

Suggestions and comments regarding Judge Robb's plan:

- To automatically address inflation, base definitions for high income on the poverty level instead of concrete dollar amount. Instead of saying \$100,000, you could say 8.2 times the poverty level for a 1 person household.
- The current brackets could have unfair results when parents have income near the bracket thresholds: a parent making \$99,999 per year would have a higher child support obligation than a parent making \$100,000 per year due to the drop from 18 percent to 14 percent child support rate). Instead of defining certain parents as high-income and changing the child support rate for their entire income, create a single point at which the portion of income over that level has a lower child support rate than the 18 percent rate for the portion of income below that level. I suggest making this point about \$80,000 per year or 6.6 times the poverty level, and I suggest a 5 percent child support rate for 1 child for the portion of annual income that exceeds \$80,000. 5 percent may sound like a low amount, but it results in child support obligations similar to Judge Robb's current plan but without significant increases or drops in support at bracket thresholds.
 - Example 1: A parent has gross monthly income of \$8,333 per month (\$100,000 per year). Support will be calculated by taking 18 percent of \$6667 (the income up to \$80,000 per year), and that amount equals \$1,200. The remaining \$1,666 per month will have 5 percent taken for support, and that amount equals \$83. Adding \$1,200 and \$83, that parent's child support obligation would be \$1283 per month. (Judge Robb's current plan result: \$1,167)
 - Example 2: A parent has gross monthly income of \$12,500 per month (\$150,000 per year). Using the same calculations in example 1, this parent's child support obligation would be \$1,408. (Judge Robb's current plan result: \$1,250 or \$1,750, depending if the parent makes \$12,501 or \$12,500)
 - Example 3: A parent has a gross monthly income of \$16,667 per month (\$200,000 per year). Using the same calculations in example 1, this parent's child support obligation would be \$1,700. (Judge Robb's current plan result: \$1,667)
- I strongly urge the Committee to avoid a 1.5 multiplier or any other multiplier that would discourage parents from seeking an equal custody arrangement. This could also result in a parent having a higher child support obligation with equal custody than with visitation.
- The new deviation factor based on relative **household** income is very reasonable and fair.

James Carr
Reno, NV