

Comments to the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel Document 3 – May 26, 2012 through October 27, 2012

From May 26, 2012, there were a total of 16 emails to the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel. Twelve (12) emails pertained to a specific DCSE case and were referred to DCSE for a case specific response. Four (4) were regarding general topics. All inquiries received a response.

All identifying information on case specific inquiries has been crossed out and salutations and closings have been deleted.

1. From: DB
Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2012, 11:47 AM
Subject: Question

I have recently remarried am and trying to find out if my spouse's income counts in the calculation for child support although the child in question is from my former spouse.

Thank you,

2. From: Kenneth Skilling
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 3:32 PM
Subject: Update to my November 16, 2011, testimony

Updated Testimony to Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

I understand that the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel will be meeting tomorrow (June 12).

I testified to the November 16, 2011, meeting of the panel (see copy of my prepared testimony below). At that time, in my prepared testimony and in my oral remarks, I mentioned that there were some missing pieces of information. I now have supplementary information on these points, and I hope that the panel will be willing to consider this additional information.

One piece of information that came to light after the November 16 meeting related to the proportion of custodial parents who are fathers. In November, I said that the latest information on this subject came from a 1999 study by the Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission. Since the November meeting, however, I have been told that an analysis of the Division of Child Support Enforcement database indicated that, as of October 2011, 93.39 percent of custodial parents were female and 6.23 percent of custodial parents were male.

In the last legislative session, fathers' groups in Virginia supported a bill (H.B. 84) that, in its original form, would have introduced a requirement that neither parent would get less than 40 percent of custody time with his or her children. This bill would have gone a long way to correcting the present enormous disparity in custody. However,

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

this bill was extensively amended during consideration, and the measure ended up making no significant change in the custody arrangements. Fathers' representatives maintain that the custody disparity has a considerable influence on consideration of child support issues, including the scale of child support. The review panel should not go further down the road of discriminating against fathers by adding to their child support burdens.

A further update to my November 16, 2011, testimony relates to the provision that shared custody provisions apply only when one of the parents "has custody or visitation of a child or children for more than 90 days in the year." I suggested that there was no justification for this "cliff effect," which has had the (apparently unintended) consequence of encouraging custodial parents' lawyers to limit visitation times to less than 90 days, in order to ensure that child support is paid at the full rate.

One objection to removal of the "cliff effect," and introduction of a sliding scale, has been that calculation of child support amounts would become too complicated, with the possibility of errors being inadvertently introduced by this complexity. However, since I testified in November last year, I have discovered that a computer program to calculate CS amounts is in widespread use throughout Virginia. The availability of this computer program (VADER --Virginia Attorneys' Divorce Electronic Reference -- see http://www.senseient.com/vader/vader_home.asp) should remove the objection to a sliding scale that relates child support precisely to visitation periods.

I would again urge the panel to resist any proposals for increases in child support that ignore the fact that the numbers in the current guideline are already indexed, and already link the amounts to parental income. Any increase in the numbers would represent the imposition of a heavier financial load on non-custodial parents (essentially, fathers) in circumstances where their incomes had not increased.

Virginia Child Support Guidelines Review Panel
November 16, 2011 Meeting
Statement by Kenneth Skilling

My name is Kenneth Skilling. I am a resident of Fairfax County, and have lived in Virginia since 1975. I have a son and a daughter, who are now grown, but I paid child support for more than 10 years. Formerly, I was president of an organization called Fathers For Virginia (FFV), and I continue to be involved in its work. FFV provides support for divorced fathers and seeks reforms that would end discrimination against these fathers. We also favor strengthening the protections against family breakdowns.

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

I understand that the review panel faces a difficult job. These issues are very complex. I would suggest that one way of simplifying the task is to look at the child support guidelines in a wider perspective. Let's not look just at numbers in the child support guidelines. Let's acknowledge that setting the numbers for the tables that appear in the statute is not an exact science. Inevitably there is an arbitrary element. Let's also look at where changing the numbers in the child support schedule is likely to lead.

Underlying Realities

In my view, there are several underlying realities that should be factored in. Unfortunately, they are not considered in the report by Dr. Jane Venohr that was presented at an earlier meeting. One important issue is the custody situation. The child support guidelines talk about "custodial parents" and "noncustodial parents." However, the inescapable fact is that it is very rare for fathers to be custodial parents. The latest information available to me – from the Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission – is that in 1999 only 4 percent of custodial parents were male (<http://jlarc.virginia.gov/meetings/December99/support.pdf>). Overwhelmingly, child support is money that fathers pay mothers.

Another underlying reality never seems to be addressed in the context of child support. That reality is the incentive pattern established by child support rules, in combination with the continued glass ceiling on paternal custody. It is inevitable that, if you make more generous provision for single parent – essentially fatherless – families, you establish more incentives for the creation of those families. The rule is that you get more of the behavior you subsidize.

Do we want to add to the incentives for the creation of fatherless families, when we know beyond any doubt that such families are immensely damaging to children?

Cost of Family Fragmentation

Then there's the issue of the cost to taxpayers of family fragmentation. I have recently seen a paper (http://www.dss.virginia.gov/files/about/sfi/intro_page/about/slide_deck_9_26_11.pdf) delivered by Social Services Commissioner Martin Brown to a conference on Strengthening Virginia's Families. This paper estimates that in 2011 the total costs to the taxpayers of fragmented families in Virginia will be about \$2.4 billion. As I understand it, this does not include the cost to individual fathers, who have to pay child support as a result of the fragmentation of their families. And let's be clear about one thing. The research shows that family fragmentation usually takes place over the objections of the fathers involved. Under no-fault divorce laws, fathers have no way of preventing this fragmentation.

Dr. Venohr seems to be recommending an increase in Virginia's child support, on the basis that the cost of raising children has increased. From her reference to "sticker

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

shock," I have to assume that this increase, if adopted, would be a very nasty surprise for the fathers who would have to pay it. I can see no justification for this increase.

The guidelines are already indexed for inflation, since the numbers are linked to total parental income: if a parent's income rises, the amount of child support rises. To raise the numbers in the guideline without regard to this indexing component means that greater burdens would be imposed on fathers whose incomes have not risen.

And then there's the issue of what's been happening in Virginia in recent years to per capita personal income (a measure of ability to pay). Dr. Venohr says that Bureau of Labor Statistics figures indicate that median family income in the state increased 86.5 percent from 1989 to 2009. However, recent experience is very different. The Council on Virginia's Future, a state agency, has a report (<http://vaperforms.virginia.gov/indicators/economy/personalIncome.php>) showing that per capita personal income in Virginia rose over the period 2001 to 2007, and then dropped off, recovering at a slow rate in 2010.

Keeping Up With the Joneses

Included in Dr. Venohr's justification for increasing child support amounts is the statement that Virginia's schedule is too low relative to those of nearby states. This "keeping up with the Joneses" argument involves a certain amount of circularity. In the time available to me I have not been able to do a comprehensive check. However, it appears that Dr. Venohr herself was involved in the review of at least the Maryland, North Carolina, and Georgia guidelines.

I would suggest to the panel that the index-linking of the present Virginia guidelines be acknowledged. The numbers in the schedule should be left as they are.

Removal of Discrimination Against Fathers

Change is needed in the guidelines. But the change should be to correct the present discrimination against fathers. The federal principles for state guidelines include two that are especially relevant in this context. One is that guidelines should be gender-neutral. Another is that guidelines should not discourage shared physical custody.

Both of these principles are violated by the failure of the present Virginia guidelines to take proper account of fixed costs. A father who wants to have his children stay with him during his visitation time must have suitable accommodation for this. His housing costs do not diminish when the children are with his ex-wife. The principle should be that the child support follows the child.

Furthermore, the current guidelines provide for shared custody provisions to apply only when one of the parents "has custody or visitation of a child or children for more than 90 days in the year." I can see no reason for this sharp distinction. The end

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

result is that lawyers make sure that fathers don't have visitation with their children that exceeds 90 days in the year. I urge the panel to recommend that this 90-day limit be removed, and a sliding scale put in its place.

3. From: DM
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 9:59 PM
Subject: Contact with committee, attend meetings and contact non-custodial parents

Please inform me how I and others in our group can be in contact with the committee, attend the meetings of the committee and contact the non-custodial parents in the committee. We would like to know how you selected the members of the committee.

4. From: MD
Sent: Saturday, June 16, 2012 11:32 PM
Subject: REVIEW REQUESTED 2011

I had recently requested a review be done on my case number XXXXXXXX; I have not heard anything from AL or VA in reference to it. Mr. XXXXXXXX sent me a bogus \$650 adjusted letter, which was not pertaining to the actual NEW amount but a month for arrears. please Contact AL, and find out what is going on with the review process. My ex is getting to retire soon possibly so the sooner the better. Thank you in advaced. I can be reached at XXXXXXXX Monday through Friday 9-4.

5. From: MD
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2012 12:01 PM
Subject: PURGE CLAUSE- PLEASE FORWARD TO MY WORKER AND REGIONAL

ALL,

I RECENTLY WENT TO COURT FOR CASE NUMBER XXXXXXXX; A PURGE CLAUSE WAS ORDERED OR 30 DAYS JAIL TO THE FATHER WHO OWES WELL OVER \$30k IN ARREARS.

THE LAWYER OF THE BIO, REQUESTED THE AMOUNT BE LOWERED TO \$3500 TO THE DCSE ATTORNEY; IT WAS AGREED BY THE DCSE ATTORNEY TO SUBMIT THE \$3500 TO ME, WITH NO KNOWLEDGE SENT TO ME IN REFERENCE TO THIS.

UNFORTUNATELY WHEN THE FUNDS ENTER THE SYSTEM, THEY ARE NOT PAID DIRECTLY TO ME, AS THE BIO HAS ANOTHER CASE IN VIRGINIA.

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

HOW DOES THE DCSE HAVE THE RIGHT TO AGREE TO THIS ACTION WITHOUT NOTIFYING ME, THEN ONLY PAY ME HALF OF WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY ORDERED?

THE PURPOSE WAS TO ENFORCE THE AMOUNT OWED, WHICH IN MY OPINION DID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING AS THE FULL AMOUNTS HAVE NOT BEEN RECEIVED SINCE THE MARCH HEARING AND PRIOR TO; UNDER THE TABLE DEAL WITH THE TWO ATTORNEYS.

I AM TOLD DCSE IS ENFORCING WHAT IS TO BE PAID; MY ORDER IS FOR \$995 PLUS \$300 TOWARDS ARREARS. THAT MEANS EACH MONTH MY CHILDREN OUGHT TO BE RECEIVING \$1295 THE ORDER IS TO ENFORCE AMOUNT AND ARREARS.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO HAVE THE MONEY SUBMITTED AS ORIGINALLY ORDERED? THE JUDGE ORDERED \$4000+ TO BE PAID TO ME DIRECTLY BY THE 16 OF MARCH?

PLEASE CALL ME SO THAT I CAN GAIN UNDERSTANDING TO THIS ERRONEOUS AGREEMENT THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE.

6. From: JI
Sent: Tuesday, August 07, 2012 12:14 PM
Subject: Review

I have been out of work since June and have still been paying full child support from unemployment

7. From: RJ
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2012 4:16 PM
Subject: Inquiry

My child's father is not currently employed; however, receives a stipend from the government through his GI Bill. Will this be considered as income?

8. From: RK
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2012 9:18 AM
Subject: Info

I need to find out who I need to speak with in reference to a child support case that was handled properly through the Portsmouth Va office and got conflicting information from Chesapeake office and the Portsmouth office. My case sat in the Portsmouth office for 7 months did nothing and told me I should not worry about the case since my

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

son will be turning 18 years in a few months, and that it would be a waste of time and by time it went to court he would be 18 years. I am owed child support have an arrears, also told that I had a case and then didn't have a case, have received conflicting information from both office and no help at all. Now my case is closed because of my son's age and received no help from the dcse system this is the second time I have had to file a complaint/10 years ago and also went to court against dcse. Could someone notify me or reply to my email this should not happen when they know where the other parent is.

9. From: Eli Hernandez
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 6:56 PM
Subject: MXXXX HXXXXXX

To whom this may concern:

I would like to request a reevaluation on my monthly child support payments. Currently I'm required to pay \$881 per month.

There have been recent changes in my life that make me unable to pay such amount. I have rent and car insurance due every month, and more importantly, I have a new daughter to also care for.

If you could please set up an appointment for reevaluation on the earliest date possible, I would be most grateful. Thank you for your understanding.
MH

10. From: Hans Bader
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 1:52 PM
Subject: Comments regarding Virginia child support guidelines and potential drafting of a new child-support schedule

Dear Child Support Guidelines Review Panel:

Attached are my comments regarding Virginia's child support guidelines and pitfalls involved in the potential drafting of a new child support schedule (the "Schedule of Monthly Basic Child Support Obligations" contained in Va. Code § 20-108.2(B)).

The attached comments are in a letter saved as a PDF file.

Dear Panel Member:

If an employee sought reimbursement twice for the same expense, that employee would probably be fired. Yet proposals to increase child support guidelines often do something similar, in two ways: either (1) by seeking to set the basic child support schedule equal to all child-rearing costs – even though some child-rearing costs are not supposed to be covered by the basic child-support schedule, but rather awarded on top of it; or (2) awarding as child

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

support expenses that are already paid for by the government through tax credits (such as child tax credits) or tax exemptions available to the custodial parent on his or her tax return. These errors make existing child support guidelines appear to be inadequate even when they are more than adequate. (For example, a 2000 JLARC Report argued for an increase in Virginia's child support levels for households with incomes below \$30,000 per year, but its conclusions were based on the erroneous premise that the basic child support schedule is supposed to include all child-rearing expenses rather than only part of them¹, as Dr. Rodgers, who assisted a previous Triennial Child Support Guideline Review Panel, noted was incorrect for JLARC to do.²)

Thus, to avoid double-counting of expenses, I would like to suggest to the panel that any basic child-support schedule drafted at its request not cover expenses that are already awarded under other provisions in the child support guidelines, or are recoverable through the

¹ See JLARC, *Technical Report: The Costs of Raising Children* (Senate Doc. No. 9) (2000), at pg. III, Summary (erroneously including all "health care" and "child care" costs in the costs to be covered by the schedule of monthly basic child support obligations found at Va. Code § 20-108.2(B)).

² See William M. Rodgers, III, *Determining the Level of Basic Child Support* (August 14, 2002) (draft report) at pg. 9 ("The JLARC report developed estimates of the costs of raising children. They included health and child care expenditures in their calculations, which for our given charge is problematic"); Report of the Triennial Child Support Guideline Review Panel (Oct. 31, 2002), Exhibit B, p. 14 ("The JLARC report" data on the costs of childrearing "include health and child-care expenditures," even though to "create a schedule of child support, expenditures on children must exclude the reported health and child care expenditures").

tax code. For example, I would suggest that daycare expenses and health insurance not be included in the basic child-support schedule,³ since they are supposed to be awarded on top of it pursuant to Va. Code § 20-108.2(D)&(E)). Failure to exclude these expenses when drawing up the child support schedule could result in it awarding patently excessive amounts in some cases— double the correct child support award for some working-class households. This is because the child support awarded on top of, and in addition to, the basic child support schedule can be the lion's share of all child support obligations for some low-income or working-class households. For example, in *Herring v. Herring*,⁴ of the \$1498 total child support obligation, 55 percent (\$823) was from day care (\$667) and children's health insurance (\$154) combined, and only 45 percent (\$675) was from the child support schedule.

The schedule should also take into account the fact that custodial parents can typically claim a \$1,000 tax credit for each child on line 51 of their tax return (see IRS Form 1040),⁵ and can claim a tax exemption of \$3650 per child on line 42 of their tax return.⁶ (In Virginia, unlike most states, judges have apparently no authority to order the custodial parent to waive the child tax exemption or credit so that it may be claimed by the non-custodial parent, even if the non-custodial parent provides most of the financial support for the child.⁷ As a result, Virginia's child support guidelines are more generous to custodial parents compared with other states than they may appear at first glance.⁸)

³ Virginia's child support schedule is found in Virginia Code Section 20-108.2(B), the "SCHEDULE OF MONTHLY BASIC CHILD SUPPORT OBLIGATIONS." (available at <http://leg1.state.va.us/000/cod/20-108.2.HTM>).

⁴ You can find this case in volume 33 of the Virginia Appellate Reports. Its citation is 33 Va. App. 281, 531 S.E.2d 923 (2000).

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

⁵ The IRS Form 1040 can be found at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/f1040.pdf>. The \$3650 tax exemption per child is listed right on line 42 (“Exemptions. Multiply \$3,650 by the number on line 6d”). The additional tax credit of \$1,000 per child claimable on line 51 is made clear on pg. 43 of the instructions for the IRS Form 1040 form. See 1040 Instructions, available at <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/i1040.pdf>.

⁶ See, e.g., Pearlene Anklesaria, *Child-Related Tax Breaks for Divorced Parents*, 22 *Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers* 425, 427 (2009); Internal Revenue Code Section 152.

⁷ *Floyd v. Floyd*, 436 S.E.2d 451, 463 (Va. 1997); see Pearlene Anklesaria, *Child-Related Tax Breaks for Divorced Parents*, 22 *J. Am. Acad. of Matrim. L.* 425, 426-27 (2009) (“A growing majority [of state judiciaries] has consistently

held that courts may use their equitable powers to order a custodial parent to execute a waiver of the exemption, permitting the noncustodial parent to claim it,” but not the Virginia courts, which refuse to do so).

⁸ The existing child support guidelines permit courts to take into account the tax consequences of daycare credits (see Va. Code 108.2(F)), reflecting the fact that custodial parents can claim tax credits of up to 33% of daycare costs, even if such costs are already paid for in child support. But they fail to take into account the \$1,000 per child tax credit, even though the latter affects far more households – indeed, so many that it should be built into the basic child support schedule itself, rather than being listed as a deviation factor. If it is only permissible as a deviation factor, courts will not apply it in the ordinary case, since deviation factors are for atypical cases, not ordinary or typical cases. Thus, a major factor like tax consequences that affects the ordinary household and the typical case should be taken into account in drawing up the child-support schedule, or it will, in practice, simply be ignored, resulting in inflated child-support awards.

The panel apparently has received a copy of the recently adopted Maryland childsupport schedule.⁹ That schedule results in excessively-high child support awards for most households for a number of reasons that I have explained elsewhere, and its supporters relied on erroneous rationales in pushing it.¹⁰ (I was out of the country at the time, and thus was unable to discuss these erroneous rationales with legislators).

Virginia’s child support schedule is more generous compared to other states than it superficially appears, for two reasons: first, because in Virginia, child support is calculated based on *gross* income, unlike in many other states, like California and Texas, where it is calculated on a smaller base of *net* income (gross income minus taxes. For example, Texas deducts income taxes and social security taxes in determining the income on which the noncustodial parent must pay child support, thus reducing the parent’s child support obligations, which are based on income¹¹); and second, because in Virginia, child support is not reduced based on factors that routinely result in reductions in child support awards in some other states, such as visitation of less than 90 whole days a year.¹²

I understand that the panel may have discussed the idea of increasing child support obligations for high-living-cost areas of Virginia. I think this is unnecessary, since the existing child support schedule is sufficient to cover child-rearing costs in even the highest-living-cost areas of Virginia. I and my wife live in such an area – Arlington – and even so, I can attest that we have never spent even half of what the existing child support schedule mandates for households with our income level. What Virginia’s existing child support schedule mandates in obligations for non-custodial parents is far beyond what we as a couple have ever actually spent on our daughter, even though she has plenty of clothes, toys, possessions, and activities, and has traveled overseas. (In calculating the cost of raising our daughter, I have used relatively generous assumptions, such as imputing to my daughter the entire amortized cost of our

⁹ See *Child Support Guidelines Review Panel September 15, 2010 Meeting Minutes* at pg. 3 (available at <http://dls.state.va.us/GROUPS/childsupport/meetings/091510/sm091510.pdf>) (“Senator Quayle requested a copy of the new Maryland guidelines and report be provided to every Panel member”).

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

¹⁰ See Bader, *Child Support Bill Would Raise Increase Already Excessive Obligations Based on Erroneous Rationale*, Feb. 5, 2010 (<http://www.examiner.com/article/child-support-bill-would-increase-already-excessive-obligationsbased-on-erroneous-rationale>) (discussing inadequacy of inflation rationale to justify major increases in child support schedule, since wages rise with inflation, and child support obligations rise with wages); Bader, *Meaningless Child Support Ranking Not a Reason to Increase Maryland Child Support Obligations*, Feb. 6, 2010 (www.freedomaction.net/profiles/blogs/meaningless-child-support) (discussing misleading apples-to-oranges rankings of state child support guidelines. Many state child support guidelines are actually less generous to custodial parents than Maryland's former schedule, or Virginia's, despite superficially being more generous, due to factors such as their basing child support awards on "net income" rather than – as in Maryland or Virginia -- "gross income" (gross income is higher than net income because it does not deduct taxes); or their reducing most child support awards based on factors that would not reduce child support in Maryland or Virginia, such as cutting child support awards if the non-custodial parent has even modest amounts of visitation).

¹¹ See Texas Family Code Chapter 154.

¹² See Virginia Code § 20-108.2(G)(3).

primary vehicle, because we purchased this SUV partly due to the expanded family size resulting from her birth).

Thank you for taking the time to review my suggestions. (I should note in closing that I have no personal stake in this issue. While I am a lawyer, I do not currently practice divorce or family law, I do not owe, pay, or receive child support, and I am not divorced.).

11. From: Fred Hawkins
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 2:37 PM
Subject: Child Support Guidelines Review Panel Meetings

Dear Vaguidelinespanel:

As the leading fathers advocacy group in Virginia, Fathers for Virginia is vitally interested in the proceedings of the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel and hope to work closely with the Panel on any legislative proposals that may result.

Please advise us of any and all planned meetings for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel. We understand there is a meeting planned for 09/20/12, but its not listed on the Panel's web site. Have any meetings occurred since the 06/12/12 meeting listed on the web site? Is there a point of contact we should use to keep current with the Panel's schedule?

Other information of interest to Fathers:

Has your industry consultant submitted her report? If so, where can we find a copy?

Will the Panel entertain reports that may rebut the paid consultant's report?

Have any other reports been submitted? Where can copies be found?

Will the Panel entertain minority or citizen reports?

Thank you for your reply. We look forward to working with the Panel to improve child support and visitation for Virginia's children.

12. From: KT
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 12:27 PM

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

Subject: child support case number XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX

Hello I would like to know if you could give me any information about my case I understand Mr. XXXXX has been back to court and also trying to receive Social Security I am not sure if you give me this information but it would really put my mind at ease some-what you my reach me at XXX-XXX-XXXX or by email, XXX.XXXX@XXXX.XXXX.XXX

13. From: AH
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 7:27 PM
Subject: Hold on my Bank account

Dear Sir or Ma'am,

On September 21st 2012 there has been a hold placed on my bank accounts by your agency in the amount of \$5068.17. I understand you have the right to take that action. I have been paying child support for 20 years, I have never been an absentee parent, in fact I've had my children live with me out side of visitation while I continued to pay child support. I had many job changes over the last couple of years and I continue to pay. I was out of work for March 2012 to August 2012. At the end of the day the action your agency chose to take has caused me hardship, and I understand your action is designed to collect. I have not had access to money for the last 4 days. With that being said all I asking am is for someone to contact me so I can resolve the issue.

Case #XXXXX
XXX-XXX-XXXX

14. From: DH
Sent: Sunday, October 07, 2012 11:00 PM
Subject: F. A. A. D.

To Whom It May Concern,
Could you please tell me what
"F.A.A.D. " (a deduction from child support) means??

15. From: LG
Sent: Monday, October 15 , 2012 1:20 PM
Subject: Question

To Whom It May Concern:

My husband pays child support for 2 children (2 different mothers) through dss. We are expecting our own baby in December and unfortunately 1 of the mothers had the child support reviewed today. It seems fair to have this

Comments for the Child Support Guidelines Review Panel

re-reviewed when our child is born but I'm not sure if that is an option.
Please confirm.

I have a separate question regarding the adjustments for support of child (line 3 on Guideline Worksheet). He currently pays \$520/month for a separate child. On the monthly schedule, should we calculate the new baby as ONE CHILD under his monthly salary and add the \$520 for the child support he pays now?

For example: With a monthly salary of \$3460, $\$492(\text{ONE CHILD}) + \$520 (\text{CURRENT CHILD SUPPORT}) = \1012

Thanks for your time.

16. From: DR
Sent: Saturday, October 27, 2012 3:01 PM
Subject: child support

I have a question concerning child support. Oct 11, 1012 we had our divorce hearing. Child support and visitation were reserved, it was signed and uncontested. When I appeared for court, his lawyer added child support in the amount of 327\$ a month and well as a month in the summer for visits. My concern is. Nobody saw any of documents pertaining to my income. My hours, nor my wages. He provided false job information to his attorney. I cannot afford this amount. He knew that when he refused to negotiate what I could afford. Then they decided to add into the divorce all matters are to be resolved in the children's jurisdiction which is AL. How am I supposed to get anything taken care of in my state of residence when they don't want anything to do with the situation. AL wants me to come in to all these offices to get anything done, which is impossible due to my financial issues. I am really at a lose here and no direction of which way to go.

Thank You