Questions for all Sponsors of HB366/SB125

1. Did you read the entire Child Support Review Report?
2. Did you read the attached Economic Study?
3. Do you realize that the suggested tables are not based on Ohio specific data?
4. Did Jane Venohr,Ph.D. of Center for Policy Research testify before the committee as to the validity of her research and data?
5. Did Jane Venohr,Ph.D., Center for Policy Research, Denver, CO reveal that there exists a conflict of interest to the committee since the Center for Policy Research is owned by Maximus, Inc. which specializes in selling government management software systems?
6. Did Jane Venohr,Ph.D., Center for Policy Research, Denver, CO reveal that there exists a conflict of interest to Jobs and Family Services since the Center for Policy Research is owned by Maximus, Inc. which specializes in selling government management software systems?
7. Do you realize that every county child support agency, the state agency, and the courts will have to invest a significant amount of money in new software?
8. Where is that money going to come from?
9. Can you explain why you support changing Ohio's calculations from time shares which it has been since 1992 to the much less used income shares method of calculation?
10. You do know that Center for Policy Research was called Policy Studies and did the original tables and recommendations for Ohio in 1992?
11. Did you know that they admitted those tables were flawed?
12. Did you run any calculations to see how a case would be affected? We did and it was a 7% increase on the low end and up to 27% on the higher end.

Line Items changes in the bill that need to be supported

13. Line 65 - Why are we using not Ohio specific numbers in regards to the price index?
14. Line 72 - Federal poverty level is likely to change with the changes of ACH.
15. Line 80 – Tax deduction for local taxes that is taken away in the new worksheet is inconsistent with the manner in which Ohio and the Federal government handles tax returns and their deductions. This problem becomes greater with the self-employed.
16. Line 129 – Why are adopted child not included in the calculations? The same expenses exist for them within the household. Under the tax code they are eligible for a credit the same as a natural child.
17. Line 151 – Define ordinary medical expense. This comes into some discussions that have happened in regards to Medicaid expansion where we talked about the use of the emergency room for common problems versa less expensive clinics and physicians or nurse assistants.
18. Line 249 – The tables as created are based on data that is not state specific. The use of regional data will always skew the data of the states involved. You will get no argument from me that the tables which were created in 1992 need to be updated but they need to be updated solely on the economics of Ohio. When I previously looked at cost of living expenses of the states with what the federal government considers this region, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, it was found that the states of Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin had significantly higher costs of living that Ohio and Michigan. Those higher costs of living should not be used in anything involved in calculations of Ohio law. If we apply common sense and the methods that Ohio applies to its own budget the question comes up; Do we use

the needs of other states or the needs of Ohioans when creating our budget? The same principle must be applied to all aspects of Ohio law, including these tables.

19. Line 502 – I am and have raised significant issues with this change from the "Time Shares" to "Income Shares" method of calculating Ohio's child support with the significant conflicts of interest that do exist. The shift from our current time shares method to income shares method will thrown Ohio into a minority in the use of this method which was admitted by Jane Venohr when she swayed Illinois to change their methodology and admitting to their legislation that the "Time Shares" method produced more equitable results across the board.
20. Line 957 – The use of the federal level of poverty plus 16% is inconsistent with Ohio used calculation amount of 133% for Medicaid eligibility in the calculation of the child support reserve.
21. Line 1031 – This section is unclear as to where the recalculation data should come from. This needs to be specific that only Ohio economic data be used in any recalculation of the basic child support tables.
22. Line 1063 – The make-up of this child support review council remains suspect in weighting. It is non-specific as to who or how many obligors or obligees should be appointed and by whom. The over weighting of the council by the legal communities obscures the effectiveness of this as an independent review process. While this is supposedly advertised by JFS they greatly fail to openly announce that the process is beginning and where the meetings are to be held. Even if found on line on the JFS website, the materials provided to the council are not made publicly available.
23. Line 1152 - The use of a complicated formula to give credit to a paying parent falls short of giving full and proper credit for the support that a parent for which they are supporting.
24. Line 1352 – I have to seriously question why we are allowing any parent to shirk their responsibility to a child and then to do it on a discretionary basis.
25. Line 1434 – Here is that inconsistent use of the federal poverty level and the way that it is used in other section of Ohio law. The support reserve with this suggests 116%. Medicaid expansion suggests 133%. Food stamp eligibility is set at 150% of the federal poverty level.
26. Line 1487 – There have been several suggestions made on extended time of the years. The setting of an actual base time for which the court may order a deviation is not acceptable as one day can make a huge swing in the obligation of child support. The simplest approach was put forth in 2011 when it was suggested that the deviation be automatic and be based on the percentage of time with each parent.
27. Line 1597 – It is the obligation of the legislation to establish formulas not that of the courts. Courts are for decisding legal matters not setting law. It appears that someone forgot the basic principle of separation of powers.
28. Lacking for the bill is instruction as to whether a current order is to continue to follow current tables and current law or if they have been are to be recalculated at the earlier date to these new tables.
29. Also missing is whether the agencies may or may not change the obligations of a obligor when the support order comes up for it three year review.

walk everybody through them. [CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION]

SENATOR CAMPBELL: That would be fine, thank you. [CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION]

JANE VENOHR: Okay, so...thank you. Last meeting, we talked about one of the things that all states are charged with when they review their guidelines is to consider current economic data on child-rearing costs as part of their review. So the best way to do that is to take some of the economic data and put it in a format similar to whatever that state is using on their child support table. So to get from the point of looking at that study of child-rearing costs, such as the USDA, which is on-line and referenced on my PowerPoint, to a format similar to the table that Nebraska uses, I have to make a lot of various assumptions. So the last meeting, on September 30th, we went through what those assumptions were. The committee gave me some...the commission gave me some direction. And in short, they asked me to develop six updated tables using various assumptions, including both the USDA measurements of child-rearing costs, and some with those...with the Betson-Rothbarth measurements. The USDA and the Betson-Rothbarth measurements are the most current economic studies of child-rearing costs available. The Rothbarth estimator is known to understate actual child-rearing costs, and the USDA is considered the highest bound. And there's lots of studies out there, including one that's conducted by the federal level, that says a stake (sic) may use our...it's not a "may." They may want to consider using anything between the lower and the upper credible bound. Is everybody following me so far? [CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION]

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Are there any questions? Okay. No, Dr. Venohr, I think you can proceed. [CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION]

JANE VENOHR: Okay. So, in short, there's two sets of tables, one with the USDA and the other set with the Betson-Rothbarth. And then another consideration is the medical

Support Guideline Model

- When parents do not reside together, the law requires child support guidelines must be used to determine the amount awarded for the support of minor children.
- Illinois currently uses the Percentage of Obligor Net Income model.
- Most (over 40) states use the Income Shares model.
- On July 1, 2017, Illinois will join the majority of states by also utilizing the Income Shares model.