

Child Support Guidelines Advisory Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, June 18, 2025, 10 a.m. to 10:35 a.m.

Facilitator: Dawn Marquardt

Minutes: Erik Durant

Members: Donna Brann, Kelly Evans, Luciana Fontanini, Jeremy Gibons, Heath Hattaway, Martin Herbest, Christine Hill, Dawn Marquardt, Natalie Otero, Sabrina Owen, Keith Raines, Mike Ritchey, David Rivera-Vernazza, and Monica Whitaker.

Guests: Jason Chappell, Michelle Chrystal, Erik Durant, Marci Hamilton, Dan Meyers, Alexandra Popescu, Michelle Underwood, and Lori Woltring.

Absent: Erin Biencourt, Tabitha Fish, Trena Klohe, Marisa Salinas, Jessica Thomas, and Amanda Thorpe.

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 edits. They will be posted on the public website. Dawn shared the results of the vote regarding whether the committee will continue the discussion on Keith’s proposal for income disparity. In total, there were 12 <i>no</i> votes, 1 <i>yes</i> vote, and 2 abstaining. It will be removed from our list of official topics to discuss during this guidelines review, but it may be revisited in future reviews. There have also been suggestions for how to improve rule commentary. Dawn thanked Keith for bringing the issue forward.	
Parenting Time and the Minimum Order	All
Lucci advised that the Income Workgroup discussed minimum orders during their last meeting. Although the full group was not present, the group tentatively decided on some recommendations. The group strongly supported keeping the minimum order in some capacity. It served an important purpose that it communicates that there is an expectation that parents support their children. The group agreed on a recommendation to reduce the minimum order from \$100 to \$50, primarily based on the Center for Policy Research (CPR) report’s recommendation as well as case data. Our case sampling showed that it is a relatively low number of cases (roughly 5%) that trigger the minimum order. If we look at all the \$100 minimum order cases and the cases that are below \$100, about half of them had parenting time, but it is less than that when you only factor in the \$100 minimum orders. In our sampling, there were 11 paying parents who had income below the self-support reserve, which is generally when the minimum order is guaranteed to kick in. Of those, only one had parenting time at all, and that individual only had 4.9% parenting time. Even though it was a recommendation from CPR to make an exception for any amount of parenting time, it probably does not affect a lot of cases with parenting time. Mike asked Lucci to what extent she thought the number of cases with minimum orders was lower than it would have been if we had used actual income for some of the parents rather than automatically imputing full-time minimum wage. Lucci responded that it was something discussed at the Income Workgroup meeting. In her opinion, there are probably a good	

number of parents who might have had lower income but were attributed with earning the lowest minimum wage in Oregon, and therefore, their income was high enough that it never came up against the self-support reserve. The 5% of cases with minimum orders received payments at a similar rate to all the other cases in our caseload, which suggests those may be relatively reasonable orders. The group of parents whose income was imputed with the lowest minimum wage in Oregon (about 22%) had a compliance rate of around 50-55%, which is much lower than the overall sample.

Mike clarified that how we defined “compliance” in our sampling was if any payment was received during the time period, which could include a single payment like a tax intercept or other involuntary payment. Lucci agreed and noted that what we would ideally want to know is how much was owed on each of those cases and how much of that was paid to get a better assessment.

With no objection from the group, Dawn advised that reducing the minimum order to \$50 will now be considered one of the recommendations of the full committee. She asked the group if they are prepared to discuss parenting time and the minimum order today or if there is any additional work needed to be done before the group has that conversation. Lori did not think there was any other data besides what Lucci provided that could help committee members come to a decision.

With the decision to reduce the minimum order to \$50, Dawn reiterated the key question up for discussion here: should there be an exception to the minimum order in situations where each parent has parenting time? Lucci noted that she doesn’t believe there is evidence to suggest there is a problem needing to be solved. It might be the right thing to do nonetheless, but it doesn’t seem like we have customers or stakeholders asking for this, except for the recommendation by the CPR report. Lori agreed, noting that if the minimum order is lower, it should be less of an issue. She would be fine with keeping the status quo. Mike noted that an exception makes more sense to him if there is a minimum amount of parenting time. Having a few overnights annually is not as persuasive as having three nights a week.

Donna expressed hesitation in tying it to parenting time. During hearings, the first question they typically ask is if there is a parenting time order, and the second question is whether it is being followed. Most of the time it is not being followed. If we try to do an exception to the minimum order for parenting time, we will have to define if there is a parenting time order, and there will be more hearings if it is not being followed.

Without further discussion, Dawn noted that the recommendations of this group are to have a \$50 minimum order and to not make an exception for parenting time. Jeremy asked for clarification about the exception for 50/50 parenting time. Lucci responded that the proposal is to keep status quo, which means maintaining the exception for 50/50 parenting time.

Action Item

- The group will move forward with recommendations to reduce the minimum order to \$50 and to keep the status quo regarding exceptions to the minimum order for parenting time.

Workgroup Updates (Health Care Coverage & Child Care Costs, Income, Parenting Time Credit)	Workgroup Representatives
<p>Health Care Coverage & Child Care Costs: Alex noted that the workgroup ran through some scenarios using the updated scale to ensure the results aligned with the direction the work group has been heading in. They had robust discussion about potentially recommending a change to the program’s current practice of automatically issuing NMSNs to receiving parents. The group discussed whether there was flexibility and authority under federal and state law and the impact on Origin. The conversation will hopefully be wrapped up in the July meeting.</p> <p>With Chris and Natalie joining the workgroup, the group discussed the OJD forms that self-represented litigants use when they petition for actions in court. A few minor clarifying edits were suggested. The group is planning to start discussing the child care cost piece in July and is still on target to have recommendations for this group in August.</p> <p>Income: Lucci noted that, in addition to the minimum order discussion, the workgroup discussed what topic to cover next. Other topics for discussion include the self-support reserve, income for parents on TANF, and income for parents when we don’t have sufficient information on their income history. The group decided to focus on the self-support reserve first since we have some concrete data and a recommendation from CPR. The group plans to discuss this during their July meeting before fine-tuning the language on the aforementioned income imputation scenarios. The group agreed that a lot of the issues seem to be around the language we are using, so it might be more about cleaning up the rule language than making drastic changes. The group also wants to look at the number of hours that is considered “full time.” The group has several action items to work on before the next meeting.</p> <p>Parenting Time Credit: Lori noted that she sent out the rule updates for the group to review but hasn’t had a chance to go through the comments and edits. Once she does that, she plans to send them back out for review and then share them with the larger committee. Dawn asked if it makes more sense to send it out to the larger group before the meeting or to have the discussion in the larger committee meeting first before sending it around for review. Lori responded that she thinks it would be sufficient to let committee members review it in advance of the meeting and then the group can go over them together during the meeting, if needed. The changes are mainly to fine-tune existing language for clarity, so it should not be too complicated.</p>	
Identify Topics for July Meeting	Dawn Marquardt
<p>Dawn noted that for the July meeting, the group will discuss the parenting time rules that Lori will circulate. Alex noted that she can tentatively aim to have the medical support rule revisions discussed at the July meeting as well. Lucci noted that because the Income Workgroup is meeting the same week as the next committee meeting, they might not have anything to bring to the July meeting.</p> <p>Dawn noted that we have had some shorter meetings lately, but her plan is to keep them on people’s calendars as-is to allow for discussion, if needed.</p>	
Round Table	All
There was no discussion for round table.	