

## STATE OF CONNECTICUT COMMISSION FOR CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, October 5, 2023 – 5:00-7:00 P.M.

## Conducted via Microsoft Teams

5:00 – 5:05 C	Call to order, provision for meeting minutes
5:05 - 6:00 ·	Assignment of Topics to Commission Members  Imputation of income and minimum wage orders  Actual evidence of income  How should weekly work hours be determined?  Should the obligor's profession be taken into consideration?  What other factors should be considered?  Should the court be expected to obtain and review relevant DOL data?  Changes needed for higher income orders.  E.g., how to handle cash and executive compensation bonuses  How to handle orders where income is lower than what is contemplated by the guidelines  How to handle lump sum awards considering the rule established in <i>Jenkins v. Jenkins</i> , 243 Conn. 584, 704 A.2d 231 (1998)  Adoption of current order when there is an arrearage at time child emancipates  Arrearages calculations  Incarcerated individuals i.e., released from jail on 3/29/23, arrears

- Methodology for orders in instances of shared custody
- Crediting other orders
  - o even if not fully paid when calculating available income 46b-215a-1(I)(i)
  - Giving credit for the voluntary support of a dependent child who is not residing with an obligor (i.e., treating such a child as a "qualified child") when calculating the presumptive support amount – 46b-215a-5c(b)(4)(C)
- Addressing situations where there are more than 2 parents following passage of the CT Parentage Act
- Providing or defining a method for calculating a monthly and/or bi-weekly expression of child support in the guidelines
- Setting an age at which the childcare contribution portion of a support order terminates, unless ordered otherwise by the court 46b-215a-2c(g)
- Protecting an actual amount of the obligor's income as a self-support reserve, as is done in some other states (see, e.g., slide 14 of Dr. Venohr's initial presentation, for Arizona's method and slides 25-26 from her more recent presentation for more information) This topic needs to be given priority because Dr. Venohr needs a decision from the Commission in order to update the Guidelines schedule
- Creation of an automated calculator in the guidelines (mentioned during discussion of slide 23 of Dr. Venohr's initial presentation)
- \*\* In addition to making a decision about how to move forward with the low-income adjustment approach, we need to make a decision about whether:
- (1) to the extent the current methodology for making a low-income adjustment is maintained using the shading on the Guidelines schedule, the shading should be expanded to higher incomes;
- (2) the current Guidelines schedule should be extended beyond \$4,000/week (perhaps to \$5,000/week?); and
- (3) the data from the updated Betson-Rothbarth study (which the Commission has already voted to use) should be adjusted to Connecticut incomes and cost-of-living using the income-realignment or price-parity methodology (see slides 8-12 of Dr. Venohr's most recent presentation)

6:00 - 6:30	Presentation of findings and recommendations to Commission
	<ul> <li>Assigned Commission members will be responsible for researching the topics, presenting the issue to the broader Commission, and making a recommendation</li> <li>Commission members assigned to the same topic can correspond by email, but are not expected to meet</li> <li>Chief Magistrate Ferguson, Attorney Pruslow, and Attorney Shaffer will work with Commission members on all topics</li> <li>Commission members should be prepared to present to the broader Commission when assigned to do so at a regular meeting. This presentation should include a description of the issue or problem that needs to be addressed, how previous Commissions addressed the issue, if at all, any relevant case law or other sources of law that are relevant to the issue, and a recommendation on how the current Commission should handle the issue.</li> </ul>
6:30 – 7:00	Open discussion.
7:00	Adjournment