

1. Please select the most appropriate response that describes your involvement with child support in Kansas. Judges and Attorneys should select their professional status. If you are a judge or attorney working in the area of child support and you are also paying or receiving child support, you will have the opportunity to respond to those survey items as well. A response to this item is required before you can proceed.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Child Support Payor	100.0%	71
Child Support Recipient	0.0%	0
Other - individual not working in the area of child support	0.0%	0
District Judge	0.0%	0
Magistrate Judge	0.0%	0
Hearing Officer	0.0%	0
Attorney employed by SRS or SRS Contractor	0.0%	0
Attorney in private practice	0.0%	0
Attorney working with a Court Trustee's Office	0.0%	0
Other - working professionally in the area of child support	0.0%	0
	answered question	71
	skipped question	0

2. Please review the recommended changes to the Kansas Child Support Guidelines and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement for each section listed:

"The following sections of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines are improved by the recommended changes."

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count
Section II.F Imputed Income	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Section III.B.7 Sharing Equal or Nearly Equal Time and Expenses	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Section IV.2.c. Removing the Equal Parenting Time Adjustment (80/20 rule)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Section IV.E.4 Special Needs and Extraordinary Expenses	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Section V Change of Circumstances - Duty to Notify	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Section V Change of Circumstances - Termination of Employment for Incarceration or Misconduct	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
Appendix II Updated Child Support Schedules	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.00	0
						answered question	0
						skipped question	71

3. Feel free to explain your responses.

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	71

4. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	71

5. Select the appropriate option to continue the survey, or to exit and submit the survey.

	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm done. Exit and submit the survey.	0.0%	0
I am a paying or receiving parent and wish to complete that portion of the survey.	0.0%	0
answered question		0
skipped question		71

6. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	31.6% (18)	52.6% (30)	15.8% (9)	57
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	42.0% (21)	38.0% (19)	20.0% (10)	50
			answered question	58
			skipped question	13

7. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	27.3% (15)	7.3% (4)	32.7% (18)	16.4% (9)	16.4% (9)	2.87	55	
							answered question	55
							skipped question	16

8. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	18	
	answered question	18
	skipped question	53

9. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	52.8% (28)	39.6% (21)	7.5% (4)	53
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	58.0% (29)	30.0% (15)	12.0% (6)	50
			answered question	54
			skipped question	17

10. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	9.6% (5)	7.7% (4)	28.8% (15)	26.9% (14)	26.9% (14)	3.54	52	
							answered question	52
							skipped question	19

11. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	22	
	answered question	22
	skipped question	49

12. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	50.0% (27)	38.9% (21)	11.1% (6)	54
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	52.0% (26)	34.0% (17)	14.0% (7)	50
			answered question	54
			skipped question	17

13. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	6.0% (3)	4.0% (2)	42.0% (21)	14.0% (7)	34.0% (17)	3.66	50	
							answered question	50
							skipped question	21

14. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	14	
	answered question	14
	skipped question	57

15. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	41.5% (22)	43.4% (23)	15.1% (8)	53
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	50.0% (24)	35.4% (17)	14.6% (7)	48
			answered question	53
			skipped question	18

16. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	51.0% (25)	4.1% (2)	34.7% (17)	6.1% (3)	4.1% (2)	2.08	49	
							answered question	49
							skipped question	22

17. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	18	
	answered question	18
	skipped question	53

18. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	54.9% (28)	21.6% (11)	23.5% (12)	51
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	53.1% (26)	18.4% (9)	28.6% (14)	49
			answered question	51
			skipped question	20

19. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	35.3% (18)	3.9% (2)	23.5% (12)	15.7% (8)	21.6% (11)	2.84	51	
							answered question	51
							skipped question	20

20. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	22	
	answered question	22
	skipped question	49

21. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	38.8% (19)	38.8% (19)	22.4% (11)	49
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	41.3% (19)	32.6% (15)	26.1% (12)	46
			answered question	49
			skipped question	22

22. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	35.6% (16)	8.9% (4)	28.9% (13)	20.0% (9)	6.7% (3)	2.53	45	
							answered question	45
							skipped question	26

23. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	14	
	answered question	14
	skipped question	57

24. Please indicate whether the section applies to your situation and if the recommended change could have a direct impact on your child support order.

	Yes	No	Uncertain	Response Count
This section applies to my child support order.	68.8% (33)	18.8% (9)	12.5% (6)	48
The recommended change could have a direct impact on my child support order.	70.8% (34)	16.7% (8)	12.5% (6)	48
			answered question	49
			skipped question	22

25. Please select the response that most closely reflects your level of agreement with the following statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Rating Average	Response Count	
I agree with the recommended change.	45.8% (22)	16.7% (8)	25.0% (12)	4.2% (2)	8.3% (4)	2.13	48	
							answered question	48
							skipped question	23

26. Feel free to explain your response.

	Response Count	
	29	
	answered question	29
	skipped question	42

27. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

	Response Count
	30
answered question	30
skipped question	41

Imputed Income

Page 7, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	I feel that in many circumstances a the party who receives child support will deliberately work under thier job skill or at minimum wage and use the child support to live off of instead of using it for the welfare of the childeren.	Oct 22, 2011 11:14 PM
2	I strongly disagree because due to the state of the economy. There are 25 million Americans unemployeed, and or under employed. I am unemployeed, and seeking work. When reporting to the local SRS, and State of my employment status, requesting a new modification to lower my Child Support to a reasonable level, in accordance with the Court Order. I was denied. So my only other option is to be incarcerated for failure to meet my Child Support. So my question to the Advisory Committee is: What are your recommendations when the local economy fails, there are no jobs, and payors are trying to pay what they can to meet their obligations, but can't? Hire an Attorney and go back to Court? Who has money to hire an Attorney in these economic times to ask for a reduction? I don't. I have never missed a Child Support payment. But as this economic crisis continues, I can't gurrantee that I will be able to maintain. Incarceration is looking better and better!	Oct 19, 2011 5:55 PM
3	Imputing wages only to increase an order that may not be payable when suddenly terminated is asking for additional hardships to one parent. Some parents have a skill set that will lead to additional amounts earned later but finding a new position may take time.	Oct 12, 2011 8:57 AM
4	In my situation, my daughter's mother was put through and completed nursing school but is employed as a [REDACTED] due to the large amount of child support that she receives. A nursing career has not be sought.	Oct 11, 2011 12:21 PM
5	I feel that that the court system needs to mandate periodic employment information from the reciever of any child case. In my case, my ex-wife was able to remain unemployeed for nearly 3 years, owe me thousands of dollars of unreimbursed costs, and no-one seemed to care.. Not even case management!	Oct 10, 2011 11:28 AM
6	The language in every subsection uses the term "a parent," however the first paragraph in section II.F.1 states: "Income may be imputed to the parent not having primary residency in appropriate circumstances, including the following:" Why does this section only apply to parents who pay child support? Why does this not apply to BOTH parents? The language also assumes one parent must have primary residency in order for this rule to apply. There should be no confusion that this rule also applies to shared custody situations where there is no primary custodian. Why is it assumed that only a parent with non-residential custody would become underemployeed for the purposes of reducing child support. Is it not reasonable and fair to assume that any shared residential or primary residential parent could not also become deliberately unemployeed or underemployeed for the purposes of overinflating their child support award? We all know it happens. Section II.F.1 language should be changed to: "Income may be imputed to either parent in appropriate circumstances, including the following:" Section II.F.1.a language should be changed to: "Incarceration shall not constitute substantial justification." Section II.F.2 language should be changed to: "If income is imputed to the payee, it should not result in a higher child support award.	Oct 9, 2011 11:42 AM
7	My order to pay is done in February 2012. Will this affect me?	Sep 30, 2011 3:30 PM

Page 7, Q3. Feel free to explain your response:

8	Agree with "c" regardless of reduction in wages parent should only be accountable for what they now could make. Strongly disagree with new "C" parent must do what ever it takes to survive and have a life themselves, if they can receive benefits at work that help them then so be it. The proportion of the payment amount far exceeds anything the residential parent would need.	Sep 30, 2011 6:48 AM
9	Income should also be imputed to women who choses to stay at home or quit their job after remarrying. This language is clearly written only to punish men who looses their jobs.	Sep 28, 2011 6:06 AM
10	with the way the economy is people arent delibertely out of work. I know a lady that had lots of college and it took her 3yrs to land a job.	Sep 24, 2011 2:40 PM
11	IF the Payor is under employed that his his or her business	Sep 19, 2011 6:25 AM
12	With the economy the way it is this could have a drastic impact on someone not being able to pay child support.	Sep 14, 2011 9:53 PM
13	This is for the court to decide. No guidance needed.	Sep 9, 2011 4:01 AM
14	This section is specifically written to punish child support paying parents. Unless and until courts really start imputing reasonable income to child support receiving parents commensurate to their educational background and department of labor income statistics, this section should not be included. In addition, this section is unfair until the child support interest rates are pulled down to a reasonable level from 10%. Many parents simply can not afford pay their arrears due to the unreasonable interest rates.	Sep 8, 2011 8:39 PM
15	In this economy and depending on your age you could have a PHD and still not be working at the wage you deserve or after age 40 they just don't want to hire you period. Due to the fact everyone on this board has a mass wealth you have no idea what it like finding work. I was a 20 year model employee from Boeing and I was 41 and put out the door because I was to old. The last 7 years I have been laid off 4 times making half what I was. And I hold a masters degree in business. you raise the support I will let my house go and set it out in the county Jail. Then you can pay my rent and feed me. 14 years after a divorce and \$300,000 dollars later. You received \$198,000 dollars in matching funds from the Feds. And you greedy bastards will then decide what I should make with a Master and say I'm under Employed. To put It bluntly FUCK YOU I give up.	Sep 8, 2011 5:59 PM
16	This section is specifically written to punish child support paying parents. Unless and until courts really start imputing reasonable income to child support receiving parents commensurate to their educational background and department of labor income statistics, this section should not be included. In addition, this section is unfair until the child support interest rates are pulled down to a reasonable level from 10%. Many parents simply can not afford pay their arrears due to the unreasonable interest rates.	Sep 8, 2011 1:19 PM
17	How does one determine whether a parent is "deliberately unemployed or underemployed"? Doesn't one have the right to determine how much they work? What if someone has to take a pay cut or demotion in order to keep their job? There are too many confounding variables at work here.	Sep 8, 2011 8:19 AM

Page 7, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

18 Parents should have the freedom to change jobs even if it results with a lower paying job sometimes. What is being proposed is against constitutional rights, further punishing non-custodial parents. In addition, even though my ex is underemployed commensurate to her college degree, courts did not impute a higher income to her or force her to go look for a higher paying job. This addition would only further alienate non-custodial parents.

Sep 8, 2011 8:00 AM

Sharing Equal or Nearly Equal Time & Expenses

Page 8, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	although the change is an improvement to the current 80/20 rule it is still NOT going to be effective. the current shared expense formula covers in detail (through the use of completing a child support worksheet as one of the requirements) expenses like health care and day care. Why is it that any other "direct" disputed by the two parties, cannot covered cannot be added to the work sheet. Requiring the use of ambiguous percentages and a formula that does not really address what the direct expenses are will be mis-used	Oct 21, 2011 6:03 PM
2	Child Support has numerous variables. Deep consideration and thought has to be given to each one. Parents who are divorced with children; Parents who have children multiple partners; and then you Single Parents with a Child, and never married. I fall under the Single Parent with a Child and never married. The Equal Parenting Time Adjustment has been used against me, and provided a significant advantage to the other Parent (Known to me as the 90/10 rule). Therefore, the local SRS, and the State should have NEVER been involved in my Child Support Case. Because in my situation, which was amicable on paying Child Support, but should have only been in "Agreement" between the two Single Parents. Sitting down and agreeing on child support obligations, sharing time on a nearly equal basis, keeping receipts, agree on expenses, writing checks to one another, and keeping records on a regular basis. However, since I couldn't get the other Single Parent to agree, or the local SRS to kick it back, and make the other Single Parent sit down with me, to make this happen. The State got involved, in which, the other Single Parent wanted. Because she knew that the State would award her more Child Support monies, in which they did. But here's the problem. The local SRS came after me for more Child Support, but not EVER did they mention or enforce the Equal/Near Equal Parenting Time, nor anything about Taxes! I live [REDACTED] miles away, and the other Single Parent has no vehicle, nor has she worked in 11 years. Which is how old my Child is now. So my question to the Advisory Committee is: Who checks the checker (Enforcer of Child Support), to make sure that the system is fair to both Parents??? Especially for good Parents who have never missed a Child Support Payment? Where is the justice and incentives in your recommendations for the Good Parents who abide by the law? I have been priced out of being a Father by the State, on two previous Tax Returns for two previous jobs that I held before my new Modification Order in 2009. I no longer have that income, but I am forced to pay a higher Child Support Payment. Also with minimal to no Parenting Time. Where is the local SRS, and the State in enforcing that? I'm just a name on a piece of paper, and the State is my Son's Father. Because the State won't enforce their own rules on the other Single Parent, to ensure that she is working, and not just relying on the State. Besides me, who else do you think is being used? Where are your recommendations on that???	Oct 19, 2011 6:36 PM
3	I still do not totally understand the proposal after reading it several times.	Oct 12, 2011 4:38 AM
4	Once again, in my case... I am the primary wage earner, child support payer, etc. I provide receipts for unreimbursed expenses and never get repaid, I provide 75% of the childrens clothing without receiving any reduction of child support, provide 75% of the transportation, cell phone, etc.. Case management doesn't seem to care... I feel that there needs to be checks and balances incorporated that need to be "mandated", not "may this" or "may that"... Where's the accountability????	Oct 10, 2011 11:51 AM
5	The newly proposed shared custody formula makes large strides towards	Oct 9, 2011 11:42 AM

Page 8, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

correcting the huge mistake of introducing the 80/20 rule. The lack of supporting data and the failure of the committee to provide a solution once the rule was determined to be problematic is why this issue has drawn such significant attention. Although sharing of actual costs on an alternating annual basis would provide the most accurate and fair method, the new formula provides a reasonable approach and method of calculation; however, the underlying assumptions still need correction and clarification to avoid litigation. 1.) Clothing - the new formula still causes one parent to provide all clothing for the child(ren). Parents are strongly against this, and have openly voiced their sincere concerns. Why is the committee still requiring one parent to provide all clothing at both homes? Everyone knows from practical experience that this does not occur. What better data is there than actual shared custodial parents? 2.) Large miscellaneous items - There needs to be further correction in the formula for high-cost items such as televisions, computers, and personal media devices. Some items, such as computers, are essentially required for a student to keep up. Your report to the supreme court in 2007 stated that most of the increased expenses incurred by the 12-18 age category is due to televisions, electronics and media devices. Is it reasonable to assume Mom is going to buy the child's desktop computer and send it with him/her to Dad's house? What about a laptop or a brand new ipod? Most likely Mom feels the child support it is owed to her to make sure the child has everything they need/want at her home. When, in fact quite a bit of the child support should be buying items that go back and forth. It is not reasonable and practical to assume these large items will go back and forth with the child. The parent paying support then pays for these items twice - not fair. 3.) Why is there an option to use a parenting time adjustment for shared custody or nearly equal parenting time? There are not 3 options, there are only 2 - sharing direct expenses, or use the shared formula. If the 80/20 is removed, there is no parenting time adjustment listed for this case. I think the committee's resistance to promote a large deviation from the 80/20 and a larger credit to the payor is due to fear that the payee would not receive sufficient funds and for fear of scrutiny by their peers. The committee needs to keep in mind that the payee should not be able to support children on child support dollars alone. Payees should be digging into their own pocket to make up the balance of the required funds. For those parents with the lower proportion of income, they receive a higher correction (part 1 of the shared formula). So, those parents will not have to dig in their pocket quite as much. It is not the responsibility of the payor to pay for everything in both homes, he still has to support his own family. There are still plenty of provisions in the guidelines for a payee to request additional child support if the award is legitimately low.

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 6 | I pay child support and my ex husband can't keep a job but still is able to buy whatever he wants. I can't afford to pay him anymore. I even have one of our children living with me and am still paying child support for him. | Sep 30, 2011 2:35 PM |
| 7 | If I understand the changes any thing that makes any or all parts of the arrangement more equal will benefit all in the long run. Just because two people do not live together does not mean that they do not need to parent together. Making it equal insures communication. | Sep 30, 2011 6:53 AM |
| 8 | Allowance should also be given for clothing, misc expenses, toys and personal electronics. The percentages should be increased to accomodate those direct expenses as well. Also, the lanugage regarding receipts being eliminated shall be taken out. This formula do not eliminate receipts if the residential parent | Sep 28, 2011 6:08 AM |

	refuses to buy children's direct needs such as clothing as such.	
9	in some cases the custodial parent doesnt allow the noncustodial parent to visit	Sep 24, 2011 2:43 PM
10	If I am reading this correctly the recommended Equal Parenting time formula would eliminate the need for exchange of receipts and I agree!!! There have been times when I receive hundreds of dollars worth of receipts at a time, which is hard to pay!	Sep 20, 2011 7:11 AM
11	The 80/20 rule was not fair and was not to the best interest of the child, yet it stood for years. Parents who share a child on an equal or nearly equal basis incur the same child living expenses like food and shelter. A detailed child support work sheet has to be filled that addresses work related day care, medical bill and extra curricular activities for all support cases. The shared expense formula addresses all issues in one simple rule as long as the child support worksheet is filled out. Why would there be a another rule which only seems to be remake of the 80/20 rule that only benefits one parent and not the child. The committee needs to consider just having one rule, if additional items need to be added to the child support worksheet like clothing, school supplies etc, to make the shared expense formula more comprehensive that should be pursued. Having two different rules will create more reasons for parents to disagree just to get the benefit of receiving more child support.	Sep 19, 2011 7:27 PM
12	I do believe that this change has come a long way to provide fairness across the support orders. I would like to see even more changes regarding the shared custody obligations but this is a start.	Sep 19, 2011 2:25 PM
13	This survey is correct when it says that it sounds complicated. I cannot state whether I agree with it as I really do not understand its effect. As a payor, my only contention with KS Child Support Guidelines is that what the recipient genuinely NEEDS for the children's upbringing is never considered. The amount of child support is PRIMARILY driven by income. This isn't my opinion, it's a fact. Just look at the computation tables. Income is the primary driver. In my situation, a shared custody arrangement with a 50/50 time share with the children, my ex-spouse receives \$3200/month for three children. Children that my ex-spouse has 15 days in that month of collecting \$3200/month tax free. And that's after a 20% parenting time adjustment was instituted three years ago. My ex-spouse needs \$2500/month at the very most. Need is an ambiguous term, yes, but it's a term that definitely shouldn't be totally discarded, either. There's no burden put on the recipient ever in proving what's actually needed. The unfortunate result is that the recipient simply uses this as extra income, with the fictitious label of Child Support. Thank you for this forum.	Sep 16, 2011 3:00 PM
14	I fail to see how the 80/20 rule was in the best interest of the child, its removal is a great step forward for improving child welfare as it pertains to child support. Parents who are involved with the child and taking the responsibility of having the child half the time already have to agree (at least when it comes to keeping the child) is concerned. The court and legal community need to have one universal rule that is applied. Having language that discourages or allows one party to be difficult ("but do not want or are not able to agree to share direct expenses should consider requesting a parenting time adjustment") makes it easy for a party to disagree. The shared expense formula which has been there and that has not been changed in the current proposed guidelines should be used first.	Sep 14, 2011 3:24 PM

Page 8, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

The rule already has in place a sanctions portion that addresses when one party fails to abide by the rule and what would be done. My recommendation is to only have one rule or make it clear that one rule should be used (shared expense formula) and if shown that a parent is not abiding by it then apply the equal parenting plan formula. Language that automatically discriminates one rule should be removed.

- 15 In my particular case, the new formula generates 40% parenting time adjustment, compared to 20% before. I agree with the new formula, however it would be STUPID not to increase the other 5%, 10% and 15% adjustments for less than equal time parents. So what you are proposing is a parent would receive 15% adjustment for 45% time vs 40% adjustment for 50% time. THAT IS INSANE!!! (in my particular case, I make 4 times the money that my ex does). Adjust the parenting time adjustments for less than equal parenting times. Sep 9, 2011 6:35 AM
- 16 With this formula, parents will still have to exchange receipts for clothing. Include clothing allowance in the percentages so that both parents can provide. I do not agree that this formula eliminates receipts completely. The formula is written such that it is always the higher income parent who has to pay. I have friends who are the lower income parent but they pay child support. How is this formula going to work for them? Sep 9, 2011 4:06 AM
- 17 - Proposed equal parenting time child support formula shall also be applied towards less than equal parenting times commensurate to parenting times. a. Parents have already proposed several formulas to the committee that would accomplish the same. b. The current 5%, 10%, 15% adjustments are, as admitted by the committee, arbitrary and does not have any financial basis. c. Uneven distribution of child support dollars will further encourage financially motivated parents to fight for children's time for the wrong reasons. Parental alienation is a real issue and unfair child support guidelines are a fuel for it. - The proposed equal parenting time formula shall be re-written such that higher income parent could receive child support as well, if ordered or agreed upon by parents. a. There are already many examples of lower income parents paying child support. The way it is written, the formula would not accommodate those existing cases. - Child support allowance for clothing and basic misc expenses should be shared commensurate to parenting times so that both parents can provide these instead of bags traveling back and forth between households. a. The clothing supply issue does not work as the committee intended it to be. Guidelines need to reflect what actually is happening. b. One parent providing all clothing alienates one parent over the other. c. Clothing allowance shall be shared commensurate to parenting times, just like other indirect expenses. - Guidelines shall provide more definition into what exactly direct and indirect expenses are, and what each parent is required to provide. - The "shared residential custody" condition shall be eliminated for the proposed equal parenting time formula. It should be only based on equal or nearly equal parenting time. a. The "shared residential custody" condition / wording was never used for the 80/20 rule. Why use it now for the proposed formula. It is a wording issue in the orders and may not be up to date in all cases. Many of the orders assign one parent primary over another for child support purposes even if the time is shared. - The child support dollars shall be accounted for by the receiving parents as to what it was spent for and be available to the paying parents once a year upon request. Sep 8, 2011 8:42 PM

18 Everyone that is a stable safe parent should get to have 50/50 but if the Mom will not budge your screwed. Its all about the money and you people On the board are for the best interest of the state not the child. best interest would be 2 parents 50/50 except in a case where there is a unsafe parent. I had a judge tell me Quote"I don't care what she does with the support or the kids as long as she ain't screwing her boy friend on the coffee table when the kids are in the same room" . And he sat on the bench way to many years and was on so many drugs he couldn't function.Where the Hell was this board then, 50/50 should always be first option and adjust the pay accordingly. Sep 8, 2011 6:07 PM

19 - Proposed equal parenting time child support formula shall also be applied towards less than equal parenting times commensurate to parenting times. a. Parents have already proposed several formulas to the committee that would accomplish the same. b. The current 5%, 10%, 15% adjustments are, as admitted by the committee, arbitrary and does not have any financial basis. c. Uneven distribution of child support dollars will further encourage financially motivated parents to fight for children's time for the wrong reasons. Parental alienation is a real issue and unfair child support guidelines are a fuel for it. - The proposed equal parenting time formula shall be re-written such that higher income parent could receive child support as well, if ordered or agreed upon by parents. a. There are already many examples of lower income parents paying child support. The way it is written, the formula would not accommodate those existing cases. - Child support allowance for clothing and basic misc expenses should be shared commensurate to parenting times so that both parents can provide these instead of bags travelling back and forth between households. a. The clothing supply issue does not work as the committee intended it to be. Guidelines need to reflect what actually is happening. b. One parent providing all clothing alienates one parent over the other. c. Clothing allowance shall be shared commensurate to parenting times, just like other indirect expenses. - Guidelines shall provide more definition into what exactly direct and indirect expenses are, and what each parent is required to provide. - The "shared residential custody" condition shall be eliminated for the proposed equal parenting time formula. It should be only based on equal or nearly equal parenting time. a. The "shared residential custody" condition / wording was never used for the 80/20 rule. Why use it now for the proposed formula. It is a wording issue in the orders and may not be up to date in all cases. Many of the orders assign one parent primary over another for child support purposes even if the time is shared. - The child support dollars shall be accounted for by the receiving parents as to what it was spent for and be available to the paying parents once a year upon request. Sep 8, 2011 1:24 PM

20 The changes made to this section are an improvement from the previous 80/20 rule but need to be clarified further. This section gives two options to parents who share the child on an equal or nearly equal basis and as such offers an opportunity for a parent to pick the option that suites them without having any bearing on the childs well being. I was forced into using the 80/20 rule because the language used to explain the SHARED EXPENCE CALCULATION makes it easy for one parent to just refuse. Not only have I been paying child support I also still provide for the same things covered as direct expences. The court needs to consider using the Shared Expence formula as the default or initial option and if the court receives information that the option is not working or if BOTH parents AGREE it is not in the best intrest of the child then the Equal parenting plan formula can be used. Sep 8, 2011 10:55 AM

Page 8, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 21 | If I am denied time with my children, I should not be financially penalized for this arrangement. | Sep 8, 2011 8:20 AM |
| 22 | The clothing and other mis expenses allowance should also be included in the percentages. Both parents should be able to provide clothing, misc expenses, toys, electronics instead of carrying these items back and forth between household. None of the shared time parents do that. In addition, the word shared-custody shall be taken out of the paragraph. 80/20 was based on equal or nearly equal parenting time...there was no word of shared custody. This will create confusion if not corrected. Similar reduction shall also be applied to parents with less than equal parenting times commensurate their parenting time percentages. 5%, 10%, and 15% are arbitrary and have no basis. It is time that the committee corrects this and stop charging the non-residential parents unfairly. | Sep 8, 2011 8:05 AM |

Removing the Equal Parenting Adjustment (80/20 Rule)

Page 9, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	the 80/20 rule was just a way for my ex to get money. I struggle every day to make sure I am able to see my child and provide to the best of my ability, but the child support as written especially the 80/20 rule has made that responsibility even that much harder especially in this rough economic times. my child means everything and I will continue doing my best to provide the best that i can, a little fairness from the court would definately help	Oct 21, 2011 6:07 PM
2	The 80/20 rule tends to show that one party has primary custody still. Shared custody should be a 50% reduction... Why is it not?	Oct 10, 2011 11:51 AM
3	I have shared residential with my children's mother, however I have to pay child support, and I only get a 20% reduction. I do not believe this is fair to myself, or my children, or my household.	Oct 10, 2011 10:28 AM
4	The 80/20 rule should have never been introduced because it is not in compliance with 45CFR 302.56. the 20% adjustment factor was a convenient factor rather than the correct one. Actual economic data should have been used in determining how much a shared custodial parent should pay, just like is required in 45CFR 302.56 When it was first determined that there were issues with the 80/20, the committee should have begun looking for solutions. In 2008 the rule went into effect. Sometime in early 2010, the committee was already aware there were significant problems with the 80/20. But since the committee only convenes every 4 years, this rule has been in effect for the last 4 years creating financial hardship for shared custodial parents. My largest concern is that the committee was able to strongly support a provision which was determined out of convenience rather than by substantiated data. The exact same thing is currently being done with the 5%, 10%, and 15% parenting time adjustments still in effect. The economist stated she had no input on the 5%, 10%, and 15% values. In the 2010 meeting minutes it is stated that the 20% was an extension of parenting time adjustment for shared custody. If the basis of the 5/10/15% values is unfounded, the 20% value will also be unfounded. As was discovered, using unfounded values can lead to significant problems with the guidelines.	Oct 9, 2011 11:42 AM
5	The 80/20 rule was arbitrary and not fair for shared custody instances.	Oct 5, 2011 7:05 PM
6	We split time evenly and it works. Don't mess it up please.	Sep 30, 2011 2:35 PM
7	Blatant example of law skewed toward the female parent. Must get read of it! Make it equal.	Sep 30, 2011 6:55 AM
8	It was very unfair anyway.	Sep 28, 2011 6:09 AM
9	My former spouse gets enough of my money because of this old goofy formula. There is no advantage for and divorced parent to get a raise, promotion or do well in his or her own business because the other spouse gets a large percentage of this. The only way to get ahead is to be dishonest.	Sep 19, 2011 6:28 AM
10	If the recipient is with the child(ren half of the month, logic says that they should receive a half month's support.	Sep 16, 2011 3:02 PM
11	I have my child half of the time and in these difficult financial times I have had to struggle and the extra child support I pay has not helped much. In my case the	Sep 14, 2011 3:34 PM

Page 9, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

80/20 rule is so unfair and cant understand how it was set up in the first place. I don't care if I have to give half my check away, seeing and being involved with my child means everything to me. Doing away with the 80/20 rule is still a great improvement!

12 80/20 rule was arbitrary and has no basis...it should have been removed and replaced long time ago. The question is: How will the KS child support committee compensate child support paying parents for years of overpayment of indirect expenses that they were forced to pay unfairly. Sep 8, 2011 8:43 PM

13 refer to last response. Sep 8, 2011 6:08 PM

14 80/20 rule was arbitrary and has no basis...it should have been removed and replaced long time ago. The question is: How will the KS child support committee compensate child support paying parents for years of overpayment of indirect expenses that they were forced to pay unfairly. Sep 8, 2011 1:26 PM

Special Needs or Extraordinary Expenses

Page 10, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| 1 | I currently receive a deduction for extracurricular activities because my ex-wife would not pay or try to convince the kids to not participate. Keep adding checks and balances! | Oct 10, 2011 11:51 AM |
| 2 | <p>I absolutely do not agree with this section or how it is being calculated. Mathematically, it causes payors to pay twice because a portion of these costs are already included in the child support figures. Furthermore, shared custodial parents, under the new formula, correct for financial disparity in the first portion of the calculation. Direct expenses for the child are then split 50/50. The application of these costs are not consistent with this approach and, instead, cause the paying parent to pay even more. Parents have voiced their concerns about this new "extraordinary expenses" section already, and no one is in favor of it except the committee. It has been clearly identified that this new rule will, by nature, increase litigation by requiring parents to return to court to adjust for changes in extracurricular activities. These usually change many times per year. This provision will create "double dipping" because education, extracurricular activities and equipment costs are already included in the child support figures. Yet, this section clearly asks the payor to pay again. The committee has stated they don't want to over complicate the guidelines, yet this provision does exactly that - complicates the guidelines. It should be completely rewritten or should simply be removed. Costs for private school should be funded by both parents, but there are two problems with this section. 1.) education costs are already included in the child support figures. Therefore, only a fraction of these expenses should be added as an extraordinary expense. The USDA report by Mark Leno should be used to determine this fraction. 2.) If the child is not in private school, but Mom is informed she could put the kids in private school at Dad's expense, that's wrong. The simple word "agreed" should be introduced to ensure both parents make that decision. Having primary residential custody does not grant one parent more right to make such decisions. What is the definition of a "premier sport?" No one I've talked to knows what this is. It is also not clearly stated whether this must be agreed or not. Competitive and recreational sports are the norm. I know many low income parents who's children play competitive soccer. Competitive soccer doesn't cost any more than recreational soccer and doesn't travel. So does competitive = premier? This will be terribly confusing and any mention of sports should be removed from this section. Under the new shared custody formula, financial disparity is corrected, so asking a shared custodial parent to then come back and pay his/her income proportionate share for expenses like sports is incorrect. It might be more appropriate for parents with minimal parenting time, but not for parents with considerable parenting time. If there are extraordinary expenses which far exceed those which any family at that particular income level would normally incur, the "overall financial condition" should be questioned. There is already a provision to request an adjustment for overall financial condition.</p> | Oct 9, 2011 11:42 AM |
| 3 | This section is not clear and allows the judges to make decisions based on how they interpret the law and it should not be included. | Oct 5, 2011 7:08 PM |
| 4 | It is not fair to the noncustodial parent to pay these costs, when they have no input into the decision making process, i.e. what school the children goes to, what sports and activities the children participate in. If this is added, one parent has the opportunity to overburden the other with expensive activities that the noncustodial parent might not have chosen. | Oct 4, 2011 1:29 PM |

Page 10, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

5	Simply put, because it fits more in line with mother's lifestyle, the addition of a more costly extracurricular activity as opposed to the existing cost effective activity which the child enjoys should not be figured in to the already court ordered payment	Oct 3, 2011 9:55 AM
6	Unless both parents agree that it is in the best interest of the child to be involved in something that would required extraordinary expenses, then this should not be included in the child support payment. This requirement could result in undue hardship on a parent preventig the parent from the ability to provide for other expenditures for the child such as birthday gifts, Christmas gifts, vacations etc. during visitation time.	Oct 2, 2011 5:02 PM
7	If I don't agree with the expense then I shouldn't have to pay for it. If the children's father does, then he can pay for it. I don't have \$75 to pay for football camp, and \$150 to pay for basketball camp. There are free ones, let the kids go to those.	Sep 30, 2011 2:38 PM
8	Just because the residential parent believes that their kids needs private or special considerations does not mean they should expect the other parent to pay for it. If the two were married it would be a joint decision based on beliefs and money. Having to stand up in court and defend why you can't afford or support this process does no one any good. If the residential parent wants to do this then they should be big enough to handle it on their own. Unless the two can agree, but the court should have no part in this.	Sep 30, 2011 7:00 AM
9	Confusing and unnecessary. Should be removed.	Sep 28, 2011 6:09 AM
10	if one parent wants the child in certain activities or schools thats not fair for the parent who disagrees with the other to have to pay for the extra's. manicures are NOT a need and neither are pagents. i think that is ridiculous to say is a need. the parent who wants the child in those kind of things should pay the cost, cause those things are NOT a need to live	Sep 24, 2011 2:46 PM
11	If one party is already paying child support on a monthly bases why is it necessary to pay more above and beyond? We are in a situation now where mother and father do not agree in regards to added and extra expenses for their child. Why should one be 'obligated' to pay 'more' when they do not agree with the choices the other party is making? These 'extraordinary expenses' seem to corner the person having to pay child support to continue to pay more without the option of saying 'NO'.	Sep 22, 2011 8:39 PM
12	I feel if extroordinary expenses are needed they must be agreed upon by both parents- I do not feel a parents should help with expense of an item if it is just because the other parent wants to buy it, when the item in question is supplied to the child already- by the school or agency such as football pants.	Sep 20, 2011 7:15 AM
13	This section is not clear!!!	Sep 9, 2011 6:36 AM
14	It is confusing and will not do any good.	Sep 9, 2011 4:06 AM
15	This section is confusing and shall be removed. Without further data, this section will confuse judges, attorneys and parents. It should not be included.	Sep 8, 2011 8:44 PM

Page 10, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 16 | This section is confusing and shall be removed. Without further data, this section will confuse judges, attorneys and parents. It should not be included. | Sep 8, 2011 1:27 PM |
| 17 | What if extraordinary expenses are not agreed upon by both parties? If my ex decides to put my kids in private school without my consent, why should I be forced to pay for it? | Sep 8, 2011 8:21 AM |
| 18 | This is very confusing, should be removed completely. | Sep 8, 2011 8:06 AM |

Change of Circumstances - Duty to Notify

Page 11, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	<p>Judge? There was no Judge in my situation. The State of Kansas assigned a Contracting Agency (In which, I will not name them), who worked at the local SRS to decide my increased Child Support Payments when my Modification came up for review in 2009. The Contracting Agency requested my last two years of tax returns for jobs I no longer worked. Requested receipts and documents when I travelled 100 miles to see my Son, the other Single Parent did not have viable transportation to meet me halfway. Plus, the other Single Parent has not worked in 11 years, and is capable of working. I provided everything that was asked for. But when it came time for the other Single Parent to rebut, all the Contracting Agency/local SRS did was give her a phone call. Everything that I provided was not taken into consideration (Documents/Receipts). But the phone call to the other Single Parent was. So, there is no Judge. The Contracting Agency/local SRS is the Judge, Jury, and Executioner. All the Judge does is place his signature and official stamp on what the Contracting Agency/local SRS gives to them. No disrespect intended, but the Contracting Agency/local SRS (Judge) is a "Kangaroo Court". Because they hide behind the mantra of looking after the Child in seeking as much Child Support as they can get. And also to make sure that the State is the enforcer, so the State can get a fee. They don't look into the facts of each and every case. If so, they would have seen that my situation warranted less Child Support, and MORE Equal/Near Equal Parenting Time. In which, all they did was make the State my Son's Father. Where's the recommendations on this? Like I said, "Who checks the checker?"</p>	Oct 19, 2011 7:12 PM
2	<p>Empowering the judicial branch of the process with "pre-emptive" powers is not correct.</p>	Oct 12, 2011 9:00 AM
3	<p>My ex-wife is now working after 3 years of doing nothing. Case management is yet to provide any information to me, 4 months later...</p>	Oct 10, 2011 11:51 AM
4	<p>I might be able to support this rule if it didn't enter the amount on line F.3. I don't know if the committee has really looked at what this does, but if a payee was \$240 in arrears, he would be charged \$20/mo until he goes back to court. If that is 3 years down the road, he has now paid \$720. Maybe the intent is to penalize the payor - which it effectively does. However, if you look at the other side of the coin, what if there was a decrease? The payee may not be receiving sufficient funds for quite some time now. This again encourages litigation. If the committee would entertain the comments from the public, we've already requested that this arrearage be addressed just like arrears are already addressed (income withholding orders pursuant to Federal law). Child support is increased or decreased until the arrearage or overpayment is satisfied, then it automatically reverts to the nominal obligation. What is to be gained by entering this on line F.3? It makes no sense.</p>	Oct 9, 2011 11:43 AM
5	<p>1. Second Paragraph: An increase in the gross income of the parent having primary residency is not a material change of circumstances for the purpose of increasing the child support obligation.</p> <p>=====</p> <p>This is clearly a change in circumstances, especially when income wasn't initially imputed to a previously non-working spouse. Maintenance is set up to provide for a non-working spouse to get back into the workforce. After that period has ended, and they go back to work, it is not fair that this new income is not taken into account. So what are also saying that if the payor gets a nice raise, their</p>	Oct 5, 2011 11:30 AM

Page 11, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

	child support obligation probably goes up, but if the receiver of Child Support gets a nice raise, that isn't factored in. That is clearly unfair.	
6	I seriously doubt the court system is actively pursuing those who fail to disclose a 10% DROP in pay. Actually, the reverse is true. In order to get child support payments adjusted down to reflect a lay-off or drop in pay, the noncustodial parent must hire a lawyer (I was actually told to do this by the child support office). It cost over \$2000 to adjust child support due to a reduction in pay - this is money I could have used to pay child support by the way. If it isn't going to be supported both ways, it shouldn't be adopted. Also, my guess is it would rarely be used on the custodial parents when they are given a raise in pay.	Oct 4, 2011 1:33 PM
7	Changes on BOTH sides of the order should be disclosed. I have disclosed both deficit and surplus where the other side has not for the entirety of the order.	Oct 3, 2011 9:57 AM
8	The responsibility for disclosure of a material change of parent should be initiated by the second parent. A parent should not have to disclose there has been a change unless the other party requests if through the court.	Oct 2, 2011 5:07 PM
9	You'd have to do an audit on my ex to find out where all his money comes from. He doesn't work and there is no way his wife makes enough money to live the way they do. My husband and I both work and can barely make ends meet.	Sep 30, 2011 2:41 PM
10	The parent who pays all ready pays a tremendous amount far more than any true parent would spend on their child if they were truly trying to raise them properly. When that parent works hard to better their own situation the child will also benefit, just not by the hand of the the residential parent. The residential parent is able to remarries and reap the rewards of improved household income, but the non-residential parent if remarries has to share that child support burden with their new spouse, because of this I would not have any section that address a "change in circumstances". If the parent works hard and makes more money then good for them they to then may be allowed to have a life.	Sep 30, 2011 7:08 AM
11	Should not have to go to court and report every time you get a raise. If the other parent feels the need to increase support the burden should fall on them.	Sep 26, 2011 10:49 AM
12	we are a very low income family, we live with family members and I have @ children that live with me that are mine and still trying to pay for @ others outside my home. I have a letter from 1 of the childs mother stating that she doesnt want child support from me cause i signed the adoption papers back in 2008 and no money is due to the state but i still have to pay, things are really unfair for the people like myself that can not afford to hire a lawyer and the court appointed lawyers dont help you out...	Sep 24, 2011 2:50 PM
13	When the child support order was originally created mom was working as a simple veterinarian assistant making a little more than minimum wage. Mom has a four year college degree and two years after the divorce is now a [REDACTED] making four times more than what dad is making. No disclosure has taken place at all in regards to mom's significant income increase. Dad still pays the same child support as well as the additional expenses. There needs to be some accountability to Duty To Notify.	Sep 22, 2011 8:48 PM
14	I have been to taken to court many times by my ex wife and she lied about her	Sep 22, 2011 8:27 PM

Page 11, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

	income several times and the courts did absolutely nothing about it! I think that if I have to be honest about my income then so should she. My ex wife has also lied about medical, dental, and other bills that she hadn't even paid but yet I had to pay her for them and they still aren't paid! I think if a bill is owed the courts should have a system set up that the medical reimbursement be paid directly to the doctor or whoever is owed the money not to the other parent. If there are receipts showing that she paid them then fine but if not then it needs to be disbursed to the medical provider.	
15	I feel just because you make more you should not have to pay the other parent more money a month!!!! It is impossible to even survive when you try to better your self and then they other parents takes your extra income.	Sep 20, 2011 7:17 AM
16	Too much government already. Stay out	Sep 19, 2011 6:29 AM
17	It is not my responsibility to inform my spouse that I have gone out and work extremely hard to improve myself only for them to take that away. In my case a income statement worksheet is done each october by the other parent so it is known each year if my income goes up. and for that i get to pay Case Manager fees for the privilege of paying more money each month. Which i find very unfair.	Sep 12, 2011 6:07 PM
18	It should state for either parent!!!	Sep 9, 2011 6:37 AM
19	What if the child support paying parent's income is involuntarily reduced? Will he be allowed to backdate his reduced child support obligation? Until that language is added, child support paying parents do not agree to this section	Sep 8, 2011 8:46 PM
20	I thought they already did this. Id like to know why when I would loose pay or income it takes 9 months for a reduction but when I gain income it takes 6 months to get to court and I have to pay retro active back to the increase which I find was not legal by federal law.	Sep 8, 2011 6:11 PM
21	What if the child support paying parent's income is involuntarily reduced? Will he be allowed to backdate his reduced child support obligation? Until that language is added, child support paying parents do not agree to this section.	Sep 8, 2011 1:29 PM
22	Similarly, involuntary reductions in salary shall also be included to reduce or backdate child support reductions. It should be a two-way street.	Sep 8, 2011 8:07 AM

Change of Circumstance - Termination of Employment

Page 12, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	How is a Single Parent who is incarcerated going to pay Child Support??? Also, what if a Single Parent who is unjustly terminated for misconduct, and can't prove that it was unjust, how does that not constitute a material change of circumstance??? I think that you are completely out of touch on this one?! Because it affects everything if you do not have a job, or money! Just ask the 25 million Americans who are out of work today!	Oct 19, 2011 7:18 PM
2	Employers seek to find misconduct to prevent paying severance packages and other benefits to long time employees. A misconduct dismissal may result from subordinate behavior and the supervisor is also dismissed without any behavior from the supervisor leading to the termination. The proposed change is allowing a supposition on the board/judge/attorney as to the parent being dismissed to avoid support.	Oct 12, 2011 9:05 AM
3	It may appear that this language is neutral, but it is not. It appears this provision is intended to apply to a child support payor who is incarcerated and files a motion to reduce his monthly child support obligation. Have you considered the case where the primary custodian is incarcerated? It appears some assumptions have been made, which are not neutral. Child support cannot decrease, but it can increase? Just because a situation like this has not occurred, doesn't mean it won't occur over the next four years. Recommended language changes: 5.) Incarceration or Termination from Employment: Termination from employment for incarceration shall not constitute a material change of circumstances that justifies a child support modification. Termination from Employment for Misconduct: Termination from employment for misconduct shall not ordinarily constitute a material change of circumstances that justifies a child support modification.	Oct 9, 2011 11:43 AM
4	My goal is that this never applies to me. But it is hard to find a job in this economy. Saying that a loss of job, even for misconduct, is short sighted.	Oct 5, 2011 11:33 AM
5	How is child support expected to be paid in the normal amount with a reduction or elimination of income? It will only further hamper collection. Why can't a propationary period be given at a reduced amount with supporting documention that employment is being searched for? Why should it be any different than if the parties were still married and one of the parents lost their job, the benefits to the child (clothing, sports activities, etc) would be reduced until suitable employment could be found.	Oct 2, 2011 5:15 PM
6	If you lose your job you still need to take care of your kids. Figure it out.	Sep 30, 2011 7:09 AM
7	can't pay if you have no income.	Sep 26, 2011 10:50 AM
8	if you let go because of the employer has no where for you anymore at their company do to economy that you shouldnt be punished but if your fired over your own stupidity than you have the right to be punished	Sep 24, 2011 2:51 PM
9	It should be for the judges to decide.	Sep 9, 2011 4:07 AM
10	Again, another one sided order to punish child support paying parents. If the child support paying parent is incarcerated or terminated employment due to misconduct, the guidelines should order a change of custody and change of which parent receives child support.	Sep 8, 2011 8:47 PM

Page 12, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

11	when I check in after the increase you are going to imply here I will fit this.	Sep 8, 2011 6:12 PM
12	Again, another one sided order to punish child support paying parents. If the child support paying parent is incarcerated or terminated employment due to misconduct, the guidelines should order a change of custody and change of which parent receives child support.	Sep 8, 2011 1:35 PM
13	A change in circumstances is a change in circumstances. How can you expect someone to pay money they don't have?	Sep 8, 2011 8:22 AM
14	I do not agree until the outrageous child support interest rates are reduced to a reasonable level. 10% is unrealistic and it only destroys families and non-custodial parents lives.	Sep 8, 2011 8:09 AM

Updated Child Support Schedules

Page 13, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

1	He insists on buying them expensive clothes and toys, which they don't need to have. I want to help provide for their needs and pleasure, but I don't want to pay more to him because he insists that they should have \$45 stuffed animals.	Oct 21, 2011 6:18 AM
2	I know that it is based on income, but why would a child 0-5, and 6-12 need \$700 a month? They can't eat that much, they don't need that much in clothes, that much for their share of rent/utilities, or school supplies. So what you are failing to state is that this amount of money is for the other Single Parent/Custodian. My point is, if the other Single Parent/Custodian is receiving \$700 a month for the one child, what incentive is there for her to work? As I have stated previously, my Son is 11 years old, and the other Single Parent/Custodian has not worked in 11 years. And is also receiving State Assistance! But is capable of working! No disrespect intended, but I wouldn't work either! The State is an enabler for people like her to game the system! Your increases should not only be based on income, but on true facts as well. Also, incentives should be mandated for that other Single Parent/Custodian to seek work as well. That's the problem, the State has made Child Support like the Welfare Program. Enforcement on the State's part is needed to make sure that the State's mantra of taking care of the Child is actually being enforced.	Oct 19, 2011 7:38 PM
3	With the overall national economy being in a recession, and the fact that it has been for past several years, I find it hard to believe that parents are spending a higher percentage of their income on their children now than they were four years ago. I realize that parents are not going to have their children go without the basic necessities of food, clothing, etc., but I'm certain everyone is looking for ways to cut costs, even when it comes to expenditures on their children, not spend more.	Oct 13, 2011 2:57 PM
4	When will the increase stop. The cost to raise a child has increased as well as the cost to live. Wages have not kept pace with the increases per the schedules. Taxes are continuing to increase as well and very little consideration is given to the monies being paid are post tax.	Oct 12, 2011 9:07 AM
5	This is based upon a continuing, obvious injustice with KS child support. Income should indeed be a part of the computation of child support amount remitted, but it's currently the ONLY consideration, (after children's age and number of children, of course). The recipient has zero responsibility of demonstrating how much the recipient actually NEEDS for the children. I remit \$3200/month, tax-free to my ex-spouse, but my ex-spouse realistically only needs at the most \$2500/month for our three children. All the while, my ex-spouse has the children 15 days/month. This \$3200/month is after the 20% reduction is made for the parenting time adjustment. I earn a good income, yes, but if an amount is unjust....it's unjust. Regardless of what one earns. I've repeatedly asked my ex-spouse to switch to a Shared Expense formula. This obviously would bring fairness into the equation. The recipient isn't willing to do so for the obvious reason that it materially reduces the recipient's amount. Both parties must agree to the Shared Expense to make it legally work. Need is ambiguous, true, but not totally ambiguous to the point of dismissing it altogether as it is now. Some element of need must be placed upon a recipient's responsibility to demonstrate.	Oct 12, 2011 5:02 AM
6	there may be an increase in costs of living. I don't see it. but raises in income have not occurred.	Oct 11, 2011 12:27 PM

Page 13, Q3: Feel free to explain your response.

7	I am assuming that the adjustments are related to cost of living increasing. I strongly feel that there needs to be accountability added, which should be an annual review that shows that child support is needed, etc...	Oct 10, 2011 11:51 AM
8	This question is misleading. The actual percentage increase for most parents will be between 10% to 12%, not 2% to 4%. This has to do with the supposed increase in spending in the lower age groups. There is insufficient information for me to even have an opinion on this question due to the lack of information to substantiate these increases. Has the committee fully reviewed the latest consumer spending survey data themselves to ensure no mistakes have been made and that assumptions are correct? Based on data, can you agree with the economist that these increases are valid? If another economist conducted an independent study and concluded that these increases were not founded, and should remain exactly where they are, wouldn't you want to see the data to support that finding? In order to support adjustments this year and in subsequent years, a complete economist report should be filed. I cannot support this because there is insufficient information.	Oct 9, 2011 11:43 AM
9	I object to the increased child support obligations because the committee has presented no justification data to support an increase.	Oct 5, 2011 7:14 PM
10	You have increased the 6-11 age range by almost 10%, where you only increased the 12-18 age range by 3%. This is completely short sighted in today's economy where most of us, including me, haven't had a raise at their jobs in three years. With two kids in this 6-11 age bracket, this is raising my child support by 10% puts me into financial jeopardy. In tough times like this, the prudent thing to do as a parent would be to lower their children's standard of living vice taking more money from the payer. I am not making these comments to appear as wanting to shuck my responsibility as the bigger earner. But the fact is that we aren't getting raises in the work force and are lucky to be keeping our jobs, so our children (or ex-spouses) shouldn't get raises either.	Oct 5, 2011 11:41 AM
11	With the current economy, parents who receive child support are most certainly spending less on children. This increase is not advisable during the current economic climate.	Oct 4, 2011 1:40 PM
12	As child's needs may have grown, due to government downsizing my pay has seen a direct reflection in the deduction of 10% annual- while the other half of the order is now spending cash to purchase a SECOND vehicle in a household containing only two persons- one being 8.	Oct 3, 2011 10:01 AM
13	the increase should start on those who file as of 2012. not those who are almost done with paying. not fair to increase with what has been working just fine.	Sep 30, 2011 5:08 PM
14	I can't afford anymore! I have 3 other children to buy for! Stop trying to take all my money!	Sep 30, 2011 2:43 PM
15	Economically things are much harder than they were four years ago, we have had to cut back on everything, so why would we increase what we spend on our kids, we would not as a family we would all survive these hard times together and our kids would be better for it. Increasing the amount I pay would send me below the poverty line. I have a good job and work hard, but I live just above poverty. She has an OK job but lives in a fancy house and take s the kids on all	Sep 30, 2011 7:24 AM

Page 13, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

kinds of trips, and spoils them with what ever they want, and who pays for all that without any say in the matter - ME. The system is broken FIX IT! Don't raise my child support give me more say in how it is spent, she walked away from the relationship for another man, and all the while new the court would not hold it against her, she new that simply because she was a women she would be awarded the kids and with them a hug monthly tax free paycheck from me. I have little to no say in how my kids are raised I just pay what ever she wants. THE SYSTEM IS BROKEN FIX IT!

16	I disagree with the increased child support amounts. There has been no increase in the cost of raising a child. Expecially, support for younger children is unfair since they dont even have school expenses and daycare is paid separately.	Sep 28, 2011 6:11 AM
17	if you have no income or very little than i dont understand how it can be said or used against you that \$15,500. I dont know anyone who spends that much money in one nor 12 months on a child	Sep 24, 2011 2:53 PM
18	Considering I am one who pays child support, I wouldn't object to a small increase ONLY if the added expenses for ALL extra curricular (and all supplies/uniforms etc. included) were included in the increase and I was not obligated to have to pay both.	Sep 22, 2011 8:54 PM
19	The more I make the more you take, the more you take the more I owe, the more I owe, the more you take. The system feeds itself, the more taken naturally would show an increase of spending but is it truly spent on the children? Does it mean the children need more? What about living within one's means? Are we now constitutionally mandated to have a certain standard of living? Are we all being treated equal? Taking more to spend more, yields taking more; this is a defeating purpose. The proposal is flawed. Who governs that the money is spent on children? No one. How can one say then that more is spent on (younger) children? Absolutely flawed this recommendation is!	Sep 19, 2011 9:15 PM
20	The concept of what the recipient NEEDS. This should not be totally discarded. Recipient should have at least some burden of demonstrating what they genuinely need. It is fair to all parties involved.	Sep 16, 2011 3:07 PM
21	I strongly disagree with the propsed increase. I know of no one over the last 3 years that have gotten a 2% to 4% let alone an 11% increase in their income so adding that burden to us who pay child support is just wrong. Wrong time and wrong economy. It is very hard out there for us who have to pay the CS and we are barely getting by as it is. Alot of us have to work 2 or more jobs just to keep up with the payments and build a life for ourselves. A good percentage of us are doing our best. Yes there are some that are not and they need to be singled out and dealt with but not all of us need to be punished.	Sep 12, 2011 6:12 PM
22	I strongly disagree. My ex husband works for air craft & works 5 min away from home. He has no expenses for housing and utilities. I work for a small company, all my insurance is out of my pocket which is 3 times more then what he pays, i work 30 min away from work & have rent & utilitles. He is always going on vacations & buying expensive toys. I can barely buy groceries for my household. I don't agree that it should go up w/out them showing that they are actually using the money on the child...not to buy expensive toys and vacations.	Sep 9, 2011 8:49 AM

Page 13, Q3. Feel free to explain your response.

	It makes it so that I can't take my son to do anything when I do have him because I can't afford it. But when he is with his father he is always "going & blowing".	
23	It still costs the same to raise a child and costs are especially lower for young children since there are no school costs when they are a baby.	Sep 9, 2011 6:38 AM
24	It is absolutely crazy that the amounts are being increased. In this economy and the job market? You people are insane. Stop abusing non-custodial parents. Raising a child did not get more expensive.	Sep 9, 2011 4:08 AM
25	We object to the increased child support obligations. a. We, the parents, have not had an increase in our children's expenses in proportionate to our gross incomes, especially in this economy. b. The committee has overcharged child support paying parents for years for indirect expenses, and they are admittedly correcting this issue in 2012. If anything, child support obligations should be reduced to compensate paying parents for years worth of losses. c. The committee has presented no justification data to support an increase.	Sep 8, 2011 8:49 PM
26	This needs to be left alone.	Sep 8, 2011 6:14 PM
27	We object to the increased child support obligations. a. We, the parents, have not had an increase in our children's expenses in proportionate to our gross incomes, especially in this economy. b. The committee has overcharged child support paying parents for years for indirect expenses, and they are admittedly correcting this issue in 2012. If anything, child support obligations should be reduced to compensate paying parents for years worth of losses. c. The committee has presented no justification data to support an increase.	Sep 8, 2011 1:36 PM
28	Cost of living has gone up for both parties. How are non-custodial parents supposed to come up with more money when their own net income has also gone down?	Sep 8, 2011 8:23 AM
29	There has been no increase in raising a child in ratio to our incomes, especially in this economy. KS is already charging non-custodial parents a huge amount of child support in comparison to the other states. Even though KS is within 10% of lowest living expense states, it ranks in the middle as far as child support obligations in comparison to the other states. The obligations shall be kept as is.	Sep 8, 2011 8:12 AM

General Comments

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | In general, I feel the recommended changes are fair. I appreciate the attempt to make things more manageable, especially in light of economic situations. | Oct 21, 2011 6:19 AM |
| 2 | I respect all of the Judges, Lawyers, and Personnel who worked on the new Kansas Child Support Guidelines. However, and no disrespect intended, I disagree. Because there are so many variables to Child Support that are not considered or recommended by the Advisory Committee. You see, you are tough and stringent when it comes to Child Support Payments and your guidelines. I understand and get that. But what I don't understand is why you can't make your guidelines reasonable, and fair to both Parents? Is Child Support 50-50, or 80-20? After you enforce the monetary end of Child Support, why can't you enforce the Equal Parenting Time, or the Tax Benefits? Those are just words in your guidelines. If that other Single Parent/Custodian does not want to give up the Child Exemption they don't have to. Oh, I can hear you say it now, take it to the Judge. And I need to correct you, you mean take it up with the Kansas Contracting Agency/Local SRS Judge, Jury, and Executioner. Why would the so called "Judge" side with me? When I provided documentation and receipts, and was still denied. There is no justice! So therefore, I humbly say to you, and no disrespect intended, you are out of touch of what is really happening out here in the State of Kansas. Don't get me wrong, you're enforcement is working. But where is the enforcement for a Father who pays child support each and every month on time for 11 years, where is that enforcement by the State to ensure that a Father is entitled by God (Not the State) to raise his Son? That's the whole point that the Advisory Committee is missing, and is out of touch on! You can throw all the money in the World at Child Support, but in the end, it's not going to matter. Because it is about Love, Bonding, Teaching, and Molding a Child into a productive citizen. The State can't do that! But you can ensure, and enforce that it happens! Bottom line, my Son is 11 yrs old now, I have 7 more yrs of Child Support. He doesn't know me as his Father. All he know's is that the State is his Father. You have taken everything away from me! I just hope that you raise him right! Because I give up, and I am tired of fighting you for something that is right. He is all yours! | Oct 19, 2011 8:05 PM |
| 3 | If the so called bush Tax Cuts are repealed, will the support guidelines be modified downward to adjust for the increase in tax burden for the higher income payors? Why is Kansas the only state in the group of 5% above and below interstate pay differential that breaks the ages into three groups? Why are so many panel members original members? | Oct 12, 2011 9:18 AM |
| 4 | One other item that seems to be swept under the rug is child support is tax free is to the recipient. If one remits \$1000/month for child support, they are really remitting about \$1200/month, depending upon the payor's tax bracket. Kansas really should start taking this into account in its computations.....or have the recipient correctly share in at least some of the tax burden. Like any other financial transaction (which child support is), tax considerations should be taken into account. | Oct 12, 2011 5:06 AM |
| 5 | First off, I feel the committee needs to be made of only one family law attorney, one payee of child support, one reciever of child support, one mathematician, one economist, etc. Why should a child support committee be made up of just attorneys? Looks bad... Secondly, end all of the exchanging of receipts... It doesn't happen. Also, clothes going back and forth doesn't happen as well. New clothes go over, old clothes come back. Shared custody should be shared | Oct 10, 2011 12:06 PM |

custody. Equal parenting time should be an automatic 50% reduction, without question. Why is it pretty much "mandatory" that child support is collected by income withholding? I feel that if a parent has demonstrated that they have kept current, then this mandating should be dropped and the "handling fees" can go to the children, not to employ someone in Topeka! Anyone who receives child support should have to be held accountable. QDRO's, etc, should be supplied to the payer! In summary, reduce all of the legal jargon, instill accountability and for goodness sakes... realize 98% of divorced parents will never see eye to eye and most importantly, a lot of the receivers of child support use these "tax free" funds as "mommy money". Thanks.

- 6 For the last 10 years Kansas parents have requested changes to the guidelines. Typically, requests to increase child support are readily supported by the committee and revised language is promptly suggested. One such change was a single letter written to the committee asking for a new provision to penalize her ex-husband for failing to notify her of a change in his income. She did not need to do anything more than write a single letter and the committee had proposed language ready for the next meeting. Yet for the last many years, parents have said the parenting time adjustments are much too low. As the committee stated, [REDACTED] past committee member, suggested the current values. Lacking foundation, the committee stands behind their values and refuses to consider changing the parenting time adjustments in favor of a more reasonable approach, which models other states (ref. IN guidelines). Changes are not only requested by child support paying men. Letters have been written by plenty of women who both pay or receive or are the spouse of a payor or payee, and plenty of child care and other professionals who also believe the guidelines are not written to promote fairness. In fact there are a number of sections which encourage further litigation. Consistent requests: 1.) Accounting for child support spending. The committee says it would be difficult, but has anyone actually done their due diligence and looked into it? What would it take? What would it cost? Maybe it would provide constant data to create an even better guideline? 2.) Increase parenting time adjustment. There's no basis for the current values. 3.) Remove the spousal maintenance from the guidelines. Parties who were never married get saddled with this cost every day even though they were never married. 4.) Include spouse's income after remarried or offer to follow a separate plan which is not based on income 5.) Allow cost shares method as opposed to income shares 6.) The committee is top-heavy with attorneys, judges, and child support enforcement personnel. Only 50% of the committee should be comprised of this group. The rest should be either neutral parties, or payors and payees. The committee should encourage and help other, neutral, parties join the committee. More diversity.
- Oct 9, 2011 11:47 AM

- 7 I feel the guidelines punish the parent who pays, which is usually the higher wage earner of the family. The guidelines need to be revised to encourage the child support recipient to better themselves for their sake and for the sake of the children involved. The guidelines should also be revised for cases where the child support recipient is also receiving child support from a previous marriage. This income was not accounted for and in my case. With such a lopsided set of rules, why would one try to better themselves? They could just sit back and take the child support payers to court at will as well as just sit back and let the committee raise the child support amounts arbitrarily. I will do anything for my daughter, but so should her mother.
- Oct 5, 2011 7:29 PM

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

8	Thank you for listening to my comments.	Oct 5, 2011 11:41 AM
9	In general there are issues with this document as it relates to enforcement. Many things are agreed to in the presence of the court but then not upheld and with no recourse (other than hiring a lawyer, which costs money). For example, in my case it was agreed and dictated by the court that travel costs for two children would be shared by the noncustodial and custodial parent. The custodial parent does not pay her half. If I want to see my children I must pay the airfare. She is the one who moved, not me. Everything in these guidelines and all decisions by the court need to be enforceable and there must be a method of recourse that is time effective and that does not require lawyer fees to be utilized. Please consider this as you rewrite the guidelines.	Oct 4, 2011 1:40 PM
10	Allow me to deduct child support from my taxes or make it taxable income for the recipient. Make some kind of change that doesn't penalize the payer when they attempt to go above and beyond what is ordered. Some of the population DO take responsibility for offspring whether they reside with them or not. All changes seem to benefit payee and in certain circumstances allow them to create a surplus while the other side sells possessions and maintains a standard of living way lower just to break even	Oct 3, 2011 10:04 AM
11	There should be a requirement for the parent who receives child support to provide documentation that a percentage of the money is actually being spent on the child for clothes, school activities etc. Why can't there be any requirement that X% of child support be placed in a trust fund or some kind of savings to ensure the child has some money after completion of high school (or GED). There is so much attention placed on parents that don't pay support, yet there are many parents that abuse the money received and not use it for the child's needs. There needs to be a mechanism to help promote and encourage the support money that is paid goes toward the child and not towards the receiving parents self interests.	Oct 2, 2011 5:28 PM
12	as stated ... it should be implemented on those who file for support in the year 2012 and not reflect on those who have already filed	Sep 30, 2011 5:09 PM
13	I don't believe that you should change the guidelines. I live in a small town and work at an elementary school. I can't afford to pay anymore, and definitely don't want to add to my child support bill. I am fine paying what I do, plus the extra \$100 to pay off back child support. Do not pass this. We can't afford another hit to our incomes.	Sep 30, 2011 2:45 PM
14	The entire system is broken, marriage is a failed institute and the system needs to assign blame for those at fault. I recognize that your committee does not deal with Kansas being a "no-fault" state but that is where it starts. On your side you need to completely revamp your child support and mandate that the payer has a direct say in where the money is spent. I know this complicates things but it is very complicated already. Your system is broken and because of that a large section of your population is getting richer while the rest of us pay for it. I love my children more than anything in the world, I never wanted any of this and nothing in this process has been my fault, but I pay for everything, I lose time with my kids, relinquished to being a part time Dad, too over 1/3 of my income going to a woman who I have no say in how or where she spends it. The whole system is broken please do the right thing and fix it.	Sep 30, 2011 7:34 AM

15	NO MATTER WHAT 90 % OF THE TIME THE FEMALE GETS WHAT SHE WANTS WETHER RIGHT OR WRONG THE FEMALE WINS REGARDLESS OF THE SITUATION. I HAVE BEEN SUPPORTING MY SON SINCE 2003 WHEN HE MOVED IN WITH ME PAID FOR EVERYTHING THRU HIGH SCOOOL AND COLLEGE AND THE EX SUPPORTED MY DAUGHTER . BUT YET I STILL GET IT STUCK TO ME HAVING TO PAY BACK SUPPORT ON MY DAUGHTER THIS IS BU,LLSHIT MY SONS MOTHER NEVER PAID FOR ANYTHING FOR HIM FROM THE TIME HE MOVED IN WITH ME TO THE PRESENT . ME PAYING ALL HIS BILLS AND FOR COLLEGE DOES NOT MEAN SHIT TO THE COURT SYSTEM HIS IS WERE THE SYSTEM FAILED BIG TIME SO I AM STUCK PAYING DOUBLE BECAUSE OF THE SYSTEM FAILING....I AGREE GO AFTER THE DEAD BEATS, BUT DONT PUT THE SCREWS TO SOMEONE THAT HAS BEEN SUPPORTING THERE CHILDREN. THAT NEEDS TO CHANGE!!!!	Sep 30, 2011 6:30 AM
16	Child support guidelines needs to be changed a lot for them to be fair yet. Another review is required next year or 2014 at the latest. Similar parenting time discounts are needed for less than equal time parents. Child support is currently an incentive for mothers to alienate their children's relationships with their fathers. Unfair guidelines destroy children's lives and runs fathers away. If you want more responsible fathers, you need to provide them incentive to be a parent...not punish them with unfair child support obligations.	Sep 28, 2011 6:13 AM
17	I find no section for the termination of paying. I have heard it is 18 but I can't find it in the worksheet. it should be in the table of contents.	Sep 26, 2011 10:52 AM
18	I believe that the income tax should really take place instead of saying 0 on the line where an amount is suppose to be. the mother in our case makes much more than I, but yet it never takes a portion off my child support due why is that? there are so many things wrong these days, i wish the law would help everybody and not just the ones that have money to hire big lawyers, my case worker wont even help me and i do everything i am suppose to. i have a state to state case that i keep getting the run around on, both states say i can send that in the mail and then never do. i pay like im suppose to but still get no help, then the state says i have to have my case worker call and request the info but my case worker asks for something tottaly different than what i asked for. my one cse got dropped for curent support because i signed adopcion papers in july 08 and they finaly went thru in may 10, my arrears were \$75 a month and now they raised them to \$200 a month and the judge in kansas raised it but they say arkansas has to lower them if they want to how fair is that, im trying to support 2kids at my house plus my ill wife, and pay child support on 2 other cases and my workers wont help me out. why is is that they get paid and are assigned to me if they arent going to help. I understand going after the dead beat dads but thats not me	Sep 24, 2011 3:03 PM
19	As a father I have no problem taking the responsibility to take care of my children financially. However, I do believe my child support order should cover all of their expenses. I do not believe I should have to pay child support and then have to pay half for extra curricular activities, medications, baseball uniforms, baseball camps that cost \$125.00 and ALL of the name brand equipment mom chooses to purchase. As the laws and guidelines read now I feel they are a bit one sided and unfair.	Sep 22, 2011 9:00 PM
20	I often feel that judges do not go off of these guidelines they in the end make	Sep 22, 2011 8:39 PM

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

their own decisions on these matters. My ex wife takes me to court often for more and more and more money and yet even if she is found to be wrong or not entitled the judge still does not EVER grant me attorneys fees or back money that is owed to me. I also feel that our system doesn't do justice for us fathers that have remarried and have other children. I have always felt like these children do not matter to our courts. All the courts care about are the children that I am paying child support for. These child support guidelines have not only failed me but my 2 daughters that do live me. I find it disturbing that our courts can't do better for ALL children involved. I am tired of my ex wife taking me to court for every little thing and costing me more and more attorneys fees and our courts allow it. It is doing nothing more then taking food out of my 2 daughters that do live with me mouths and its wrong in my eyes.

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 21 | Your Child support formula is outdated and is counter productive. I have no reason to be successful or get a promotion or raise because what I don;t give away in taxes, I give to my former spouse. My former spouse is affected in the same way. What ever raise or promotion she gets is taken away when we do a child support modification. It's a joke!! Why try to earn more?? | Sep 19, 2011 6:32 AM |
| 22 | What also needs to be considered is that the payor is paying taxes on the amount. The recipient receives money tax free. A huge consideration that never seems to be acknowledged. | Sep 16, 2011 3:07 PM |
| 23 | Another issue I have in my personal case is that one day my CS is X amount and it cost Y to raise the children. I go out and improve my self work hard and increase my salary so I might be able to get ahead a little bit and with one email to our Case Manager my CS responsibility goes up. I am out working hard improving myself each year and yet the other parent is at the same job with the same income not improving which makes my percentage go up and theirs go down and I have to end up paying more, which then defeats the purpose of me going out and improving myself for the family. In other words this is really counter productive to us working and improving ourselves. CS goes from 800 a month and the very next month just because we improve it goes to 1300. that is not fair and really is a shame. At some point enough is enough right? I havnet and i am sure i am not the only one who has paid religously the entire time but yet get punished by improving oneself. I dont mind paying CS and will always take care of my children i jsut believe that the formula is skewed and needs to be adjusted down. No way it takes what the chart says to raise kids. The chart and the outlandish amount of CS that is forced on us non custodial parents is criminal and is not close to being fair. If this is going to be the case then all judges need to mandate 50-50 custody and make the custodial parent improve themselves also and not just punish the parent out making themselves better. I do not have all the answers I jsut know that it is very hard on the non custodial parent to pay the high cost of CS and in my case the kids are not without. A more realistic approach needs to be taken. | Sep 12, 2011 6:23 PM |
| 24 | I think that you should take each parties individual living expenses into consideration. There is a huge difference in working for an Aircraft company compared to working for a small family owned company like I do. The economy is down and people are having a hard time paying bills, but the child support is going up....i don't understand :-/ | Sep 9, 2011 8:51 AM |
| 25 | The child support schedules have been updated to reflect the increased amount | Sep 9, 2011 6:38 AM |

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

parents are spending on children. This is generally an increase of between 2% and 4% across income categories. The top income amount in the tables has been raised to \$15,500 per month so that high-income earners do not have to compute the child support obligation through the formula. Finally, the percentage adjustment for the two younger age groups (0 – 5 years of age and 6 – 11 years of age) has increased to reflect the increase in spending on younger children compared to spending on children four years ago. I strongly object to the increase in child support obligations.

26 Allow as many parents as the number of officials and professionals on the committee. We live the guidelines everyday, they dont. Include clothing allowance so both parents can purchase clothing. We are tired of carrying bags back and forth. It is not happening and the quality of clothing purchased for the paying parent's house is lower quality then what is purchased for the other home. If clothing allowance is not shared, it allows parental allienation. Make child support collecting parents accountable for where they spend the money. The money is not going to children. We need more frequent reviews of the guidelines. These guidelines are far from being acceptable. Sep 9, 2011 4:12 AM

27 The child support guidelines were already unfair in their entirety. The entire system need to be completely overhauled and re-calculated. The guidelines do nothing more than favor one parent over another creating animosity keeping the family entrenched in turmoil as well as lengthy, expensive and exhausting court proceeding. They do nothing more than perpetuate parental alienation and send the message that, one parent is more important than the other, to our children. The State of Kansas child support enforcement needs to be audited and the allocation of all monies collected from both private and federal funding such as Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, need to be disclosed in their entirety to the public. More efforts need to be made and policies adopted to protect and benefit both parents equally. More money needs to be allocated to help keep fathers involved in their children's lives. There are only about 6% of fathers that totally default on child support due to willful non compliance. Approximately 5% of fathers default on child support due to an inability to pay. That is a total of 11% of fathers ordered to pay child support default on their obligation. Child support enforcement helps mothers track these fathers down to force them to pay child support at no charge. Legal action is being taken against fathers that include wage garnishment, suspension of the their driving privileges, up to and including incarceration for failure to pay only. All while using "the best interest of the child" as a veil of justification. These enforcement tactics have only succeeded in compounding the problem and systematically removing fathers from their children's lives. This is not "in the best interest of the child". Keep in mind that 6% of those fathers want to pay, but are unable. As compared to 33% of mothers who willfully withhold children from the biological father. Mothers withholding children from the biological fathers is 3 times the problem of non payment of child support and yet their drivers licenses are not being suspended, their wages are not being garnished and they are not being incarcerated? It seems as though the federal funding is being allocated to address the wrong problem. There are not any free services offered to help fathers locate mothers that have fled with the children. There are not any free services to help fathers enforce their god given right to be fathers to their children and provide access to them. There are no free services offered to fathers to help them decrease their child support when circumstances warrant a decrease. In many cases the father is already struggling financial and can't afford legal representation to go to court Sep 8, 2011 10:08 PM

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

for a child support reduction. Money from Title IV-D needs to be divided to assist parents equally and help children enjoy the advantage of being able spend time with and love each parent equally without the fear of losing a father due to a mother's withholding or incarceration. That is what's "in the best interest of the child". The State/Federally funded child support enforcement agencies should be disbanded as they are unfair, ineffective and operating under archaic pretenses and guidelines. An updated system that serves to protects the rights of our children and truly represents the best interest of the children. It should represent the issues facing mothers and fathers equally while sheltering the children under the veil of their own god given right to have and love both parents equally. Perhaps Children's Rights Enforcement Agency would be an appropriate title. Working to protect children from broken homes.

- 28 This whole board and operation should be brought up on charges. your nothing more that a court ordered mafia. I have always kept up on my support and over paid thousands. I have had enough another increase the house goes to the bank I stay in jail. Not a problem I give up you win. now see how much money you get. Sep 8, 2011 6:17 PM
- 29 Fathers are repeatedly given short shrift in this legislation. Mothers are given license to exploit men who get little access to their own children, yet must pay to feed and clothe them. The guidelines as they exist now are prejudicial and exploitative. Sep 8, 2011 8:24 AM
- 30 1. I object to the increased child support obligations (~10%). a. There has not had an increase in our children's expenses in proportionate to our gross incomes, especially in this economy. b. The committee has overcharged child support paying parents for years for indirect expenses, and they are admittedly correcting this issue in 2012. If anything, child support obligations should be reduced to compensate paying parents for years worth of losses. c. The committee has presented no justification data to support an increase. 2. Proposed equal parenting time child support formula shall also be applied towards less than equal parenting times commensurate to parenting times. a. Parents have already proposed several formulas to the committee that would accomplish the same. b. The current 5%, 10%, 15% adjustments are, as admitted by the committee, arbitrary and does not have any financial basis. c. Uneven distribution of child support dollars will further encourage financially motivated parents to fight for children's time for the wrong reasons. Parental alienation is a real issue and unfair child support guidelines are a fuel for it. 3. The proposed equal parenting time formula shall be re-written such that higher income parent could receive child support as well, if ordered or agreed upon by parents. a. There are already many examples of lower income parents paying child support. The way it is written, the formula would not accommodate those existing cases. 4. Child support allowance for clothing and basic misc expenses should be shared commensurate to parenting times so that both parents can provide these instead of bags travelling back and forth between households. a. The clothing supply issue does not work as the committee intended it to be. Guidelines need to reflect what actually is happening. b. One parent providing all clothing alienates one parent over the other. c. Clothing allowance shall be shared commensurate to parenting times, just like other indirect expenses. 5. Guidelines shall provide more definition into what exactly direct and indirect expenses are, and what each parent is required to provide. 6. Similarly, sanctions shall be ordered for child support receiving parents if they voluntarily Sep 8, 2011 8:15 AM

Page 14, Q1. Feel free to comment on any other aspect of the Kansas Child Support Guidelines.

terminate their employment, get fired due to misconduct or remain underemployed to receive higher amounts of child support. 7. Similarly, sanctions shall be ordered for child support receiving parents if they fail to disclose an increase in their salary. 8. Similarly, backdating of child support reduction shall be ordered for paying parents in the case of an involuntary salary reduction or layoffs. 9. The proposed addition regarding extraordinary expenses shall be removed to prevent confusion. It is not clear to any of the parents. 10. The "shared residential custody" condition shall be eliminated for the proposed equal parenting time formula. It should be only based on equal or nearly equal parenting time. a. The "shared residential custody" condition / wording was never used for the 80/20 rule. Why use it now for the proposed formula. It is a wording issue in the orders and may not be up to date in all cases. Many of the orders assign one parent primary over another for child support purposes even if the time is shared. 11. A requirement shall be added to the guidelines to accept as many parent representatives on the committee as the number of other officials; lawyers, judges, professors, senators, etc. 12. All justification data shall be released for public review, free of charge, on the committee website at least 2 months before the public review of the guidelines. 13. The guidelines shall provide the statistics on how many mothers vs. fathers receive support. The committee shall be ordered to find ways to equalize these numbers. 14. The child support dollars shall be accounted for by the receiving parents as to what it was spent for and be available to the paying parents once a year upon request.