

## **MINUTES**

**March 23, 2018**

### **NEVADA CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING TO REVIEW CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT GUIDELINES IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 278 OF THE 2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION.**

The public meeting to review child support enforcement guidelines was brought to order by committee vice chair Dawn Throne at 1:04 p.m. on Friday, March 23, 2018. This meeting was video-conferenced between the Legislative Counsel Bureau, 401 South Carson Street, Hearing Room 3137, Carson City, NV and the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Hearing Room 4401, Las Vegas, NV. The meeting was also accessible via teleconference.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kathleen Baker, Washoe County District Attorney's Office  
Karen Cliffe, Clark County District Attorney's Office  
Ellen Crecelius, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy  
Charles Hoskin, Family Division of the Eighth Judicial District Court  
Cathy Kaplan, Child Support Chief, Division of Welfare and Supportive Services  
Assemblyman Keith Pickard  
Bridget E. Robb, Family Division of the Second Judicial District Court  
Senator Michael Roberson  
Jim Shirley, Family Division of the Eleventh Judicial District Court  
Dawn Throne, Family Law Section of the State Bar of Nevada

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Patricia Farley  
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo  
Joseph Sanford, Churchill County District Attorney's Association  
Kim Surratt, Family Law Section of the State Bar of Nevada

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE:**

Lidia Stiglich, Justice, Nevada Supreme Court

#### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Joy Tomlinson, Administrative Assistant IV, Division of Welfare and Support Services  
Rebecca Lindelow, Family Services Supervisor, DWSS  
Kiersten Gallagher, Social Services Manager, DWSS  
Amy Crowe, Senior Deputy Attorney General

#### **GUESTS PRESENT – NORTH**

Glen Baker  
Areli Galvan

**GUESTS PRESENT – SOUTH**

None

**GUESTS PRESENT VIA TELEPHONE:**

Michael McDonald  
Jimmy Carr  
Alexander Falconi

**Agenda Item #1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

The public meeting to review child support enforcement guidelines was brought to order by committee vice chair Dawn Throne at 1:04 p.m. Roll call was taken. Cathy Kaplan was present in place of Ms. Murray. Judge Robb and Ms. Cliffe arrived during public comment.

**Agenda Item #2 – Public Comment**

Ms. Throne called for public comment in the south: no public comment.

Ms. Throne called for public comment over the telephone. Public comment was heard from Michael McDonald. Mr. McDonald asked the committee to consider changing the percentage used to calculate the child support calculation. He suggested using a low flat rate for child support. Mr. McDonald also asked the committee to look at the deviations currently being used for joint physical custody. He stated this would lower the litigation that is taking place. Mr. McDonald stated pathogenic parenting is the cause of many social issues and asked the committee to look at reports from other countries regarding how they handle child support. Also, he stated children should be able to emancipate themselves.

Public Comment was heard from Jimmy Carr. Mr. Carr directed the committee to Jane Venohr's Report, Exhibits 29-32, page 51. Mr. Carr referred to the charts in these exhibits. He also addressed the definition of serial parenting and suggested the committee be more specific in the different definitions.

Ms. Throne called for public comment in the north. Public comment was heard from Glen Baker. Mr. Baker stated his opinion aligns with Mr. McDonald's comment. He stated he is paying a high amount in child support to his ex-wife. Mr. Baker stated the obligee does not try to better themselves by seeking better employment since they are receiving a high amount in child support. He went on to state his ex-wife wants to receive full custody of the children and the child support payments. He stated this is an incentive built in to the system. Mr. Baker also stated child support ruins family structures. Mr. Baker also supports Mr. Carr's public comment regarding the percentages for higher income.

**Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Meeting Minutes (March 9, 2018)**

Assemblyman Pickard motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Judge Shirley seconded motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item #4 – Discussion and recommendations on the proposed offset on Gross Monthly Income by the child care and health care expenses from Judge Hoskin.**

Ms. Throne asked Judge Hoskin to present his updated language for gross monthly income. See Exhibit A. Judge Hoskin presented the updated language for gross monthly income and the changes he made. Judge Robb motioned to adopt the language. The committee discussed additional changes they would like to see in the language before it is adopted, listed below.

- Deal with medical separately.
- Remove one half verbiage when referring to child care and health care.
- Clarify which children are being considered in definition for child care.
- Add language “pursuant to a court order” on child care and health care.
- Replace “paid by the obligor” with “received by the obligee” in section 12b and c.
- Create two separate definitions for child care and health care. Have one definition for paid by the obligor and another definition for received by the obligee.
- Define reasonable.
- Add a separate subsection under 12b and c “for the obligor, the reasonable cost for child care and health care paid by the obligor.”
- Add a separate subsection under 12b and c “for the obligee, the reasonable cost for child care and health care received by the obligee.”
- Add “the reasonable cost of child care paid or received” to simply the definition or “the reasonable cost of child care”.
- Create a new section (13) for deductions of gross income for things parents are paying.
- 13a would be child support received.

Judge Hoskin stated he would redraft the language and present the updated language at the next meeting. Judge Robb withdrew her motion until the language is redrafted.

Ms. Throne suggested this agenda item be included on the next meeting’s agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #5 – Discussion and recommendations on Mr. Sanford’s proposal on High Income Calculations.**

Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item for the next meeting as Mr. Sanford was not in attendance in order to present his proposal.

**Agenda Item #6 – Discussion and recommendations on proposed percentages for average income calculations from Ms. Surratt.**

Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item for the next meeting as Ms. Surratt was not in attendance to present her proposal.

**Agenda Item #7 – Discussion and recommendations on allowing modifications of child support based on child development milestone and not just a change in income as proposed in public comment at the last hearing.**

Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item #8 – Discussion and recommendations on guidance for the courts regarding how to calculate a deviation for additional dependents in the home, where the payor does not have a court ordered support obligation.**

Ms. Throne opened this item up for discussion among the committee. Judge Hoskin stated he is not sure the committee can discuss this agenda item until they are further along in determining the child support calculations. Ms. Throne stated if the committee leaves this as a deviation process, then there will be unfair outcomes based on the different judges.

Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item and suggested this agenda item be included on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #9 – Discussion and recommendations on proposed language from Mr. Pickard from Marshal Willick for a child support calculation for shared, split, and serial parenting.**

Assemblyman Pickard stated he discussed this agenda item with Ms. Surratt and Mr. Willick and wanted to present their discussion to the committee. He stated the process for shared, split, and serial cases starts with a review of the obligor's cases. Then, Mr. Pickard stated one would multiply the obligor's gross monthly income by 29% and divide that amount by the number of children the obligor has. Next, he stated one would multiply the obligee's gross monthly income by 25% and divide that amount by the number of children the obligee has. Assemblyman Pickard suggested identifying the child shared by the two and consider what type of custody the parties have and follow those processes. He stated these calculations are easy to calculate and are consistent across all cases. Assemblyman Pickard volunteered to create a graph to show how these calculations will work and then the committee could work on the language to codify this calculation.

Judge Robb did not like how one obligor will be paying less than another obligor because they have multiple children. Assemblyman Pickard stated this comes back to right sizing an order and cannot ignore the number of children the obligee has. He stated they would still leave the court some discretion. Judge Robb stated right sizing the order would be an injustice to the child as the committee would be ignoring the obligation to the child.

Judge Hoskin stated his concern is that the committee must make sense intellectually. He stated there are more issues that the committee needs to be aware of. Judge Hoskin suggested that Assemblyman Pickard put together his graph, so the committee can see where he is going with this agenda item and calculate the numbers to see if his suggestion will work.

Ms. Cliffe stated the serial parenting calculation can be different than the split parenting calculation. Ms. Throne stated that fixes some of the problems with setting fair calculations for serial parenting, but it does not fix the difference in how children are being treated if some of the orders are from out of state. Assemblyman Pickard stated this calculation allows calculations across the board.

Assemblyman Pickard volunteered to create his graph for the calculations and present it at the next meeting. Ms. Throne suggested this agenda item be included on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #10 – Discussion and recommendations regarding proposed language from Ms. Baker and Judge Hoskin regarding emancipation of children and self-adjusting orders.**

Ms. Baker presented her findings while researching this agenda item. She could not find many decisions on the West Coast. She referred to the Child Support Flyer. See Exhibit B. Ms. Baker stated she is fearful if Nevada does retroactive modifications, the state will lose its IV-D funding. She stated there are some cases that give some specifications on how to do a retroactive modification. The issue is that at the time of emancipation, how are judges going to know the amount that is still being paid complies with the guidelines. She suggested having specific guidelines that require the parties to come to court upon emancipation of a child for a modification of child support. The committee made some suggestions on how to handle self-adjusting orders, listed below.

- Include language that requires parties to come back to court when a child emancipates to modify the child support order.
- Parties need to stipulate.
- Put the parties on notice to come back to court and request the modification.

Ms. Baker volunteered to provide language and factors based on her research and present it at the next meeting. Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item and suggested this agenda item be included on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #11 – Review and approve final language from Ms. Surratt for defining split, serial, and shared parenting.**

Ms. Throne asked the committee if they were ready to adopt the definitions. See Exhibit C. Ms. Cliffe stated she would like to discuss this agenda item when Ms. Surratt is present. She had some questions on Ms. Surratt's reasoning behind the definitions.

Ms. Throne suggested this agenda item be included on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #12 – Discussion and recommendation regarding proposed language from Ms. Throne regarding self-determination and stipulated orders with disclosure of Gross Monthly Income for future modifications.**

Ms. Throne stated she did look at what other states are doing but did not find much guidance. She did draft some proposed language for stipulated orders. See Exhibit D. The committee discussed this agenda item and suggested some changes be made to the language, listed below.

- Remove public assistance from subsection d.
- Replace "public assistance" with "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)" in subsection d.
- Add "public assistance that is reimbursable to the state" in subsection d.
- Add "if the court does not believe it is in the best interest of the child/children".

Ms. Cliffe volunteered to research the public assistance verbiage and provide that information to Ms. Throne to add to the language. Ms. Throne tabled this agenda item and suggested it be included on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Agenda Item #13 – Discuss and approve ideas for future agenda items.**

Ms. Throne asked the committee if they had any items they would like to be added to the next agenda. The committee did not have any items to add to the agenda. Assemblyman Pickard brought up the memo he provided from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) regarding a topic from the previous meeting, comparing Wisconsin and Nevada's welfare systems. See Exhibit E.

**Agenda Item #14 – Discuss and approve future meeting date(s).**

Ms. Throne reminded the committee that the next meeting is April 13<sup>th</sup> at LCB. Ms. Throne stated Ms. Surratt was working on adding additional dates for the committee to meet and would email those dates to the committee once finalized.

**Agenda Item #15 – Public Comment**

Ms. Throne called for public comment in the south: no public comment.

Ms. Throne called for public comment in the north. Public Comment was heard from Glen Baker. Mr. Baker stated every child should have the exact same rights as the others. He suggested the only equitable way to determine the correct calculation is to divide the obligation between the children. Mr. Baker stated this is the only way to have fair treatment for each child.

Ms. Throne asked Mr. Baker what county his child support obligation is from. Mr. Baker stated his child support order is from Winnemucca, NV/Humboldt County. Ms. Throne then asked Mr. Baker if he is getting a deviation for the subsequent born child. Mr. Baker stated he does have to pay the full 25% now but has a court hearing come up soon where the full child support amount will be sought. He stated he gave more money up front as part of the divorce and has paid extra child support to avoid going back to court.

Ms. Throne called for public comment over the telephone. Public Comment was heard from Michael McDonald. Mr. McDonald stated he was ordered to pay 25% along with half the child care and health care. He stated many times parents are fighting over the child so they can receive child support from the other party. Mr. McDonald suggested the debit card be accessible to both parties so both parties can see how the money is being spent. He asked the committee to consider Nevada going to a flat rate. Mr. McDonald stated the IV-D funding should not matter when trying to calculate child support; it should be the best interest of the child.

Public Comment was heard from Alexander Falconi. Mr. Falconi brought up a Nevada case that discussed retroactive modifications. He stated he agrees with placing parties on notice when a child emancipates. Mr. Falconi stated he has seen where some states add language for child abduction.

Public Comment was heard from Jimmy Carr. Mr. Carr wanted to provide the correct page in Jane Venohr's report that showed charts regarding an income tax bracket calculation. He stated the correct page is 44 showing Exhibits 29-32.

**Agenda Item #16 – Adjournment**

Ms. Throne called for a motion for adjournment. Judge Robb motioned to adjourn. Assemblyman Pickard and Ms. Baker seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

# **EXHIBIT A**

“Gross income.”

(a) “Gross income” for purposes of calculating child support means all of the following:

1. Salary and wages.
2. Interest and investment income.
3. Social Security disability and old-age insurance benefits under Federal Law.
4. Income from a pension or retirement plan.
5. Net proceeds resulting from worker's compensation or other personal injury awards intended to replace income.
6. Unemployment insurance.
7. Income continuation benefits.
8. Voluntary deferred compensation, employee contributions to any employee benefit plan or profit-sharing, and voluntary employee contributions to any pension or retirement account whether or not the account provides for tax deferral or avoidance.
9. Military allowances and veterans benefits.
10. Any and all compensation for lost wages.
11. Undistributed income of a corporation, including a closely-held corporation, or any partnership, including a limited or limited liability partnership, in which the parent has an ownership interest sufficient to individually exercise control or to access the earnings of the business, unless the income included is an asset under [*section regarding imputed income*] In this paragraph:
  - a. “Undistributed income” means federal taxable income of the closely held corporation, partnership, or other entity plus depreciation claimed on the entity's federal income tax return less a reasonable allowance for economic depreciation.
  - b. A “reasonable allowance for economic depreciation” means the amount of depreciation on assets computed using the straight line method and useful lives as determined under federal income tax laws and regulations.

**Note:** Income considered under this subsection is subject to the adjustments under [*section regarding adjustments*].

12. All other income, whether taxable or not, except that gross income does not include any of the following:

- a. Child support.
- b. The reasonable costs of [*one-half of??*] child care for the subject children, paid by the obligor.
- c. The reasonable costs of [*one-half of??*] health care for the subject child(ren), paid by the obligor
- d. Foster care payments under Federal Law.
- e. Kinship care payments under Federal Law.
- f. Public assistance benefits under Federal Law, except that child care subsidy payments under Federal Law, shall be considered income to a child care provider.



- g. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) under Federal Law.
  - h. Cash benefits paid by counties under Federal Law.
  - i. Supplemental Security Income and state supplemental payments under Federal Law.
  - j. Payments made for social services or any other public assistance benefits.
  - k. Compensation for losses, both general and special damages, in personal injury awards not intended to replace income.
- (b) This subsection defines gross income used in establishing a child support order under this chapter and may not be used to limit income withholding, or the assignment of worker's compensation benefits for child support.

**Note:** This paragraph clarifies that although the portion of worker's compensation awards not intended to replace income is excluded from gross income in *establishing* a child support order, the full worker's compensation benefit is assignable for the *collection* of child support.

# **EXHIBIT B**



OFFICE OF  
**CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT**  
Administration for Children & Families

May 12, 2016

Jenelle Gimlin, Program Chief  
Child Support Enforcement  
Division of Welfare and Supportive Services  
1470 College Parkway  
Carson City, NV 89706

Dear Ms. Gimlin:

The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) is aware of the issue with the Washoe County Judge retroactively modifying child support orders. With this letter, we provide guidance on the federal requirements for retroactive modifications.

As a condition of state IV-D plan approval, states must have in effect laws requiring the use of procedures to prohibit retroactive modification of child support obligations pursuant to section 466(a)(9) of the Social Security Act and 45 CFR 302.70(a)(9). State procedures may permit modification with respect to any period during which there is pending a petition for modification, but only from the date that notice has been given, either directly or through the appropriate agent, to the obligee or (where the petitioner is the obligee) to the obligor. Specifically, state IV-D agencies must have in effect and use procedures whereby any payment or installment of support under any child support order is, on and after the date it is due, a judgment by operation of law, with the full force, effect, and attributes of a judgment of the state and is entitled, as such, to full faith and credit in such state and in any other state. (Please see OCSE AT-86-06 on the Final Rule: Prohibition of Retroactive Modification of Child Support Arrearages.)

Under 45 CFR 302.12, the state IV-D agency is responsible and accountable for the operation of the IV-D program and for securing compliance with the requirements of the state plan. A state must have an approved state IV-D plan in order to receive federal funding under title IV-D of the Social Security Act. If you need any additional technical assistance regarding this matter, please contact Elise Wing, OCSE Regional Program Manager, by telephone at (415) 437-8480 or email at [elise.wing@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:elise.wing@acf.hhs.gov).

Sincerely,

Vicki Turetsky  
Commissioner  
Office of Child Support Enforcement

cc: Elise Wing, ACF/OCSE Regional Program Manager, Region IX

# **EXHIBIT C**

## **Parenting Definitions**

### **SERIAL PARENTING:**

"Serial-family parent" means a parent with an existing legal obligation for child support who incurs an additional legal obligation for child support in a subsequent family as a result of a court order. The Serial parenting formula applies only if the additional child support obligation incurred by a parent is the result of a court order and the support obligation being calculated is for children from a subsequent family or subsequent paternity judgment or acknowledgment. A parent may not use the provisions of this subsection as a basis for seeking modification of an existing order based on a subsequently incurred legal obligation for child support.

### **SHARED PARENTING:**

"Shared-placement parent" means a parent who has a court ordered period of placement of a at least 40%.

### **SPLIT PARENTING:**

"Split-placement parent" means a parent who has two (2) or more children and who has physical placement of one or more but not all of the children.

# **EXHIBIT D**

### **Stipulations and Orders**

Parents have the right to stipulate to a child support obligation for their child(ren) that does not comply with these guidelines. However, in order to be binding, a stipulation must be in writing and:

- a. Set forth the current gross monthly income of each parent;
- b. Specify what the child support obligation would be under these guidelines;
- c. Provide notice to both parents that, if either parent seeks a review of the child support obligation upon a material change in circumstances or for regular periodic review, a court will be bound by the child support guidelines in effect at the time of the review;
- d. Certify that the recipient parent is not receiving public assistance and has not applied for public assistance; and
- e. Be approved and adopted as an order of the court.

A court presented with a proposed stipulation of the parents for a child support obligation that does not comply with these guidelines may reject the stipulation, even if it complies with the requirements set forth above, if the court believes that the stipulation is a product of coercion. Additionally, the receipt of public assistance by the recipient or the parent entitled to receive child support under the guidelines will constitute a change of circumstances that will allow the review of the child support obligation and the modification of the child support obligation in accordance with the child support guidelines then in effect.

# **EXHIBIT E**



STATE OF NEVADA  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING  
401 S. CARSON STREET  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701-4747  
Fax No.: (775) 684-6600



RICK COMBS, *Director*  
(775) 684-6800

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION (775) 684-6800

JASON FRIERSON, *Assemblyman, Chair*  
Rick Combs, *Director, Secretary*

INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (775) 684-6821

JOYCE WOODHOUSE, *Senator, Chair*  
Cindy Jones, *Fiscal Analyst*  
Mark Krmpotic, *Fiscal Analyst*

BRENDA J. ERDOES, *Legislative Counsel* (775) 684-6830  
ROCKY COOPER, *Legislative Auditor* (775) 684-6815  
MICHAEL J. STEWART, *Research Director* (775) 684-6825

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: March 19, 2018  
TO: Assemblyman Keith Pickard  
FROM: Cesar Melgarejo, Senior Policy Analyst  
Research Division  
SUBJECT: Wisconsin Welfare vs. Nevada Welfare

This memorandum responds to your request for information regarding how Wisconsin's welfare system differs from Nevada's welfare system.

**SUMMARY**

On a broad scale, the Nevada and Wisconsin welfare systems have very few differences. One overall difference is the manner in which regulatory policies are adopted for the operation of welfare programs. In Wisconsin, policies and procedures governing welfare programs are found in statute. These include income limitations, work participation requirements, and asset restrictions. Nevada's operating policies and procedures, however, are outlined in the [State Plans](#) adopted by the [Division of Welfare and Supportive Services](#), within the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

**WELFARE SYSTEM DIFFERENCES**

According to the 2015 [Welfare Reform Report Card](#), produced by The Heartland Institute, Nevada and Wisconsin ranked number 3 and 5 respectively for Best Welfare Reform Policies. Additionally, Nevada and Wisconsin ranked number 47 and 50 respectively for Worst Performance Outcomes. The two welfare systems are similar in regard to work requirements, work exemptions, and lifetime eligibility.

Both states offer 12 government funded benefit programs, some of which must follow strict federal guidelines while others allow states to establish programmatic goals and procedures

based on their adopted State Plans. For the benefit programs that allow states to establish a maximum income level per household, Nevada has established a maximum income level about 31 to 35 percent lower than Wisconsin. The table below provides income level information for the programs where the two welfare systems differ.

	Nevada		Wisconsin	
	Household Size	Maximum Income Level	Household Size	Maximum Income Level
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	1	\$15,444	1	\$23,760
	2	\$20,826	2	\$32,040
	3	\$26,208	3	\$40,320
	4	\$31,590	4	\$48,600
	5	\$36,972	5	\$56,880
	6	\$42,354	6	\$65,160
	7	\$47,749	7	\$73,460
	8	\$53,157	8	\$81,780
Energy Assistance Program (EAP)	1	\$17,820	1	\$26,175
	2	\$24,030	2	\$34,228
	3	\$30,240	3	\$42,282
	4	\$36,450	4	\$50,336
	5	\$42,660	5	\$58,390
	6	\$48,870	6	\$66,443
	7	\$55,095	7	\$67,953
	8	\$61,335	8	\$69,463
Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)	1	\$24,120	1	\$35,640
	2	\$32,480	2	\$48,060
	3	\$40,840	3	\$60,480
	4	\$49,200	4	\$72,900
	5	\$57,560	5	\$85,320
	6	\$65,920	6	\$97,740
	7	\$74,280	7	\$110,190
	8	\$82,640	8	\$122,670

According to The Heartland Institute, Nevada scores higher than Wisconsin in relation to integration of services. Integration of services refers to organizing state systems in a way that allows welfare and other services to be delivered in a coordinated, "one-stop" fashion. In Nevada, SNAP, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Medicaid eligibility, TANF and SNAP employment and training programs, social work crisis intervention, childcare, energy assistance, and child support services are all administered by the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. In Wisconsin, the same programs and services are split between two departments. The Department of Children and Families oversees TANF, childcare and related job training, transportation, alcohol and substance abuse, and mental health. The Department of Human Services oversees SNAP and Medicaid.

Medicaid services offered in Nevada are different from those offered in Wisconsin. In Nevada, Medicaid is health insurance that helps people who cannot afford medical care pay for some or all of their medical bills. Nevada Medicaid is available only to certain low-income individuals and families in Nevada who fit into an eligibility group that is recognized by federal and state law. In Wisconsin, Medicaid is a health care program for people with disabilities and people 65 and older. Unlike Nevada, Wisconsin did not adopt the Medicaid expansion, but Wisconsin does provide Medicaid eligibility to adults up to the poverty level under a Medicaid waiver. In addition, Wisconsin offers the [Medicaid Purchase Plan](#) to people with disabilities who are working or are interested in working.

### WISCONSIN WELFARE REFORM

Wisconsin passed several welfare reform bills during their 2018 Special Session. Below is a summary of those bills, as well as a Nevada comparison where applicable:

- [Assembly Bill 1](#) – Allows the Department of Human Services (DHS) to set work requirements in FoodShare Employment and Training (FSET) to the maximum allowed under federal law. Under federal law, the maximum work requirement allowed is 30 hours per week, which constitutes part-time work.
  - Nevada requires 30 hours of work minimum for all Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDs).
- [Assembly Bill 2](#) – Expands FSET statewide for able-bodied adults with school-aged dependents.
  - Nevada and Wisconsin allow work requirement exemptions for a single custodial parent with a child under 6 years of age or a caretaker or parent caring for a disabled family member.
- [Assembly Bill 3](#) – Creates asset restrictions for individuals participating in FoodShare, Wisconsin Works, and Wisconsin Shares. Assets may not exceed \$2,500 in combined equity value, one home, valued at no more than 200 percent of the statewide median value for homes. The combined equity value of any vehicles, except those used for business purposes, owned by the individual's family can be no more than \$20,000.
  - In Nevada, the amount of real and personal property that can be retained by the TANF household cannot exceed \$6,000. Excluded resources include: One vehicle, home of residence, non-liquid investments, funds in Individual Development Account, and tax-preferred education accounts.