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 Pirog-Good a copy of her unpublished "expert" study.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 46th 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)									
	Α	В	С	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	317	462	1114	2134	5384					
Income after CS (%)	(60%)	(65%)	(75%)	(81%)	(85%)					

§Noncustodial Parent

¶Not Available

^{*}Child Support

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

	Parental Joint Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)											
	830 (9	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)									
Income	530 (6360)	720 (8640)		1500 (18,000)		2,640 (31,680)		6,300 (75,600)			
			С	P's§ Gross M	lonthly Inc	come in Do	ollars (Yea	arly)	-			
	300 (3600)	480	(5760)	1000 (12,000)	1760	(21,120)	4,200 (50,400)		
		Мо	nthly Shar	e of Child Sup	port in Pi	rog-Good	Cases in	Dollars (Ye	early)			
	A (6	4/36)	B (60/40)		C (60/40)		D (60/40)		E (60/40)			
	NCP CP		NCP	СР	NCP	СР	NCP	CP	NCP	СР		
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%	3	7.3%	26.	.4%	19	0.5%	14.	7%		

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

^{*}Child Support

Table 3. Household 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 (530 (6360)		720 (8640)		1500 (18,000)		2,640 (31,680)		6,300 (75,600)			
Income		CP's§ Gross Monthly Income in Dollars (Yearly)											
	300 (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	СР	NCP	CP	NCP	CP	NCP	СР	NCP	CP			
Correct 1997 OK	213	113	258	189	386	274	506	354	916	627			
CS* Guideline Amount	(2,550)	(1,358)	(3,099)	(2,266)	(4,625)	(3,284)	(6,065)	(4,244)	(10,983)	(7,522)			
NCP or CP % of Gross Income for	40%	38%	35%	39%	25%	27%	19%	20%	15%	15%			
CS THEOTHE TO	4070	3070	3370	3370	2570	21 /0	1370	2070	1370	1370			
Monthly Gross	317	187	462	291	1114	726	2134	1406	5384	3,573			
Income after CS (%)	(60%)	(62%)	(65%)	(61%)	(75%)	(73%)	(81%)	(80%)	(85%)	(85%)			
Actual Gross	317	513	462	738	1114	1386	2134	2266	5384	5116			
Income (% Parental)	(38%)	(62%)	(38%)	(62%)	(44%)	(56%)	(48%)	(52%)	(51%)	(49%)			

§Noncustodial Parent (NCP) or Custodial Parent (CP)
*Child Support

Table 4. Ranking by State for Child Support Awards

New Hampshire PI 870	State	CS Model‡	P-G NCP Average	Rank	State	Revised NCP Average	Revised Rank	State	CS Model	Parental CS Average	Revised Rank
	Massachusetts	С	*	1	Massachusetts	*	1	Oklahoma	IS	1021	1
Permisylvania S	Alabama	IS	*	2	Alabama	*	2	Massachusetts	С	*	2
Tendersyman 15	Utah	IS	*	3	Utah	*	3	Alabama	IS	*	3
California 15 70.0 70.	Pennsylvania	IS	*	4	Pennsylvania	*	4	Utah	IS	*	4
New York	Indiana	IS	1018	5	Indiana	1018	5	Pennsylvania	IS	*	5
Secrigia Pi 888 8 Secrigia 888 8 West Virginia M 882 West Virginia M 882 9 West Virginia 882 9 New Jersey IS 850 West Virginia 870 10 Arizona IS 824 Newdad Pi 870 11 Newada 870 11 Florida IS 790 New Hampshire Pi 855 12 New Hampshire 855 12 Hawaii M 780 Tennessee Pi 827 14 Tennessee 827 14 Rhode Island IS 776 Arizona IS 824 Tennessee Pi 827 14 Tennessee 827 14 Rhode Island IS 776 Arizona IS 824 15 Delaware M 750 Tennessee Pi 824 15 Arizona IS 824 15 Delaware M 750 Tennessee Region Regi	California	IS	902	6	California	902	6	Indiana	IS	1018	6
West Virginia M 882 9 West Virginia 882 9 New Jorsey IS 850 Wisconsin PI 870 10 Wisconsin 870 11 Florida IS 824 New Hampehire PI 850 12 New Hampehire 855 12 Hawaii M 790 New Hampehire IS 850 13 New Hampehire 855 12 Hawaii M 790 New Jersey IS 855 12 New Hampehire 855 12 Hawaii M 790 Ternenssee PI 827 14 Robel Island IS 776 15 Profide Florida IS 790 16 Florida 15 Deloware M 790 16 Michigan IS 726 Hawaiiigon 15 779 18 Washington 779 18 South Carolina IS 723 25 Louisiana	New York	PI	894	7	New York	894	7	California	IS	902	7
Wisconsin PI 870 10 Wisconsin 870 10 Aizona IS 824 Nevada PI 870 11 Nevada 870 11 Florida IS 790 New Hampshire PI 885 12 New Jampshire 855 12 Hawaii M 780 New Jersey IS 850 13 New Jersey 850 13 Washington IS 779 Tornessee PI 827 14 Tarnessee 824 15 Delsware M 780 Florida IS 790 16 Florida IS 794 IS 734 I Hawaii 770 17 Maryland IS 772 18 South Dakota IS 722 IS Hosaii M 780 17 Hawaii 776 19 Louisiana IS 723 IS 722 IS 723 IS 72	Georgia	PI	888	8	Georgia	888	8	West Virginia	М	882	8
Newdama PI 870 11 Newdama 870 11 Florida IS 790 P New Hampshire PI 855 12 New Hampshire 855 12 Hawaii M 780 780 New Jersey IS 850 13 Washington IS 779 15 Reservation 13 Washington IS 779 16 Michigan IS 776 78 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 88 72 72 72 88 72 72 72 72 88 72 72 72 88 72 72	West Virginia	М	882	9	West Virginia	882	9	New Jersey	IS	850	9
New Hampshire PI 855 12 New Hampshire 855 12 Hawaii M 780 New Jersey IS 850 13 New Jersey 850 13 Washington IS 779 Tennessee PI 827 14 Tennessee 827 14 Rhode Island IS 776 IS Florida IS 90 16 Florida 790 16 Michigan IS 734 IS Hawaii M 780 17 Hawaii 780 17 Maryland IS 726 IS 776 18 Washington 779 18 South Dakota IS 723 IS	Wisconsin	PI	870	10	Wisconsin	870	10	Arizona	IS	824	10
New Jersey	Nevada	PI	870	11	Nevada	870	11	Florida	IS	790	11
Tennessee	New Hampshire	PI	855	12	New Hampshire	855	12	Hawaii	М	780	12
Tennessee	New Jersey	IS	850	13	New Jersey	850	13	Washington	IS	779	13
Arizona IS 824 15 Arizona 824 15 Delaware M 750 Florida IS 790 16 Florida 790 16 Michigan IS 734 Hawaii 780 17 Mayland IS 726 IS 726 IS 726 IS 726 IS 726 IS 723 IT Hawaii 176 19 Mayland IS 723 IS 723 IS PROS IS 776 19 Rhode Island IS 708 20 Connecticut 776 19 Louisiana IS 723 IS 723 IS 722 Immediate IS 723 IS 721<		PI	827	14	-	827	14			776	14
Florida	Arizona										15
Hawaii											16
Washington IS 779 18 Washington 779 18 South Dakota IS 723 Rhode Island IS 776 19 Rhode Island 776 19 Louisiana IS 723 IS Connecticut PI 768 20 Connecticut 768 20 Kansas IS 722 IS Delaware M 750 21 Delaware 760 21 New Mexico IS 717 IS Michigan IS 734 23 Michigan 734 23 Virginia IS 710 IS South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 25 Netrosta IS 700 IS South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Wermort <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Hawaii</td><td></td><td></td><td>ŭ</td><td></td><td></td><td>17</td></t<>					Hawaii			ŭ			17
Rhode Island								,			18
Connecticut											19
Delaware M 750 21 Delaware 750 21 New Mexico IS 717 Minnesota Minnesota PI 737 22 Minnesota 737 22 South Carolina IS 712 IS Michigan IS 734 23 Michigan 734 23 Virginia IS 710 Michigan Manyland IS 726 24 Manyland 726 24 Ohio IS 700 IS South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 25 Nebraska IS 700 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 696 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 722 Missouri IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS											20
Minnesota PI 737 22 Minnesota 737 22 South Carolina IS 712 Michigan IS 734 23 Michigan 734 23 Virginia IS 710 I South Dakota IS 726 24 Maryland 726 24 Ohio IS 706 IS South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 IS North Dakota IS 723 26 Louisiana 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 698 IS Kansas IS 717 29 Nex Missouri IS 696											21
Michigan IS 734 23 Michigan 734 23 Virginia IS 710 Manyland Manyland IS 726 24 Manyland 726 24 Ohio IS 706 IS South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 25 Nebraska IS 700 IS North Dakota IS 723 26 Louisiana 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 696 IS Kansas IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 IS South Carolina IS 7112 30 South Carolina IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 692 IS 696											22
Maryland IS 726 24 Maryland 726 24 Ohio IS 706 South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 25 Nebraska IS 701 I Louisiana IS 723 26 Louisiana 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 I North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 698 I Kansas IS 722 28 Kansas 722 28 Missouri IS 696 I New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 I Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 696 IS 692 IS 667 I <td></td> <td>23</td>											23
South Dakota IS 723 25 South Dakota 723 25 Nebraska IS 701 Louisiana IS 723 26 Louisiana 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 IS North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 698 IS Kansas IS 7722 28 Kansas 722 28 Missouri IS 696 IS New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 IS South Carolina IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 696 2 Virginia IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 692 IS Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 770 34 Kentucky Missouri <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td></td><td>24</td></td<>					-			_			24
Louisiana IS 723 26 Louisiana 723 26 Kentucky IS 700 North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 698 1 Kansas IS 722 28 Kansas 722 28 Missouri IS 696 2 New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico IS 696 2 South Carolina IS 712 30 South Carolina 712 30 Colorado IS 696 2 Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 1 Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 657 1 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 1 Kentucky <t< td=""><td>•</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>25</td></t<>	•										25
North Dakota PI 723 27 North Dakota 723 27 Vermont IS 698 Kansas IS 722 28 Kansas 722 28 Missouri IS 696 2 New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 2 South Carolina IS 712 30 South Carolina 712 30 Colorado IS 696 2 Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 1 Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 657 1 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 662 1 Kentucky IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 1 </td <td></td> <td>26</td>											26
Kansas IS 722 28 Kansas 722 28 Missouri IS 696 New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 1 South Carolina IS 712 30 South Carolina 712 30 Colorado IS 696 1 Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 1 Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 lowa IS 657 1 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 1S 608 1S 652 1 Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 1 Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 698 35 Montana M 542 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td><td></td><td></td><td>27</td></td<>								,			27
New Mexico IS 717 29 New Mexico 717 29 Maine IS 696 South Carolina IS 712 30 South Carolina 712 30 Colorado IS 696 P Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 P Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 657 P Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 P Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 IS 608 IS 608 IS 608 IS 608 Mortana M 542 P 894 W M 542 P 888 IS Colorado 696 37 Georgia PI 888 P </td <td></td> <td>28</td>											28
South Carolina IS 712 30 South Carolina 712 30 Colorado IS 696 Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 657 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 IS Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 IS 609 36 Missouri 696 37 Georgia PI 884 IS 609 37 Georgia PI 870 IS 609 38 Wisconsin PI 870 IS 609 38 Wisconsin											
Virginia IS 710 31 Virginia 710 31 North Carolina IS 692 Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 Iowa IS 657 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 IM Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 IM Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 IM Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 Alaska PI 684 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>29</td></td<>											29
Ohio IS 706 32 Ohio 706 32 lowa IS 657 Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 IS Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 IS Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 IS Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 IS 870 I											30
Nebraska IS 701 33 Nebraska 701 33 Oregon IS 652 Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 65											31
Kentucky IS 700 34 Kentucky 700 34 Idaho IS 608 Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652						_					32
Vermont IS 698 35 Vermont 698 35 Montana M 542 Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 870 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Minnesota <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>, ,</td><td></td><td></td><td>33</td></td<>								, ,			33
Missouri IS 696 36 Missouri 696 36 New York PI 894 Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 PI Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North D						_					34
Maine IS 696 37 Maine 696 37 Georgia PI 888 Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI											35
Colorado IS 696 38 Colorado 696 38 Wisconsin PI 870 North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas											36
North Carolina IS 692 39 North Carolina 692 39 Nevada PI 870 Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 602 Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois								_			37
Alaska PI 684 40 Alaska 684 40 New Hampshire PI 855 Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 643 Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583											38
Iowa IS 657 41 Iowa 657 41 Tennessee PI 827 Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 PI Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 PI Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 PI Wyoming PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 643 PI Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 583 Oklahoma IS 50											39
Oregon IS 652 42 Oregon 652 42 Connecticut PI 768 Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 1 Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 1 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 1 Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 643 1 Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 1 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>40</td></t<>											40
Texas PI 643 43 Texas 643 43 Minnesota PI 737 Idaho Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 PI 684 Illinois PI 643 PI 602 PI 602 PI 602 PI 602 PI 602 PI 600 PI 600 PI 600 PI 600 PI 600 PI 600											41
Idaho IS 608 44 Idaho 608 44 North Dakota PI 723 Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 Illinois PI 643 PI 643 Illinois 602 46 Texas PI 643 Illinois MI 47 Arkansas PI 602 Illinois MI 47 Arkansas PI 602 Illinois MI 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Illinois MI 600 Illinois MI MI 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Illinois MI MI 600 Illinois MI MI 600 Illinois MI MI 600 Illinois MI					.	_					42
Arkansas PI 602 45 Oklahoma 603 45 Alaska PI 684 Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 643 Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529											43
Illinois PI 600 46 Arkansas 602 46 Texas PI 643 Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529						-					44
Wyoming PI 583 47 Illinois 600 47 Arkansas PI 602 Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529			602	45							45
Montana M 542 48 Wyoming 583 48 Illinois PI 600 Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529	Illinois		600			_		Texas			46
Mississippi PI 529 49 Montana 542 49 Wyoming PI 583 Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529	, ,			47	Illinois						47
Oklahoma IS 504 50 Mississippi 529 50 Mississippi PI 529	Montana	М	542	48	Wyoming	583	48	Illinois	PI	600	48
	Mississippi	PI	529	49	Montana	542	49	, ,	PI	583	49
	Oklahoma	IS	504	50	Mississippi	529	50	Mississippi	PI	529	50
through Chang (IC) Deposit of Income (DI) Malgar Delawaya (M)	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 the 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 therefor 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.