

# State of Alaska

Department of Revenue  
Administrative Services Division



**SARAH PALIN, GOVERNOR**

333 Willoughby Avenue, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor

P.O. Box 110400

Juneau, Alaska 99811-0405

Phone: (907) 465-2300

Fax: (907) 465-2394

April 11, 2009

The Honorable Jay Ramras  
Chair, Judiciary Committee  
Alaska House of Representatives  
Alaska State Capitol, Room 120  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Representative Ramras;

There is only one difference between the Senate CS for SB 96 and the House CS for HB 192. On page 2 of both bills, Sec 1 included paragraph (a) of intent language but the Senate CS inadvertently left out paragraph (b) which is in CSHB 192 as follows:

“(b) The proposed changes made in AS 25.25.101(19) under sec. 3 of this Act are conforming amendments that will result in procedural changes in Alaska for enforcement and modification of child support orders from other jurisdictions. UIFSA does not determine the authority of an Indian tribe to enter, modify, or enforce a child support order. In Alaska, the scope of tribal authority to enter, modify, or enforce a child support order is an unsettled legal question, due in part to the lack of Indian country in most of the state. In adopting UIFSA conforming amendments, the legislature does not intend to grant or restrict tribal jurisdiction to enter, modify, or enforce child support orders, and the amendments are not intended to either directly or impliedly, to acknowledge, expand, or restrict tribal jurisdiction.”

The Department supports including this intent language in CSSB 96 if that bill is to pass (H)JUD and move to (H)FIN for further consideration

Thank you for working with us on this issue.

Sincerely,

Ginger Blaisdell  
Director

## **Legislative Testimony**

**Jessie M. Archibald**  
**Staff Attorney, Tribal Child Support Unit**  
**Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska**  
**320 West Willoughby Ave., Suite 300**  
**Juneau, Alaska 99801**

**HEARING: (H) JUD Apr 13 8:00 AM CAPITOL 120 TELECONFERENCE**

My name is Jessie Archibald. I represent the Central Council Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska Tribal child support program. I would like to request that my written testimony be entered into the record. The purpose of my testimony is to explain the Tribe's objection to the Section 1. (b) language regarding the Definition of "State"; Legislative Intent, contained in CS for House Bill 192 (HHS), and respectfully request that section (b) language be deleted.

### Reasons for Objections:

1. Section (b) language is not necessary because UIFSA has built in procedures for the non-registrant to raise objections about the issuing tribunal's subject matter jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction, and other matters that may make a specific order not entitled to recognition and enforcement in Alaska's tribunals.
2. The language specifically segregates out tribal child support orders for particular scrutiny, and carries a not-very-thinly-veiled implication that that scrutiny should be hostile, and even suggests that the legislature is pre-judging the validity of an objection based on a lack of Indian country, essentially endorsing the principal that a child support obligor should be able to duck a child support obligation by objecting on that basis. The legislature should leave those issues to the individual litigants and the courts.
3. Child support is hard enough without the legislature of the State of Alaska putting into the statutes language that allows deadbeat parents to use legislative intent language to try to get out from under from having to pay support.

**As an alternative, the Tribe would like to propose the following legislative intent language:**

**Section 1.** The uncodified law of the State of Alaska is amended by adding a new section to read:

DEFINITION OF "STATE": LEGISLATIVE INTENT. (a) ....

(b) The legislature recognizes that child support enforcement programs are administered by Federal, State and Tribal entities that address the establishment of paternity and enforcement of

support orders with the intent of promoting the general economic welfare and the best interest of dependent children. UIFSA provides a vehicle for the non-registrant to raise objections about the issuing tribunal's subject matter jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction, and other matters that may make a specific order not entitled to recognition and enforcement in Alaska's tribunals. The intent of the legislature is that tribal child support orders should be subject to the same types of objections, and to the same extent, as child support orders from tribunals of other jurisdictions. It is the intent of the legislature is to provide a procedural vehicle for Tribal child support orders for such orders to be registered in Alaska state tribunals in the same manner child support orders from other tribunals are registered. This legislation is not intended to prejudge the validity of any specific order or the validity of any objections to a specific order.

---

---

### **Short Description of Central Council Tribe's Child Support Program**

1. Initially, federal funding was only provided to States that operate federally funded and approved child support programs.
2. More recently, with the adoption of the Final Rule on Child Support Enforcement Programs at 45 CFR 309, federally recognized Indian Tribes became eligible to receive federal funding to operate their own child support programs.
3. With the adoption of the Final Rule, the enforcement of child support has now become a Federal-State-Tribal partnership.
4. To receive federal funding for child support, the Tribe is required to adopt a plan that meets the requirements outlined in 45 CFR 309 which is the Final Rule on Child Support Enforcement Programs.
5. Central Council received federal funding and approval to operate a Tribal Child Support Program in March of 2007.
6. When Alaska initially was required to adopt UIFSA, it did not include the definition of "State" to include an Indian Tribe.
7. Now that Alaska Tribes are beginning to receive federal funding to operate child support programs, it is necessary for Alaska to amend the State UIFSA in order to come into compliance with the rest of the nation.
8. Alaska stands alone as the only state that has not adopted the federal uniform guidelines that define "state" to include an Indian Tribe, probably because when Alaska first adopted the

federal version of UIFSA, it was not considered that Tribes would be receiving federal grants to operate child support programs.

9. The Tribal Child support program is located within the Tribe's Employment and Training Department. Our program is referred to as the "Tribal Child Support Unit."
10. The Tribe's goal is to ensure that Tlingit and Haida children receive the financial and emotional support of both their parents. The program strives to support and affirm the traditions of the Tribe and families. We believe that child support should be a reliable source of income for families. TCSU focuses its efforts on the needs of children, and in doing so, we empower parents to ensure their children's needs are met. Our program has a cooperative approach to establishing and enforcing support obligations.
11. Here are some statements we want to hear our children shout out:
  - I'm playing football this year, thanks Dad!
  - I made the basketball team, thanks Mom!
  - Thanks Dad, I'm getting good grades in school!
  - I'm playing soccer this year...thank you Mom!
  - I'm going to camp this summer, thank you Dad!
  - Even though you're not with me, I know you care! Thanks Mom!

---

---

End