

Child Support Guidelines Advisory Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, April 16, 2025, 10 a.m. to 10:25 a.m.

Facilitator: Dawn Marquardt

Minutes: Erik Durant

Members: Erin Biencourt, Donna Brann, Kelly Evans, Luciana Fontanini, Jeremy Gibons, Martin Herbest, Christine Hill, Dawn Marquardt, Natalie Otero, Sabrina Owen, Keith Raines, Marisa Salinas, Linda Scher, Amanda Thorpe, and Monica Whitaker.

Guests: Chris Bowers, Jason Chappell, Michelle Chrystal, Erik Durant, Annie Engel, Marci Hamilton, Sarah Heinen, Alicia Mahan, Dan Meyers, Zizi Owens, Alexandra Popescu, Charlene St. Jules, Michelle Underwood, and Lori Woltring.

Absent: Deborah Dowdle, Tabitha Fish, Heath Hattaway, Trena Klohe, Mike Ritchey, David Rivera-Vernazza, and Jessica Thomas.

Call to Order	Dawn Marquardt
Dawn brought the meeting to order and conducted a roll call of the members present.	
Minute Review and Approval	Dawn Marquardt
The minutes were approved without any edits. They will be posted on the public website.	
Workgroup Updates (Health Care Coverage & Child Care Costs, Income, Parenting Time Credit)	Workgroup Representatives
<p>Health Care Coverage & Child Care Costs:</p> <p>Alexandra shared the workgroup met last week and had a robust conversation. They have started with the four options identified in the policy paper and, through discussion, have begun to identify the general consensus for recommendations. The workgroup has decided not to maintain the status quo and have agreed to move forward with removing the requirement to give private health care coverage priority over public coverage.</p> <p>They also discussed including dental, vision, prescription drug, and mental health in the medical support guidelines. There is still more research needed to be done, but the group agreed to look at expanding the commentary to clarify those coverages should not be ordered as standalone items because they are already encompassed by the overarching health care coverage. When parents do provide additional coverage, we would allow that credit when support is calculated.</p> <p>The workgroup had an additional conversation about changing the 4% cap, specifically, if it should be considered per parent rather than combined. The group still has some research to do and wants to look at Oregon Health Authority and Oregon Health Plan data before they make any recommendations. They plan to finish this discussion before moving on to the topic of high-deductible insurance coupled with health savings accounts that Keith suggested at a prior meeting.</p> <p>Income:</p> <p>Luciana noted that the workgroup met this Monday, so the minutes are not ready to share. During the meeting, the discussion focused on what income to use for a parent receiving TANF. The rule currently requires that they are imputed at full-time minimum wage,</p>	

specifically, the lowest minimum wage in the state where the parent lives. There was general consensus from the group that this requirement is not well liked, but it was pointed out that we need to find a solution that works better. The group talked through several different options but didn't settle on one that they are ready to recommend. There was a desire to see more calculations using the new scale. When Luciana sends out the minutes to the group, she will also provide more examples for everyone to consider. For the next meeting, they hope to decide on how to approach this issue. They also want to discuss whether concerns about the existing rule language could be addressed by allowing more flexibility.

They also talked through whether they agree with the rule commentary that currently says to impute some income to a parent on TANF so that there is cost sharing between the parents. There was a general consensus that the group still believes that is true. Additionally, they discussed whether needs-based assistance a person receives because they don't have enough income to support themselves ("means tested benefits") should be considered in the income calculation. The rule currently excludes some types of public assistance as income but does not have an exhaustive list, which may imply that only those detailed in rule should be excluded from income.

The group still needs to discuss what income to use for a parent when there is not enough information available to determine actual or potential income, and they need to talk through minimum orders and the self-support reserve as well.

Parenting Time Credit:

Lori advised that the workgroup met yesterday, went through all the identified issues, and agreed on what the recommendations were going to be. They are now working on rule language, so it was decided to continue the conversations via email. They will leave the workgroup meetings on the calendar in case they are needed but will cancel them if not.

There is one outstanding piece that might be more appropriate to discuss with this larger group because it does not just affect parenting time but rather the overall calculation. That issue is regarding if we should apply the minimum order when there is parenting time. One of the recommendations in the study was that the inclusion of parenting time would be an exception to applying the minimum order. Dawn asked if that should be a topic for the next meeting since we did not include it on the agenda for today, and Lori agreed. Jeremy added that he agreed we should not apply the minimum order when there is shared parenting time.

Keith advised he still has not abandoned his concern about how disparate incomes often produce unfair support amounts. Linda added that she thought there was some interest during the last meeting to look into why the calculations come out so unfairly for these situations. Luciana advised that she is open to this discussion but would like to see some examples of how the calculations are resulting in unfair results. Jeremy agreed and noted that Keith provided some examples that went out with the February 14 agenda, which would be a good starting point. Dawn noted that it would be good to check whether any of these issues would be resolved with the newly proposed scale. This can be discussed at the next meeting. Keith suggested beginning with looking at 50/50 parenting time when one parent makes \$135,000 and the other makes \$35,000. Luciana added that it would be helpful to have an explanation of why the calculations are unfair. Is it that the children's needs are not being met? Keith noted that if the guidelines say the result is the right number, the court must find something extremely substantial to justify deviating from the guidelines. Amanda

offered to help work through some different examples to bring to the next meeting, looking at lower incomes with other parenting time agreements (e.g., 70/30 or 60/40). She asked if she could get the new scale to work from. Luciana advised that she will check with Krista before sharing the new scale in case there are any links or other reasons it might not work when sharing externally. Michelle Underwood advised via the chat that there could be firewall and security blocking access issues. Dawn advised we will follow up with Krista.

Identify Topics for May Meeting

All

Dawn advised that, in addition to the workgroup updates, we have identified two topics during this meeting that we can include on the next agenda. The first is the topic Lori raised about parenting time and the minimum order. The second topic will be sharing the examples and continuing the conversation of how disparate incomes may be producing unfair results. Luciana can work on putting together examples like what Keith sent out previously that can be discussed at the next meeting.

Round Table

All

There was no further discussion for round table.