

To the child support guideline committee:

My name is Adam Radel and I would have liked to give this public comment in person or over the phone but work obligations do not allow me to participate in the next meeting. I have been listening in and reviewing minutes of this committee for months and I appreciate the work that is being done to review the child support guidelines.

My divorce decree and child support order were established in the Elko County court although I have subsequently relocated to Sandy, UT. My case is unique because although my children's mother and I live in separate states we labeled our custody situation as joint physical custody in order to settle our divorce amicably and move forward recognizing the role both parents play in raising children. Due to this joint designation we use the Wright v Osborne income offset method when calculating child support. My children now attend school in Utah and spend alternating weekends, holidays, and the summer in Nevada. The total time share comes out to roughly 68% of the time in Utah and 32% in Nevada.

I am currently in the process of reviewing child support through the courts and requesting a deviation for time spent with each parent. The request for review was filed 12 months ago when my children moved to Utah but the case has yet to be completed.

Under current Nevada rules of Wright v Osborne because I am the higher income earner I pay child support of \$1500 per month for my 4 children even though I pay for the majority of their clothing, food, and extra curricular activities. If child support had been calculated in Utah where the children primarily reside I would be receiving \$800 per month under Utah guidelines instead of paying.

The total number of days spent with each parent was included in the very first version of the calculation considered by this committee months ago but has not been discussed subsequently. It may have been the intention of the committee to address this topic under shared parenting in future meetings but I wanted to make sure it isn't forgotten as this was previously considered a deviation.

I believe that adding the number of days spent with each parent into the calculation would eliminate a lot of contention in custody battles where the parties are arguing over the label of "Sole" or "Joint" custody rather than focusing on the schedule that is best for the children.

On a separate topic, I am also concerned when the committee discusses the idea of considering the household income of the parties. Previous discussions were not clear to me on whether the household income would be used for both parties. The intention of using household income was to address underemployment situations of the receiver but did not discuss how that would affect the payor.

It would not be fair or just for a payor's child support to increase because their partner is also employed. The new partner has no legal obligation to support the children and if household income of both parties were the basis for calculation that would be the result.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adam Radel