%	10%	1776	2004	13%	14%
13950	1136	1375	8%	10%	1778	2008	13%	14%
14000	1138	1377	8%	10%	1781	2011	13%	14%
14050	1140	1380	8%	10%	1784	2015	13%	14%
14100	1141	1383	8%	10%	1786	2018	13%	14%
14150	1143	1385	8%	10%	1789	2021	13%	14%
14200	1144	1388	8%	10%	1791	2025	13%	14%
14250	1146	1391	8%	10%	1794	2028	13%	14%
14300	1147	1393	8%	10%	1796	2031	13%	14%
14350	1149	1396	8%	10%	1799	2034	13%	14%
14400	1150	1398	8%	10%	1801	2038	13%	14%
14450	1152	1401	8%	10%	1804	2041	12%	14%
14500	1154	1403	8%	10%	1807	2044	12%	14%
14550	1155	1406	8%	10%	1809	2047	12%	14%
14600	1157	1408	8%	10%	1812	2050	12%	14%
14650	1158	1411	8%	10%	1814	2053	12%	14%
14700	1160	1413	8%	10%	1817	2056	12%	14%
14750	1161	1416	8%	10%	1819	2059	12%	14%
14800	1163	1418	8%	10%	1822	2062	12%	14%
14850	1164	1420	8%	10%	1824	2065	12%	14%
14900	1166	1423	8%	10%	1827	2068	12%	14%
14950	1167	1425	8%	10%	1829	2071	12%	14%
15000	1169	1427	8%	10%	1832	2074	12%	14%

**Table 13: Comparison of Schedules: Current and Proposed
(Three and Four Children)**

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
1200	436	85	36%	7%	465	96	39%	8%
1250	451	114	36%	9%	497	129	40%	10%
1300	467	143	36%	11%	526	161	40%	12%
1350	483	172	36%	13%	545	194	40%	14%
1400	499	201	36%	14%	563	227	40%	16%
1450	515	230	36%	16%	581	259	40%	18%
1500	533	259	36%	17%	602	292	40%	19%
1550	547	288	35%	19%	617	325	40%	21%
1600	560	317	35%	20%	632	357	40%	22%
1650	573	346	35%	21%	647	390	39%	24%
1700	587	375	35%	22%	662	423	39%	25%
1750	600	404	34%	23%	676	455	39%	26%
1800	612	433	34%	24%	690	488	38%	27%
1850	623	462	34%	25%	702	521	38%	28%
1900	634	491	33%	26%	714	554	38%	29%
1950	645	520	33%	27%	727	586	37%	30%
2000	655	549	33%	28%	739	619	37%	31%
2050	666	578	32%	28%	751	652	37%	32%
2100	677	607	32%	29%	763	684	36%	33%
2150	688	636	32%	30%	776	717	36%	33%
2200	699	665	32%	30%	788	750	36%	34%
2250	710	694	32%	31%	800	782	36%	35%
2300	721	723	31%	31%	812	815	35%	35%
2350	732	752	31%	32%	825	848	35%	36%
2400	743	781	31%	33%	837	880	35%	37%
2450	754	810	31%	33%	849	913	35%	37%
2500	765	839	31%	34%	862	946	34%	38%
2550	776	868	30%	34%	874	979	34%	38%
2600	787	897	30%	35%	886	1011	34%	39%
2650	797	926	30%	35%	897	1044	34%	39%
2700	806	955	30%	35%	908	1077	34%	40%
2750	816	972	30%	35%	919	1095	33%	40%
2800	826	986	30%	35%	930	1111	33%	40%
2850	836	1000	29%	35%	941	1127	33%	40%
2900	846	1014	29%	35%	953	1143	33%	39%
2950	856	1028	29%	35%	964	1159	33%	39%
3000	866	1042	29%	35%	975	1175	33%	39%
3050	876	1056	29%	35%	987	1190	32%	39%
3100	886	1069	29%	35%	998	1205	32%	39%
3150	896	1083	28%	34%	1010	1221	32%	39%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
3200	906	1096	28%	34%	1021	1236	32%	39%
3250	917	1109	28%	34%	1032	1250	32%	38%
3300	927	1122	28%	34%	1044	1265	32%	38%
3350	937	1135	28%	34%	1055	1280	31%	38%
3400	947	1148	28%	34%	1067	1294	31%	38%
3450	957	1161	28%	34%	1078	1309	31%	38%
3500	967	1173	28%	34%	1089	1323	31%	38%
3550	977	1186	28%	33%	1101	1337	31%	38%
3600	987	1195	27%	33%	1112	1347	31%	37%
3650	997	1204	27%	33%	1124	1358	31%	37%
3700	1009	1213	27%	33%	1137	1368	31%	37%
3750	1020	1222	27%	33%	1150	1377	31%	37%
3800	1032	1230	27%	32%	1163	1387	31%	37%
3850	1043	1239	27%	32%	1176	1396	31%	36%
3900	1055	1247	27%	32%	1189	1405	30%	36%
3950	1066	1255	27%	32%	1202	1414	30%	36%
4000	1078	1262	27%	32%	1214	1423	30%	36%
4050	1089	1270	27%	31%	1227	1431	30%	35%
4100	1101	1277	27%	31%	1240	1440	30%	35%
4150	1112	1284	27%	31%	1253	1448	30%	35%
4200	1124	1291	27%	31%	1266	1455	30%	35%
4250	1135	1298	27%	31%	1279	1463	30%	34%
4300	1147	1304	27%	30%	1292	1470	30%	34%
4350	1158	1310	27%	30%	1305	1477	30%	34%
4400	1170	1316	27%	30%	1318	1484	30%	34%
4450	1181	1322	27%	30%	1331	1491	30%	34%
4500	1193	1328	27%	30%	1344	1497	30%	33%
4550	1204	1333	26%	29%	1357	1503	30%	33%
4600	1216	1344	26%	29%	1370	1515	30%	33%
4650	1227	1354	26%	29%	1383	1526	30%	33%
4700	1237	1364	26%	29%	1395	1538	30%	33%
4750	1247	1374	26%	29%	1406	1549	30%	33%
4800	1257	1384	26%	29%	1417	1561	30%	33%
4850	1267	1394	26%	29%	1428	1572	29%	32%
4900	1277	1404	26%	29%	1439	1583	29%	32%
4950	1286	1414	26%	29%	1450	1594	29%	32%
5000	1295	1423	26%	28%	1460	1605	29%	32%
5050	1305	1433	26%	28%	1471	1616	29%	32%
5100	1314	1442	26%	28%	1481	1626	29%	32%
5150	1323	1452	26%	28%	1492	1637	29%	32%
5200	1333	1461	26%	28%	1502	1647	29%	32%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
5250	1342	1470	26%	28%	1513	1658	29%	32%
5300	1351	1479	25%	28%	1524	1668	29%	31%
5350	1361	1488	25%	28%	1534	1678	29%	31%
5400	1370	1497	25%	28%	1545	1688	29%	31%
5450	1379	1506	25%	28%	1555	1698	29%	31%
5500	1389	1515	25%	28%	1566	1708	28%	31%
5550	1398	1524	25%	27%	1576	1718	28%	31%
5600	1407	1532	25%	27%	1587	1727	28%	31%
5650	1417	1541	25%	27%	1598	1737	28%	31%
5700	1426	1549	25%	27%	1608	1746	28%	31%
5750	1435	1557	25%	27%	1619	1756	28%	31%
5800	1445	1565	25%	27%	1629	1765	28%	30%
5850	1454	1574	25%	27%	1640	1774	28%	30%
5900	1463	1581	25%	27%	1650	1783	28%	30%
5950	1473	1589	25%	27%	1661	1792	28%	30%
6000	1482	1597	25%	27%	1672	1801	28%	30%
6050	1491	1605	25%	27%	1682	1809	28%	30%
6100	1501	1613	25%	26%	1693	1818	28%	30%
6150	1510	1620	25%	26%	1703	1826	28%	30%
6200	1519	1628	25%	26%	1714	1835	28%	30%
6250	1529	1635	24%	26%	1724	1843	28%	29%
6300	1538	1642	24%	26%	1735	1851	28%	29%
6350	1547	1649	24%	26%	1745	1859	27%	29%
6400	1557	1656	24%	26%	1756	1867	27%	29%
6450	1566	1663	24%	26%	1767	1875	27%	29%
6500	1575	1670	24%	26%	1777	1883	27%	29%
6550	1583	1677	24%	26%	1786	1891	27%	29%
6600	1590	1684	24%	26%	1794	1898	27%	29%
6650	1597	1690	24%	25%	1801	1906	27%	29%
6700	1604	1697	24%	25%	1809	1913	27%	29%
6750	1610	1703	24%	25%	1817	1920	27%	28%
6800	1617	1710	24%	25%	1824	1927	27%	28%
6850	1624	1716	24%	25%	1832	1934	27%	28%
6900	1631	1722	24%	25%	1839	1941	27%	28%
6950	1637	1728	24%	25%	1847	1948	27%	28%
7000	1644	1734	23%	25%	1855	1955	27%	28%
7050	1651	1740	23%	25%	1862	1962	26%	28%
7100	1658	1746	23%	25%	1870	1968	26%	28%
7150	1665	1751	23%	24%	1878	1975	26%	28%
7200	1671	1757	23%	24%	1885	1981	26%	28%
7250	1678	1762	23%	24%	1893	1987	26%	27%
7300	1685	1768	23%	24%	1900	1993	26%	27%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
7350	1692	1773	23%	24%	1908	1999	26%	27%
7400	1698	1778	23%	24%	1916	2005	26%	27%
7450	1705	1784	23%	24%	1923	2011	26%	27%
7500	1712	1789	23%	24%	1931	2016	26%	27%
7550	1719	1794	23%	24%	1938	2022	26%	27%
7600	1725	1798	23%	24%	1946	2028	26%	27%
7650	1732	1803	23%	24%	1954	2033	26%	27%
7700	1739	1808	23%	23%	1961	2038	25%	26%
7750	1746	1812	23%	23%	1969	2043	25%	26%
7800	1753	1817	22%	23%	1977	2048	25%	26%
7850	1758	1821	22%	23%	1983	2053	25%	26%
7900	1764	1826	22%	23%	1989	2058	25%	26%
7950	1770	1830	22%	23%	1995	2063	25%	26%
8000	1776	1834	22%	23%	2001	2068	25%	26%
8050	1781	1838	22%	23%	2007	2072	25%	26%
8100	1787	1842	22%	23%	2014	2077	25%	26%
8150	1793	1846	22%	23%	2020	2081	25%	26%
8200	1799	1849	22%	23%	2026	2085	25%	25%
8250	1804	1853	22%	22%	2032	2089	25%	25%
8300	1810	1857	22%	22%	2038	2093	25%	25%
8350	1816	1860	22%	22%	2045	2097	24%	25%
8400	1822	1864	22%	22%	2051	2101	24%	25%
8450	1827	1867	22%	22%	2057	2105	24%	25%
8500	1833	1870	22%	22%	2063	2108	24%	25%
8550	1839	1878	22%	22%	2069	2117	24%	25%
8600	1845	1886	21%	22%	2076	2126	24%	25%
8650	1850	1893	21%	22%	2082	2134	24%	25%
8700	1856	1901	21%	22%	2088	2143	24%	25%
8750	1862	1909	21%	22%	2094	2152	24%	25%
8800	1868	1916	21%	22%	2100	2160	24%	25%
8850	1873	1924	21%	22%	2107	2169	24%	25%
8900	1879	1931	21%	22%	2113	2177	24%	24%
8950	1885	1939	21%	22%	2119	2186	24%	24%
9000	1891	1946	21%	22%	2125	2194	24%	24%
9050	1896	1953	21%	22%	2131	2202	24%	24%
9100	1901	1961	21%	22%	2137	2211	23%	24%
9150	1905	1968	21%	22%	2141	2219	23%	24%
9200	1909	1975	21%	21%	2146	2227	23%	24%
9250	1914	1983	21%	21%	2151	2235	23%	24%
9300	1918	1990	21%	21%	2156	2243	23%	24%
9350	1922	1997	21%	21%	2160	2252	23%	24%
9400	1926	2004	20%	21%	2165	2260	23%	24%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
9450	1930	2011	20%	21%	2170	2268	23%	24%
9500	1935	2018	20%	21%	2175	2276	23%	24%
9550	1939	2025	20%	21%	2179	2283	23%	24%
9600	1943	2032	20%	21%	2184	2291	23%	24%
9650	1947	2039	20%	21%	2189	2299	23%	24%
9700	1951	2046	20%	21%	2194	2307	23%	24%
9750	1956	2053	20%	21%	2198	2315	23%	24%
9800	1960	2060	20%	21%	2203	2322	22%	24%
9850	1964	2067	20%	21%	2208	2330	22%	24%
9900	1968	2074	20%	21%	2213	2338	22%	24%
9950	1972	2080	20%	21%	2218	2345	22%	24%
10000	1977	2087	20%	21%	2222	2353	22%	24%
10050	1980	2094	20%	21%	2226	2360	22%	23%
10100	1984	2100	20%	21%	2230	2368	22%	23%
10150	1987	2107	20%	21%	2234	2375	22%	23%
10200	1991	2113	20%	21%	2238	2383	22%	23%
10250	1994	2120	19%	21%	2242	2390	22%	23%
10300	1997	2126	19%	21%	2245	2397	22%	23%
10350	2001	2133	19%	21%	2249	2404	22%	23%
10400	2004	2139	19%	21%	2253	2412	22%	23%
10450	2008	2145	19%	21%	2257	2419	22%	23%
10500	2011	2152	19%	20%	2261	2426	22%	23%
10550	2014	2158	19%	20%	2265	2433	21%	23%
10600	2018	2164	19%	20%	2269	2440	21%	23%
10650	2021	2170	19%	20%	2273	2447	21%	23%
10700	2025	2177	19%	20%	2277	2454	21%	23%
10750	2028	2183	19%	20%	2281	2461	21%	23%
10800	2031	2189	19%	20%	2284	2468	21%	23%
10850	2035	2195	19%	20%	2288	2474	21%	23%
10900	2038	2201	19%	20%	2292	2481	21%	23%
10950	2042	2207	19%	20%	2296	2488	21%	23%
11000	2045	2213	19%	20%	2300	2495	21%	23%
11050	2048	2219	19%	20%	2304	2501	21%	23%
11100	2052	2224	18%	20%	2308	2508	21%	23%
11150	2055	2230	18%	20%	2312	2514	21%	23%
11200	2059	2236	18%	20%	2316	2521	21%	23%
11250	2062	2242	18%	20%	2320	2527	21%	22%
11300	2065	2247	18%	20%	2323	2534	21%	22%
11350	2069	2253	18%	20%	2327	2540	21%	22%
11400	2072	2259	18%	20%	2331	2547	20%	22%
11450	2076	2264	18%	20%	2335	2553	20%	22%
11500	2079	2270	18%	20%	2339	2559	20%	22%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
11550	2082	2275	18%	20%	2343	2565	20%	22%
11600	2086	2281	18%	20%	2347	2572	20%	22%
11650	2089	2286	18%	20%	2351	2578	20%	22%
11700	2093	2292	18%	20%	2355	2584	20%	22%
11750	2096	2297	18%	20%	2359	2590	20%	22%
11800	2099	2302	18%	20%	2362	2596	20%	22%
11850	2103	2308	18%	19%	2366	2602	20%	22%
11900	2106	2313	18%	19%	2370	2608	20%	22%
11950	2110	2318	18%	19%	2374	2614	20%	22%
12000	2113	2323	18%	19%	2378	2619	20%	22%
12050	2116	2329	18%	19%	2382	2625	20%	22%
12100	2120	2334	18%	19%	2386	2631	20%	22%
12150	2123	2339	17%	19%	2390	2637	20%	22%
12200	2127	2344	17%	19%	2394	2642	20%	22%
12250	2130	2349	17%	19%	2398	2648	20%	22%
12300	2133	2354	17%	19%	2401	2654	20%	22%
12350	2137	2359	17%	19%	2405	2659	19%	22%
12400	2140	2363	17%	19%	2409	2665	19%	21%
12450	2144	2368	17%	19%	2413	2670	19%	21%
12500	2147	2373	17%	19%	2417	2675	19%	21%
12550	2150	2378	17%	19%	2421	2681	19%	21%
12600	2154	2383	17%	19%	2425	2686	19%	21%
12650	2157	2387	17%	19%	2429	2691	19%	21%
12700	2161	2392	17%	19%	2433	2697	19%	21%
12750	2164	2397	17%	19%	2437	2702	19%	21%
12800	2167	2401	17%	19%	2440	2707	19%	21%
12850	2171	2406	17%	19%	2444	2712	19%	21%
12900	2174	2410	17%	19%	2448	2717	19%	21%
12950	2178	2415	17%	19%	2452	2722	19%	21%
13000	2181	2419	17%	19%	2456	2727	19%	21%
13050	2184	2423	17%	19%	2460	2732	19%	21%
13100	2188	2428	17%	19%	2464	2737	19%	21%
13150	2191	2432	17%	18%	2468	2742	19%	21%
13200	2195	2436	17%	18%	2472	2747	19%	21%
13250	2198	2441	17%	18%	2476	2751	19%	21%
13300	2201	2445	17%	18%	2479	2756	19%	21%
13350	2205	2449	17%	18%	2483	2761	19%	21%
13400	2208	2453	16%	18%	2487	2766	19%	21%
13450	2212	2457	16%	18%	2491	2770	19%	21%
13500	2215	2461	16%	18%	2495	2775	18%	21%
13550	2218	2465	16%	18%	2499	2779	18%	21%
13600	2222	2469	16%	18%	2503	2784	18%	20%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Three Children				Four Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
13650	2225	2473	16%	18%	2507	2788	18%	20%
13700	2229	2477	16%	18%	2511	2793	18%	20%
13750	2232	2481	16%	18%	2515	2797	18%	20%
13800	2235	2485	16%	18%	2518	2801	18%	20%
13850	2239	2488	16%	18%	2522	2805	18%	20%
13900	2242	2492	16%	18%	2526	2810	18%	20%
13950	2246	2496	16%	18%	2530	2814	18%	20%
14000	2249	2500	16%	18%	2534	2818	18%	20%
14050	2252	2503	16%	18%	2538	2822	18%	20%
14100	2256	2507	16%	18%	2542	2826	18%	20%
14150	2259	2510	16%	18%	2546	2830	18%	20%
14200	2263	2514	16%	18%	2550	2834	18%	20%
14250	2266	2517	16%	18%	2554	2838	18%	20%
14300	2269	2521	16%	18%	2557	2842	18%	20%
14350	2273	2524	16%	18%	2561	2846	18%	20%
14400	2276	2528	16%	18%	2565	2850	18%	20%
14450	2280	2531	16%	18%	2569	2853	18%	20%
14500	2283	2534	16%	17%	2573	2857	18%	20%
14550	2286	2537	16%	17%	2577	2861	18%	20%
14600	2290	2541	16%	17%	2581	2864	18%	20%
14650	2293	2544	16%	17%	2585	2868	18%	20%
14700	2297	2547	16%	17%	2589	2871	18%	20%
14750	2300	2550	16%	17%	2593	2875	18%	19%
14800	2303	2553	16%	17%	2596	2878	18%	19%
14850	2307	2556	16%	17%	2600	2882	18%	19%
14900	2310	2559	16%	17%	2604	2885	17%	19%
14950	2314	2562	15%	17%	2608	2888	17%	19%
15000	2317	2565	15%	17%	2612	2892	17%	19%

**Table 14: Comparison of Schedules: Current and Proposed
(Five and Six Children)**

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
1200	470	104	39%	9%	475	112	40%	9%
1250	502	140	40%	11%	507	150	41%	12%
1300	536	176	41%	14%	542	188	42%	14%
1350	570	211	42%	16%	576	226	43%	17%
1400	605	247	43%	18%	611	264	44%	19%
1450	633	283	44%	19%	645	302	44%	21%
1500	656	318	44%	21%	680	340	45%	23%
1550	672	354	43%	23%	714	378	46%	24%
1600	689	390	43%	24%	737	417	46%	26%
1650	705	425	43%	26%	754	455	46%	28%
1700	721	461	42%	27%	772	493	45%	29%
1750	738	497	42%	28%	789	531	45%	30%
1800	752	532	42%	30%	805	569	45%	32%
1850	766	568	41%	31%	819	607	44%	33%
1900	779	604	41%	32%	834	645	44%	34%
1950	793	639	41%	33%	848	683	43%	35%
2000	806	675	40%	34%	862	721	43%	36%
2050	819	711	40%	35%	877	760	43%	37%
2100	833	746	40%	36%	891	798	42%	38%
2150	846	782	39%	36%	905	836	42%	39%
2200	860	817	39%	37%	920	874	42%	40%
2250	873	853	39%	38%	934	912	42%	41%
2300	886	889	39%	39%	948	950	41%	41%
2350	900	924	38%	39%	963	988	41%	42%
2400	913	960	38%	40%	977	1026	41%	43%
2450	927	996	38%	41%	991	1065	40%	43%
2500	940	1031	38%	41%	1006	1103	40%	44%
2550	954	1067	37%	42%	1020	1141	40%	45%
2600	967	1103	37%	43%	1034	1179	40%	45%
2650	979	1138	37%	43%	1048	1217	40%	46%
2700	991	1174	37%	43%	1060	1255	39%	46%
2750	1003	1194	36%	43%	1073	1277	39%	46%
2800	1015	1212	36%	43%	1085	1296	39%	46%
2850	1027	1229	36%	43%	1098	1314	39%	46%
2900	1039	1247	36%	43%	1112	1333	38%	46%
2950	1052	1264	36%	43%	1125	1351	38%	46%
3000	1064	1281	35%	43%	1138	1369	38%	46%
3050	1076	1298	35%	43%	1152	1387	38%	45%
3100	1089	1314	35%	42%	1165	1405	38%	45%
3150	1101	1331	35%	42%	1178	1423	37%	45%
3200	1114	1347	35%	42%	1191	1440	37%	45%
3250	1126	1364	35%	42%	1205	1458	37%	45%
3300	1139	1380	35%	42%	1218	1475	37%	45%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
3350	1151	1396	34%	42%	1231	1492	37%	45%
3400	1164	1411	34%	42%	1245	1509	37%	44%
3450	1176	1427	34%	41%	1258	1526	36%	44%
3500	1189	1443	34%	41%	1271	1542	36%	44%
3550	1201	1458	34%	41%	1285	1559	36%	44%
3600	1213	1469	34%	41%	1298	1570	36%	44%
3650	1226	1480	34%	41%	1311	1582	36%	43%
3700	1240	1491	34%	40%	1326	1594	36%	43%
3750	1254	1502	33%	40%	1342	1606	36%	43%
3800	1268	1512	33%	40%	1357	1617	36%	43%
3850	1283	1523	33%	40%	1372	1628	36%	42%
3900	1297	1532	33%	39%	1387	1638	36%	42%
3950	1311	1542	33%	39%	1402	1649	35%	42%
4000	1325	1552	33%	39%	1417	1659	35%	41%
4050	1339	1561	33%	39%	1432	1669	35%	41%
4100	1353	1570	33%	38%	1448	1678	35%	41%
4150	1367	1578	33%	38%	1463	1687	35%	41%
4200	1382	1587	33%	38%	1478	1696	35%	40%
4250	1396	1595	33%	38%	1493	1705	35%	40%
4300	1410	1603	33%	37%	1508	1714	35%	40%
4350	1424	1611	33%	37%	1523	1722	35%	40%
4400	1438	1618	33%	37%	1538	1730	35%	39%
4450	1452	1625	33%	37%	1553	1737	35%	39%
4500	1467	1632	33%	36%	1569	1745	35%	39%
4550	1481	1639	33%	36%	1584	1752	35%	39%
4600	1495	1652	33%	36%	1599	1766	35%	38%
4650	1509	1664	32%	36%	1614	1779	35%	38%
4700	1522	1677	32%	36%	1627	1793	35%	38%
4750	1534	1689	32%	36%	1641	1806	35%	38%
4800	1546	1702	32%	35%	1654	1819	34%	38%
4850	1558	1714	32%	35%	1667	1832	34%	38%
4900	1570	1726	32%	35%	1679	1845	34%	38%
4950	1582	1738	32%	35%	1692	1858	34%	38%
5000	1593	1750	32%	35%	1704	1871	34%	37%
5050	1605	1762	32%	35%	1716	1883	34%	37%
5100	1616	1773	32%	35%	1728	1896	34%	37%
5150	1628	1785	32%	35%	1741	1908	34%	37%
5200	1640	1796	32%	35%	1753	1920	34%	37%
5250	1651	1807	31%	34%	1765	1932	34%	37%
5300	1663	1819	31%	34%	1778	1944	34%	37%
5350	1674	1830	31%	34%	1790	1956	33%	37%
5400	1686	1841	31%	34%	1802	1968	33%	36%
5450	1697	1852	31%	34%	1815	1979	33%	36%
5500	1709	1862	31%	34%	1827	1991	33%	36%
5550	1720	1873	31%	34%	1839	2002	33%	36%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
5600	1732	1883	31%	34%	1851	2014	33%	36%
5650	1743	1894	31%	34%	1864	2025	33%	36%
5700	1755	1904	31%	33%	1876	2036	33%	36%
5750	1766	1914	31%	33%	1888	2047	33%	36%
5800	1778	1924	31%	33%	1901	2057	33%	35%
5850	1790	1934	31%	33%	1913	2068	33%	35%
5900	1801	1944	31%	33%	1925	2078	33%	35%
5950	1813	1954	30%	33%	1937	2089	33%	35%
6000	1824	1963	30%	33%	1950	2099	33%	35%
6050	1836	1973	30%	33%	1962	2109	32%	35%
6100	1847	1982	30%	32%	1974	2119	32%	35%
6150	1859	1992	30%	32%	1987	2129	32%	35%
6200	1870	2001	30%	32%	1999	2139	32%	35%
6250	1882	2010	30%	32%	2011	2149	32%	34%
6300	1893	2019	30%	32%	2023	2158	32%	34%
6350	1905	2027	30%	32%	2036	2168	32%	34%
6400	1916	2036	30%	32%	2048	2177	32%	34%
6450	1928	2045	30%	32%	2060	2186	32%	34%
6500	1940	2053	30%	32%	2073	2195	32%	34%
6550	1949	2062	30%	31%	2083	2204	32%	34%
6600	1957	2070	30%	31%	2092	2213	32%	34%
6650	1965	2078	30%	31%	2100	2221	32%	33%
6700	1974	2086	29%	31%	2109	2230	31%	33%
6750	1982	2094	29%	31%	2118	2238	31%	33%
6800	1990	2102	29%	31%	2127	2247	31%	33%
6850	1999	2109	29%	31%	2136	2255	31%	33%
6900	2007	2117	29%	31%	2145	2263	31%	33%
6950	2016	2124	29%	31%	2154	2271	31%	33%
7000	2024	2132	29%	30%	2163	2279	31%	33%
7050	2032	2139	29%	30%	2172	2287	31%	32%
7100	2041	2146	29%	30%	2181	2294	31%	32%
7150	2049	2153	29%	30%	2190	2302	31%	32%
7200	2057	2160	29%	30%	2199	2309	31%	32%
7250	2066	2167	28%	30%	2207	2316	30%	32%
7300	2074	2173	28%	30%	2216	2323	30%	32%
7350	2082	2180	28%	30%	2225	2330	30%	32%
7400	2091	2186	28%	30%	2234	2337	30%	32%
7450	2099	2193	28%	29%	2243	2344	30%	31%
7500	2108	2199	28%	29%	2252	2351	30%	31%
7550	2116	2205	28%	29%	2261	2357	30%	31%
7600	2124	2211	28%	29%	2270	2363	30%	31%
7650	2133	2217	28%	29%	2279	2370	30%	31%
7700	2141	2222	28%	29%	2288	2376	30%	31%
7750	2149	2228	28%	29%	2297	2382	30%	31%
7800	2158	2234	28%	29%	2305	2388	30%	31%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
7850	2164	2239	28%	29%	2313	2394	29%	30%
7900	2171	2244	27%	28%	2320	2399	29%	30%
7950	2178	2249	27%	28%	2328	2405	29%	30%
8000	2185	2254	27%	28%	2335	2410	29%	30%
8050	2192	2259	27%	28%	2343	2415	29%	30%
8100	2198	2264	27%	28%	2350	2421	29%	30%
8150	2205	2269	27%	28%	2357	2426	29%	30%
8200	2212	2274	27%	28%	2365	2431	29%	30%
8250	2219	2278	27%	28%	2372	2435	29%	30%
8300	2226	2282	27%	27%	2380	2440	29%	29%
8350	2232	2287	27%	27%	2387	2445	29%	29%
8400	2239	2291	27%	27%	2395	2449	29%	29%
8450	2246	2295	27%	27%	2402	2453	28%	29%
8500	2253	2299	27%	27%	2410	2458	28%	29%
8550	2260	2308	26%	27%	2417	2468	28%	29%
8600	2266	2318	26%	27%	2425	2478	28%	29%
8650	2273	2327	26%	27%	2432	2488	28%	29%
8700	2280	2337	26%	27%	2440	2498	28%	29%
8750	2287	2346	26%	27%	2447	2508	28%	29%
8800	2294	2355	26%	27%	2455	2518	28%	29%
8850	2300	2365	26%	27%	2462	2528	28%	29%
8900	2307	2374	26%	27%	2470	2538	28%	29%
8950	2314	2383	26%	27%	2477	2548	28%	28%
9000	2321	2392	26%	27%	2484	2558	28%	28%
9050	2328	2401	26%	27%	2492	2567	28%	28%
9100	2334	2410	26%	26%	2498	2577	27%	28%
9150	2339	2419	26%	26%	2503	2587	27%	28%
9200	2344	2428	25%	26%	2509	2596	27%	28%
9250	2349	2437	25%	26%	2514	2606	27%	28%
9300	2354	2446	25%	26%	2520	2615	27%	28%
9350	2359	2455	25%	26%	2525	2625	27%	28%
9400	2365	2464	25%	26%	2531	2634	27%	28%
9450	2370	2473	25%	26%	2536	2643	27%	28%
9500	2375	2481	25%	26%	2541	2653	27%	28%
9550	2380	2490	25%	26%	2547	2662	27%	28%
9600	2385	2498	25%	26%	2552	2671	27%	28%
9650	2390	2507	25%	26%	2558	2680	27%	28%
9700	2396	2515	25%	26%	2563	2689	26%	28%
9750	2401	2524	25%	26%	2569	2698	26%	28%
9800	2406	2532	25%	26%	2574	2707	26%	28%
9850	2411	2541	24%	26%	2580	2716	26%	28%
9900	2416	2549	24%	26%	2585	2725	26%	28%
9950	2421	2557	24%	26%	2590	2734	26%	27%
10000	2427	2565	24%	26%	2596	2743	26%	27%
10050	2431	2574	24%	26%	2601	2751	26%	27%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
10100	2436	2582	24%	26%	2606	2760	26%	27%
10150	2440	2590	24%	26%	2610	2769	26%	27%
10200	2445	2598	24%	25%	2615	2777	26%	27%
10250	2449	2606	24%	25%	2620	2786	26%	27%
10300	2453	2614	24%	25%	2625	2794	25%	27%
10350	2458	2622	24%	25%	2629	2803	25%	27%
10400	2462	2630	24%	25%	2634	2811	25%	27%
10450	2467	2637	24%	25%	2639	2819	25%	27%
10500	2471	2645	24%	25%	2644	2828	25%	27%
10550	2475	2653	23%	25%	2648	2836	25%	27%
10600	2480	2660	23%	25%	2653	2844	25%	27%
10650	2484	2668	23%	25%	2658	2852	25%	27%
10700	2489	2676	23%	25%	2663	2860	25%	27%
10750	2493	2683	23%	25%	2667	2868	25%	27%
10800	2497	2691	23%	25%	2672	2876	25%	27%
10850	2502	2698	23%	25%	2677	2884	25%	27%
10900	2506	2705	23%	25%	2682	2892	25%	27%
10950	2511	2713	23%	25%	2686	2900	25%	26%
11000	2515	2720	23%	25%	2691	2908	24%	26%
11050	2519	2727	23%	25%	2696	2916	24%	26%
11100	2524	2735	23%	25%	2701	2923	24%	26%
11150	2528	2742	23%	25%	2705	2931	24%	26%
11200	2533	2749	23%	25%	2710	2939	24%	26%
11250	2537	2756	23%	24%	2715	2946	24%	26%
11300	2541	2763	22%	24%	2720	2954	24%	26%
11350	2546	2770	22%	24%	2724	2961	24%	26%
11400	2550	2777	22%	24%	2729	2968	24%	26%
11450	2555	2784	22%	24%	2734	2976	24%	26%
11500	2559	2790	22%	24%	2739	2983	24%	26%
11550	2563	2797	22%	24%	2743	2990	24%	26%
11600	2568	2804	22%	24%	2748	2998	24%	26%
11650	2572	2811	22%	24%	2753	3005	24%	26%
11700	2577	2817	22%	24%	2758	3012	24%	26%
11750	2581	2824	22%	24%	2762	3019	24%	26%
11800	2585	2830	22%	24%	2767	3026	23%	26%
11850	2590	2837	22%	24%	2772	3033	23%	26%
11900	2594	2843	22%	24%	2777	3040	23%	26%
11950	2599	2850	22%	24%	2781	3047	23%	25%
12000	2603	2856	22%	24%	2786	3053	23%	25%
12050	2607	2862	22%	24%	2791	3060	23%	25%
12100	2612	2869	22%	24%	2796	3067	23%	25%
12150	2616	2875	22%	24%	2800	3074	23%	25%
12200	2621	2881	21%	24%	2805	3080	23%	25%
12250	2625	2887	21%	24%	2810	3087	23%	25%
12300	2629	2893	21%	24%	2815	3093	23%	25%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
12350	2634	2899	21%	23%	2819	3100	23%	25%
12400	2638	2905	21%	23%	2824	3106	23%	25%
12450	2643	2911	21%	23%	2829	3112	23%	25%
12500	2647	2917	21%	23%	2834	3119	23%	25%
12550	2651	2923	21%	23%	2838	3125	23%	25%
12600	2656	2929	21%	23%	2843	3131	23%	25%
12650	2660	2935	21%	23%	2848	3137	23%	25%
12700	2665	2940	21%	23%	2853	3143	22%	25%
12750	2669	2946	21%	23%	2857	3149	22%	25%
12800	2673	2952	21%	23%	2862	3156	22%	25%
12850	2678	2957	21%	23%	2867	3161	22%	25%
12900	2682	2963	21%	23%	2872	3167	22%	25%
12950	2687	2968	21%	23%	2876	3173	22%	25%
13000	2691	2974	21%	23%	2881	3179	22%	24%
13050	2695	2979	21%	23%	2886	3185	22%	24%
13100	2700	2984	21%	23%	2891	3191	22%	24%
13150	2704	2990	21%	23%	2895	3196	22%	24%
13200	2709	2995	21%	23%	2900	3202	22%	24%
13250	2713	3000	20%	23%	2905	3207	22%	24%
13300	2717	3005	20%	23%	2910	3213	22%	24%
13350	2722	3010	20%	23%	2914	3218	22%	24%
13400	2726	3016	20%	23%	2919	3224	22%	24%
13450	2731	3021	20%	22%	2924	3229	22%	24%
13500	2735	3025	20%	22%	2929	3234	22%	24%
13550	2739	3030	20%	22%	2933	3240	22%	24%
13600	2744	3035	20%	22%	2938	3245	22%	24%
13650	2748	3040	20%	22%	2943	3250	22%	24%
13700	2753	3045	20%	22%	2948	3255	22%	24%
13750	2757	3050	20%	22%	2952	3260	21%	24%
13800	2761	3054	20%	22%	2957	3265	21%	24%
13850	2766	3059	20%	22%	2962	3270	21%	24%
13900	2770	3064	20%	22%	2967	3275	21%	24%
13950	2775	3068	20%	22%	2971	3280	21%	24%
14000	2779	3073	20%	22%	2976	3285	21%	23%
14050	2783	3077	20%	22%	2981	3290	21%	23%
14100	2788	3082	20%	22%	2986	3294	21%	23%
14150	2792	3086	20%	22%	2990	3299	21%	23%
14200	2797	3090	20%	22%	2995	3304	21%	23%
14250	2801	3095	20%	22%	3000	3308	21%	23%
14300	2805	3099	20%	22%	3005	3313	21%	23%
14350	2810	3103	20%	22%	3009	3317	21%	23%
14400	2814	3107	20%	22%	3014	3322	21%	23%
14450	2819	3111	20%	22%	3019	3326	21%	23%
14500	2823	3115	19%	21%	3024	3330	21%	23%
14550	2827	3119	19%	21%	3028	3335	21%	23%

Combined Gross Monthly Income	Five Children				Six Children			
	Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income		Schedules		Share of Combined Gross Monthly Income	
	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed
14600	2832	3123	19%	21%	3033	3339	21%	23%
14650	2836	3127	19%	21%	3038	3343	21%	23%
14700	2841	3131	19%	21%	3043	3347	21%	23%
14750	2845	3135	19%	21%	3047	3351	21%	23%
14800	2849	3139	19%	21%	3052	3355	21%	23%
14850	2854	3142	19%	21%	3057	3359	21%	23%
14900	2858	3146	19%	21%	3062	3363	21%	23%
14950	2863	3150	19%	21%	3066	3367	21%	23%
15000	2867	3153	19%	21%	3071	3371	20%	22%

APPENDIX SUMMARY OF KEY ASSUMPTIONS

The design of the Schedule of Basic Child Support Obligations is based on a number of key economic decisions and assumptions that are documented throughout the text of the report and the technical appendix. This Appendix highlights the design assumptions that may be the most significant for application of the guidelines to individual cases.

(1) The Guidelines are based on gross income. These guidelines are designed to provide child support as a specified proportion of an obligor's gross monthly income. The tables are in gross income for three reasons:

- Use of gross income simplifies the use of the child support guidelines because it obviates the need for a complex gross to net calculation in individual cases;
- Use of gross income can be more equitable because it avoids non-comparable deductions; and
- Use of gross income does not cause child support to be increased when an obligor acquires additional dependents, claims more exemptions, and therefore has a higher net income for a given level of gross income.

(2) Incorporated into the Schedule is a “self-support reserve” for obligors. This concept allows low-income obligors to retain enough income after payment of taxes and child support to maintain at a least a subsistence level of living (i.e., the self-support reserve.)

(3) The Schedule does not include expenditures on child care, extraordinary medical, and children's share of health insurance costs. The Schedule is based on economic data that represent estimates of total expenditures on child-rearing costs up to age 18. The major categories of expenditures include food, housing, home furnishings, utilities, transportation, clothing, education, and recreation. Excluded from these figures are average expenditures for child care, children's extraordinary medical care, and the children's share of health insurance. These costs are deducted from the base amounts used to establish the Schedule because they are added to child support obligations as actually incurred in individual cases. Deducting these expenditures from the base amounts avoids double-counting them in the child support calculation.

(4) The Schedule includes expenditures on ordinary medical care. Although expenditures for the children's extraordinary medical care and the children's share of health insurance are to be added to the child support obligation as actually incurred in individual cases, it is assumed that parents will make some expenditures on behalf of the children's ordinary (i.e., out-of-pocket expenses not covered by insurance) medical care. The Schedule amounts in this report are based on the assumption that expenditures on ordinary medical care are \$250 per year per child.

(5) The Schedule is based on modified versions of JLARC's Average Use in Vehicles approach for one and two children and their Per Capita approach for three children. Detailed discussion of these approaches can be found in “Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children.” Child expenditures for households with four, five, and six children are constructed by multiplying the

obligations of households with three children by 1.1274, 1.2293, and 1.3142. These factors are used in the current schedule.

(6) A “separate household discount” is provided. The discount has two purposes. The first is to reserve income for an obligor to spend directly on their children during parenting time. The rationale for doing this is based on expenditures that might occur during the non-custodial parent’s 60 to 90 days of visitation. The second is to provide non-custodial parents with income to cover the “fixed cost” of operating a second household. Fixed cost is defined as expenditures on shelter, household equipment and fixed transportation (net outlays on new and used cars and trucks, vehicle insurance and vehicle finance charges).

(7) Gross monthly income excludes Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). This maintains consistency with the State’s practice of excluding these components of income.

EXHIBIT C

William McKinley Rodgers III

Biographical Sketch

William Rodgers is the Frances L. and Edwin L. Cummings Associate Professor of Economics at the College of William and Mary and a member of the Wilkins Forum at the University of Minnesota's Humphrey Institute. His research focuses on general issues in labor economics and the economics of social problems. His work examines a variety of topics including the relationship between racial earnings gaps and market-wide earnings inequality; gender inequality; the economics of education; affirmative action; and the evaluation of the impact of labor market policies. He is the author of numerous articles in scholarly journals and edited volumes on these topics.

Rodgers' recent research explores the impact that the 1990's economic expansion has had on the earnings and employment of Americans. Currently, he is examining the impact that increases in the federal minimum wage have on the food security of American families.

Professor Rodgers has been an Associate Editor for the *Southern Economic Journal* for two years and co-edited the book *Prosperity for All: The Economic Boom and African Americans* (Russell Sage Foundation, 2000). He served as the Chief Economist of the U.S. Department of Labor from January 2000 to January 2001. He is the director of the newly created Center for the Study of Equality at the College of William and Mary. Rodgers also serves on the Governor's Advisory Board of Economists.

His policy work includes testifying before the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, the Joint Sub-committee Studying the Status and Needs of African American Males in Virginia and serving as a consultant for the National Urban League, the Joint Center for Economic and Political Studies and AFL-CIO.

Professor Rodgers chairs William and Mary's Committee on Employee Opportunity, whose charge is to study and make recommendations on how to improve the paths of personal advancement and professional growth of the College's classified, part-time and contract work force.

Professor Rodgers graduated from Dartmouth College in 1986 and earned M.A.'s from the University of California at Santa Barbara and Harvard University. He earned his Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University in 1993. He is a past member of both the Williamsburg-James City County School Board and a Trustee for the New Horizons Regional Vocational Education Center. Currently, Professor Rodgers is President-Elect of the National Economic Association, co-chair of the Planning Committee of the United Way of Greater Williamsburg and a member of the American Economic Association's Committee on the Status of Minorities in the Economics Profession.

He is married to Yana Rodgers, Associate Professor of Economics at William and Mary. They have three young children.

EXHIBIT D

**Murray Steinberg
9244 Royal Grant Drive
Mechanicsville, VA 23116
(804) 559-7054 (home)
(804) 559-7072 (fax)
November 20, 2002**

Child Support Guideline Review Panel
Joe Crane, Chairman
730 East Broad Street
4th Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

Dissenting Opinion of Murray Steinberg

The record will show that I voted on the prevailing side for most recommendations of this panel. The facts presented to this panel simply do not support adopting the new Schedule of Monthly Child Support Obligations, as presented by Dr. William Rodgers. Accordingly, I strongly object to its recommendation for three reasons.

1. The overwhelming majority of testimony the Panel received from the public was that child support, obligations were unjust and too high. As one person put it, child support awards “grossly exceed actual child expenses....” Another asked, “How am I suppose to care for my children... if I have to live in near poverty.” The number one complaint stated over and over was that noncustodial parents receive no tax benefits. Others complained that special one time “environmental pay,” second jobs or unpredictable, nonrecurring overtime pay was unjustly included their “gross income.” Neither of these issues was adequately addressed by the Panel.

Only one person stated “The guidelines do not adequately provide for the housing costs, child care costs, health related costs or education costs of rearing children.” One other person wrote that the child support his girl friend was to receive was “woefully inadequate.” Many forget that our child support guidelines determine each parent’s obligation, and that the father’s obligation alone is not suppose to be adequate. Both parents have an equal obligation to support their child. If custodial parents felt the awards were inadequate, they surely did not make that clear to the panel.

2. Before the Panel could evaluate our child support guidelines, we needed the to answer two basic, fundamental questions: 1) the definition of “child support” and 2) the parameters of the schedule. No definition of “child support” was accepted by the panel majority. Some of the parameters were found in Policy Studies Inc.’s “Updated Child Support Schedule, State of Virginia, April 6, 1999, “Summary of Key Assumptions,” but no definition was found.

Minutes of the Panel's July 1, 2002 meeting state "Senator Quayle moved the Panel maintain the current definition of "child support" being used." The majority approved his motion. However, from my research, I have determined that not only is there no "current definition" of "child support" in Virginia statutes or case law, but also there is none in any Federal laws, acts, or regulations.

3. Statements of facts presented by Dr. Rodgers sounded more like reasons to decrease our present schedule. The following is a summary of statements made by Dr. Rodgers:

- There is no "current research and data on the cost of and expenditures necessary for rearing children" in separate households. [Va. Code § 20-108.2 (H)]
- "Studies have begun to show that at the national level, the growth in incarcerations has contributed to growth in arrearages of less-educated and less-skilled workers... Over this period (Mid-1970s to mid-1990s), incarceration rates for less-educated and less-skilled Americans grew dramatically, having adverse impacts on their current and future earnings."
- "... today the majority of obligors are fathers who are more involved in child-rearing than they were 20 years ago. In addition to paying or receiving child support, many obligors spend money on their children during parenting time... in addition to the child support they pay."
- "... from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, the earnings of less-skilled and less-educated Americans failed to keep pace with inflation."
- "... the deterioration in labor market opportunities of less-skilled and less educated Americans and the negative impacts that incarceration have on an individual's ability to meet child support obligations provide a sound rationale for updating the schedule."

The following facts seem to defy logic.

In developing new schedules, Dr. Rodgers said he assumed the same standard of living would be maintained after separation of the intact household, even though he agreed that this assumption is mathematically impossible. Dr. Rodgers stated that a smaller percentage of the parents combined gross income will be used to support the children if parents are living separately. A larger percentage will be needed to cover fixed expenses like housing.

Dr. Rodgers stated "The fact that they (food and beverages, housing, and transportation which comprise approximately 67 percent of expenditures) increased over either period provides rationale for updating the schedule." Although he correctly stated that the "income of less-skilled and less-educated Americans failed to keep pace with inflation," he neglected to state that overall American's incomes not only have kept up with the cost of necessities, but actually have risen faster.*

Under our present schedule the child support obligation goes up as income rises. There is in effect a self regulating adjustment now. For example as combined income increases from \$2,000 to \$3,000 child support increases by 32%. As income increases from \$3,000 to \$6,000 child support increases by 71%.

* The Bureau of Labor Statistics chronicles a steady rise in the inflation-adjusted wages of the average American worker in its recent report on the subject. [See Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment Cost Index, Constant Dollar, June 1989" (July 25, 2002).] On Page 3 of that report is a table showing that after inflation, workers' wages have risen slowly but steadily from 1981 through 2002. [Table 2a, Employment Cost Index (Compensation), Civilian Workers]

That includes the period spanned by the current child support guidelines, beginning in 1989, since wages are 9.9 percent higher after inflation than they were in 1989. (The table calculates all wages as a percentage of their 1989 level; the index was 109.9 in March 2002 and 110.3 in June 2002, according to Table 2a. So there was a 9.9 percent rise by March 2002 and 10.3 percent rise by June 2002). Ref: <http://www.bls.gov/web/econst.pdf>.

The proposed schedule raises child support roughly 17% at the lower and higher income levels and 8% in the middle income levels. If a person at the \$3,000 combined income level gets a \$100 a month raise, he could wind up paying 24% more child support using the new schedule.

Dr. Rogers stated that no visitation was built into his schedule because his schedule is based upon estimates of raising children in an intact family. It should be noted that the Panel voted to include "the assumption of 'exercised' visitation by the noncustodial parent to be between 60 to 90 days annually" at the final meeting held October 8, 2002. Not until his final report to the Panel, dated October 31, 2002, did Dr. Rodgers state, "The rationale for doing this (separate household discount) is based on expenditures that might occur during the non-custodial parent's 60 to 90 days of visitation...."

Dr. Rodgers states, "The proposed schedule contains an average discount of 64%, with discounts of 70 percent at \$3,550, \$4,500, and \$8500." There does not appear to be a clear or consistent discount which can be identified at any income level. What is discounted? Originally Dr. Rodgers gave the Panel five options, stating that if we wanted different ones to just let him know. The adjustments called "Separate Household Discount" seem to be arbitrary and capricious.

As with the present schedule, no one can identify the components in any of the proposed schedule. How much is included for housing, food, clothing, education, or routine medical expenses? What is the percentage of fixed cost? If the noncustodial parent does not exercise 60 to 90 days of visitation, how much should be added to his/her child support obligation? No one knows! Judges will have a hard time knowing how much to adjust without at least knowing the breakdown of fixed and variable costs. Of course, it would be impossible for D.C.S.E. staff to make any adjustments.

FINALLY, there will be fiscal impact if this new schedule is enacted into law. The average increase is 17% in the lower and upper income levels and 8% in the middle income levels. The Division of Child Support Enforcement currently handles over 300,000 cases. Each person is entitled to a review every three years. I cannot imagine anyone who would turn down a review yielding them an increase in child support.

Even if the General Assembly adopts the new schedule and adds a clause which states “the new Schedule shall not be considered, of itself, a material change of circumstances,” judges and D.C.S.E. staff will have to first calculate child support using the old schedule to determine if there is a material change of circumstances to warrant a modification. Some custodial parents will be encouraged or tempted to ask for a modification even if they have no other material change of circumstances.

Furthermore, there will be a greater number of noncustodial parents who will not be able to pay the increased amount, resulting in a greater number of show cause hearings and an increased number of people being incarcerated. There will be fiscal impact!

UNTIL there can be a schedule with identifiable components, based upon current data on the actual cost of raising a child or children in separate households, I believe it would be reckless and irresponsible to recommend that the General Assembly adopt another schedule.

For all these reasons, I respectfully dissent and ask that the General Assembly reject the recommendation of the Panel majority for a new schedule at this time.

Murray Steinberg

Murray Steinberg

Concurring with this Dissenting Opinion are members Cynthia Ewing and Maxie Cannon