

Folks,

I have included four Tables and four summary slides (overheads I made) for Interim study 97-33 in Oklahoma. These overheads were used in a presentation to the Oklahoma joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee that is charged in Oklahoma with overseeing the State CS guideline review process mandated by Congress. The Family Support Act of 1988 specifies State child support guideline reviews are to occur every 4 years and must consider (1) economic data related to the cost of raising children in the State, and (2) then analyze case data related to the application of and deviations from the child support guidelines. We have got the committee reviewing all of the CS guidelines including costs here in Oklahoma. We have yet to get them to start a case review. The case review can be used to catch judges since a judges opinion and order for CS must match the CPs and NCPs story.

We were informed that the CSE division (CSED) of Oklahoma was going to use an expert named Dr. Maureen Pirog-Good as the justification for raising the CS guidelines here 45-200%. We were able to get over the internet an idea of who she was, and from Dr. Pirog-Good a copy of her unpublished "expert" study. We already were very familiar with USDA cost estimates on expenditures on children by families, the laws, the CS approaches taken by other States, and the history of the approaches.

The first Table (Table 1) I created was one that was used to set the record straight on Pirog-Good's faulty data for Oklahoma. I used it in combination with her primary data given in her report for all of the States to show the variation in CS...especially States where there should be no fluctuation in CS. She obtains her data from either the State DHS or a judicial committee for the State. I have found her data to be wrong for many States. I broke down her records by year, by income (gross and monthly), and gave her CS obligation for the NCP that she had as raw data. She presented cases C, D, and E to Oklahoma's CSED that were all combined parental incomes higher than the median household income for Oklahoma. I then went on to show in the Table the correct amount of CS being paid by the NCP (dollars/month and year), and the CS as a percent of gross income using the correct figures. My intention was to show her data was wrong and start the committee thinking about how much money was being transferred from the NCP to the CP in the name of CS. What I did not get done was an estimated Net income for the NCP and CP after paying CS because I ran out of time. I would recommend it be included in these tables where appropriate.

The second Table is a continuation of the theme but with inclusion of the CP's supposed share for the 5 different cases based on income. I brought up accountability for the CS contributed by the NCP. I also brought up the fact that her \$25/month medical and \$150/month child care tended to dramatically underestimate the CS since these were add-ons in OK. Remember most divorces with children

occur when the children are young and these costs are included.....and often not removed. I also pointed out the poverty levels for both parents or for when a parent because of CS wouldn't qualify for welfare yet they were living in poverty.

Table 3 was used to present total household income for both households...the CP's and NCP's in dollars and as percent of total parental income. This table would be much more informative if presented as NET income also.

The fourth Table is the rankings that Pirog-Good gave to Oklahoma's CSED in the first 4 columns for the States, that just so happened to place Oklahoma last. I used correct values for Oklahoma and revised the rankings pointing out that her values for other States were wrong in the next three columns. The last three columns ranked Oklahoma first since I included both the NCP and CPs share as being as valid as only using the NCP's obligation used in a Percent of Income Approach. They tried to cut me off as I got to this explanation because they didn't want the press reporting it. After this Table, rankings weren't so important anymore to them. This is where knowledge of where your State ranks for median household income can help or hurt you...so be prepared. Oklahoma for example ranks 46<sup>th</sup> out of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. This is good for us, since being number one or number 25 in the rankings says Oklahoman's pay too much.

The four summary slides covered 4 topics including what the committee was supposed to do and Oklahoma's CS guideline approach. There was a slide with fun facts on where Oklahoma ranks in income, USDA estimates for expenditures on children by families, and that allowed me to cover automatic COLAs. There was a third slide dealing with the Pirog-Good study that linked DHS/CSED involvement in manipulating and basically lying to the Committee. One member of the Committee actually was reading from this summary slide (given as a handout prior to starting the meeting that was important) when the head of Oklahoma's CSED was giving his 15 minutes worth. The committee members didn't believe him or asked tough questions with the information they were provided. The fourth slide gave some common sense realities of CS and its impacts on children, NCPs, and CPs.

I will be more than willing to take questions if you have any.

Greg Palumbo  
405-271-1204  
gregory-palumbo@ouhsc.edu

**Table 1. Noncustodial Parent Child Support Obligation that Equals Their Share of the Total Child Support**

Year	Parental Joint Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)				
	830 (9,960)	1,200 (14,400)	2,500 (30,000)	4,400 (52,800)	10,500 (126,000)
	NCP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)				
	530 (6360)	720 (8640)	1500 (18,000)	2,640 (31,680)	6,300 (75,600)
	NCP's Monthly Share of Child Support in Pirog-Good Cases in Dollars (Yearly)				
	A	B	C	D	E
1988	NA¶	283 (3,396)	410 (4,920)	530 (6,360)	916 (10,992)
1991	NA	258 (3,096)	395 (4,740)	505 (6,060)	891 (10,692)
1993	NA	258 (3,096)	385 (4,620)	505 (6,060)	891 (10,692)
1995	NA	250 (3,000)	438 (5,256)	585 (7020)	1027 (12,324)
1997	171 (2,052)	171 (2,052)	295 (3,545)	415 (4985)	801 (9,614)
Correct 1997 OK CS* Amount	213 (2,550)	258 (3,099)	386 (4,625)	506 (6,065)	916 (10,983)
Pirog-Good "Mistake" in CS due	-42 (504)	-87 (1,044)	-91 (1,092)	-91 (1,092)	-115 (1,380)
NCP Monthly Gross Income (%) for CS	40%	35%	25%	19%	15%
NCP Monthly Gross Income after CS (%)	317 (60%)	462 (65%)	1114 (75%)	2134 (81%)	5384 (85%)

§Noncustodial Parent

¶Not Available

\*Child Support

**Table 2. Parent Child Support Obligation that Equals Their Share of the Total Child Support**

Income	Parental Joint Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	830 (9,960)		1,200 (14,400)		2,500 (30,000)		4,400 (52,800)		10,500 (126,000)	
	NCP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	530 (6360)		720 (8640)		1500 (18,000)		2,640 (31,680)		6,300 (75,600)	
	CP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	300 (3600)		480 (5760)		1000 (12,000)		1760 (21,120)		4,200 (50,400)	
	Monthly Share of Child Support in Pirog-Good Cases in Dollars (Yearly)									
	A (64/36)		B (60/40)		C (60/40)		D (60/40)		E (60/40)	
	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP
Correct 1997 OK CS* Guideline Amount	213 (2,550)	113 (1,358)	258 (3,099)	189 (2,266)	386 (4,625)	274 (3,284)	506 (6,065)	354 (4,244)	916 (10,983)	627 (7,522)
NCP or CP % of Gross Income for CS	40%	38%	35%	39%	25%	27%	19%	20%	15%	15%
Total Parental CS	326 (3,912)		447 (5,364)		660 (7,920)		860 (10,320)		1543 (18,516)	
CS as % Gross Parental Income	39.3%		37.3%		26.4%		19.5%		14.7%	

§Noncustodial Parent (NCP) or Custodial Parent (CP)

\*Child Support

**Table 3. Household Income**

Income	Parental Joint Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	830 (9,960)		1,200 (14,400)		2,500 (30,000)		4,400 (52,800)		10,500 (126,000)	
	NCP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	530 (6360)		720 (8640)		1500 (18,000)		2,640 (31,680)		6,300 (75,600)	
	CP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)									
	300 (3600)		480 (5760)		1000 (12,000)		1760 (21,120)		4,200 (50,400)	
	Monthly Share of Child Support in Pirog-Good Cases in Dollars (Yearly)									
	A (64/36)		B (60/40)		C (60/40)		D (60/40)		E (60/40)	
	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	CP
Correct 1997 OK CS* Guideline Amount	213 (2,550)	113 (1,358)	258 (3,099)	189 (2,266)	386 (4,625)	274 (3,284)	506 (6,065)	354 (4,244)	916 (10,983)	627 (7,522)
NCP or CP % of Gross Income for CS	40%	38%	35%	39%	25%	27%	19%	20%	15%	15%
Monthly Gross Income after CS (%)	317 (60%)	187 (62%)	462 (65%)	291 (61%)	1114 (75%)	726 (73%)	2134 (81%)	1406 (80%)	5384 (85%)	3,573 (85%)
Actual Gross Income (% Parental)	317 (38%)	513 (62%)	462 (38%)	738 (62%)	1114 (44%)	1386 (56%)	2134 (48%)	2266 (52%)	5384 (51%)	5116 (49%)

§Noncustodial Parent (NCP) or Custodial Parent (CP)

\*Child Support

**Table 4. Ranking by State for Child Support Awards**

State	CS Model‡	P-G NCP Average	Rank	State	Revised NCP Average	Revised Rank	State	CS Model	Parental CS Average	Revised Rank
Massachusetts	C	*	1	Massachusetts	*	1	Oklahoma	IS	1021	1
Alabama	IS	*	2	Alabama	*	2	Massachusetts	C	*	2
Utah	IS	*	3	Utah	*	3	Alabama	IS	*	3
Pennsylvania	IS	*	4	Pennsylvania	*	4	Utah	IS	*	4
Indiana	IS	1018	5	Indiana	1018	5	Pennsylvania	IS	*	5
California	IS	902	6	California	902	6	Indiana	IS	1018	6
New York	PI	894	7	New York	894	7	California	IS	902	7
Georgia	PI	888	8	Georgia	888	8	West Virginia	M	882	8
West Virginia	M	882	9	West Virginia	882	9	New Jersey	IS	850	9
Wisconsin	PI	870	10	Wisconsin	870	10	Arizona	IS	824	10
Nevada	PI	870	11	Nevada	870	11	Florida	IS	790	11
New Hampshire	PI	855	12	New Hampshire	855	12	Hawaii	M	780	12
New Jersey	IS	850	13	New Jersey	850	13	Washington	IS	779	13
Tennessee	PI	827	14	Tennessee	827	14	Rhode Island	IS	776	14
Arizona	IS	824	15	Arizona	824	15	Delaware	M	750	15
Florida	IS	790	16	Florida	790	16	Michigan	IS	734	16
Hawaii	M	780	17	Hawaii	780	17	Maryland	IS	726	17
Washington	IS	779	18	Washington	779	18	South Dakota	IS	723	18
Rhode Island	IS	776	19	Rhode Island	776	19	Louisiana	IS	723	19
Connecticut	PI	768	20	Connecticut	768	20	Kansas	IS	722	20
Delaware	M	750	21	Delaware	750	21	New Mexico	IS	717	21
Minnesota	PI	737	22	Minnesota	737	22	South Carolina	IS	712	22
Michigan	IS	734	23	Michigan	734	23	Virginia	IS	710	23
Maryland	IS	726	24	Maryland	726	24	Ohio	IS	706	24
South Dakota	IS	723	25	South Dakota	723	25	Nebraska	IS	701	25
Louisiana	IS	723	26	Louisiana	723	26	Kentucky	IS	700	26
North Dakota	PI	723	27	North Dakota	723	27	Vermont	IS	698	27
Kansas	IS	722	28	Kansas	722	28	Missouri	IS	696	28
New Mexico	IS	717	29	New Mexico	717	29	Maine	IS	696	29
South Carolina	IS	712	30	South Carolina	712	30	Colorado	IS	696	30
Virginia	IS	710	31	Virginia	710	31	North Carolina	IS	692	31
Ohio	IS	706	32	Ohio	706	32	Iowa	IS	657	32
Nebraska	IS	701	33	Nebraska	701	33	Oregon	IS	652	33
Kentucky	IS	700	34	Kentucky	700	34	Idaho	IS	608	34
Vermont	IS	698	35	Vermont	698	35	Montana	M	542	35
Missouri	IS	696	36	Missouri	696	36	New York	PI	894	36
Maine	IS	696	37	Maine	696	37	Georgia	PI	888	37
Colorado	IS	696	38	Colorado	696	38	Wisconsin	PI	870	38
North Carolina	IS	692	39	North Carolina	692	39	Nevada	PI	870	39
Alaska	PI	684	40	Alaska	684	40	New Hampshire	PI	855	40
Iowa	IS	657	41	Iowa	657	41	Tennessee	PI	827	41
Oregon	IS	652	42	Oregon	652	42	Connecticut	PI	768	42
Texas	PI	643	43	Texas	643	43	Minnesota	PI	737	43
Idaho	IS	608	44	Idaho	608	44	North Dakota	PI	723	44
Arkansas	PI	602	45	Oklahoma	603	45	Alaska	PI	684	45
Illinois	PI	600	46	Arkansas	602	46	Texas	PI	643	46
Wyoming	PI	583	47	Illinois	600	47	Arkansas	PI	602	47
Montana	M	542	48	Wyoming	583	48	Illinois	PI	600	48
Mississippi	PI	529	49	Montana	542	49	Wyoming	PI	583	49
Oklahoma	IS	504	50	Mississippi	529	50	Mississippi	PI	529	50
National Avg		733								

‡Income Shares (IS), Percent of Income (PI), Melson-Delaware (M)

## Summary for 1997 Oklahoma Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee Interim Study 97-33

- The Family Support Act of 1988 specifies State child support guideline reviews are to occur every 4 years and must consider (1) economic data related to the cost of raising children in the State, and (2) then analyze case data related to the application of and deviations from the child support guidelines.
- The income-shares model is used in Oklahoma. This approach increases the dollar amount allocated to raising children as income level of both parents increases, but takes into account the actual percentage of parental income spent on a child decreases as income increases. Upon determining from the guidelines the appropriate support amount for the children, the child support is apportioned between the parents based on each parent's proportion of the total parent income.

## Summary for 1997 Oklahoma Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee Interim Study 97-33

- Oklahoma's median family income in 1996 was \$27,437. Oklahoma ranks 46 out of the 50 States and the District of Columbia for median family income.
- Most families in Oklahoma would fall into the low income category earning less than \$33,800/year, as defined by the USDA in 1995, when determining their estimates on expenditures on children by families. This is equal to Dr. M. Pirog-Good's case A presented to the DHS.
- USDA estimates on expenditures on children by families as a percent of gross income for food, clothing, housing, medical, education, childcare, miscellaneous, and transportation have not changed since 1985.
- USDA use of per capita or cost share methodology for determining expenditures on children by families inflates the cost for miscellaneous, housing, and transportation expenses for children resulting in alimony/lifestyle support in the award.
- USDA estimates on expenditures on children by families includes medical and childcare expenses. The addition of these expenses to the basic child support award amount in Oklahoma results in noncustodial parents paying twice for the same expenses; i.e. alimony/lifestyle support again is being termed child support.
- Oklahoma's present child support guidelines result in child support obligations for both parents that are equivalent to the inflated costs associated with raising children given by the USDA.
- Since Oklahoma child support is based on a percentage of joint parental gross income, modification of child support due to increases or decreases in parental income are accounted for in the income shares approach to determining child support. Automatic COLAs are therefore unnecessary and would not reflect actual parental income.



## Summary for 1997 Oklahoma Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee Interim Study 97-33

- Almost all of the data from an unpublished manuscript by Pirog-Good, Klotz, and Byers that was presented by Dr. Pirog-Good to the Oklahoma DHS is wrong.
- The data Dr. Pirog-Good has collected from the Oklahoma DHS has varied from year to year even though the Oklahoma child support guidelines have not been changed.
- The information supplied by the Oklahoma DHS to Pirog-Good on child support determinations for 5 cases in 1997 was substantially lower than the correct child support amount as determined using Oklahoma child support guidelines.
- Presumably the Oklahoma DHS paid Dr. Pirog-Good to present her expert “findings” to the Oklahoma DHS for Interim study 97-33.
- Dr. Pirog-Good’s flawed/wrong data obtained from the Oklahoma DHS, wrongly place Oklahoma with the lowest average child support award in the nation.
- Dr. Pirog-Good’s flawed rankings do not take into account the child support guideline approaches used by the different States or the differences between them.
- Oklahoma ranks somewhere between 1st and 34th in the nation in total joint parental child support for two children yet has a median family income that ranks it 46th out of 50 States and the District of Columbia.
- Based on present child support guidelines in Oklahoma and median family income, Oklahoman’s are being assessed too much child support today and have been since implementation of the child support guidelines mandated by the Family Support Act of 1988.

## Summary for 1997 Oklahoma Joint House and Senate Judiciary Committee Interim Study 97-33

- Noncustodial parents and custodial parents require sufficient income that allow them to support their children while parenting.
- Noncustodial parents and custodial parents already by law are forced to dedicate too much of their gross income to child support.
- Noncustodial parents are forced to account for child support transferred to the custodial parent, yet the custodial parent is not accountable for the child support.
- Oklahoma child support guidelines contain alimony for the custodial parent.
- The income share model used in Oklahoma allows for changes in cost of living through modifications of child support, making COLAs unnecessary.
- Non-scientific increases in child support guidelines will impoverish noncustodial parents and will ultimately jeopardize the children they support.
- Non-scientific increases in child support guidelines will jeopardize the well being of children present in second families containing noncustodial parents, including those containing a custodial parent.
- Child support cannot replace government assistance/entitlements to poor families in Oklahoma unless it is greater than \$17,700/year gross income.
- Child support payments do not remove families from the welfare rolls.
- Impoverishing noncustodial parents through oppressive child support guidelines, thereby forcing them to obtain additional employment with the threat of jail, benefits the State and Federal government foremost in the form of increased tax revenue.
- Oppressive child support guidelines that impoverish noncustodial parents creates beat dead parents, who are not true deadbeats, while justifying the child support enforcement industry.