

H B  
175

# State is chastized for 'taking from children'

175/25

by Carol Murkowski  
Times Writer

A roomful of parents took the state legislature to task Monday night, accusing them of "taking money from our children."

The audience of more than 40 women, with a sprinkling of men and children, testified at a legislative hearing to discuss a proposed fee schedule to be attached to services of the state's Child Support Enforcement Agency.

The agency collects money from one divorced spouse and sends a check to the caretaker parent, ensuring that child support is paid. The service has been free in the past, but intent language attached to the agency's budget last year will require a fee schedule.

Three types of fees, on a sliding scale based on ability to pay, would be taken from the check being sent to the parent with custody of the children.

"But this is not my money," Barbara Zabriskie said strongly at the Monday session. "This money belongs to my child."

"I can't see why you legislators consider bailing out a car company and then take money from our children," Evelyn Hadfield added, garnering a round of applause.

Several women at the hearing said they supported their children with little or no help from their former husbands, and it was a constant battle to keep from turning to public assistance. An extra chunk taken from their child support could be disastrous, they said.

"The legislature should be humiliated and embarrassed at this," Sharon Desatoff said. "At this rate, it won't be long before

it won't be worthwhile to keep up the struggle."

"I am being penalized for being a working mother," Zabriskie added. "I'll be one of the persons who have to pay because I'm employed. I am employed, and I cannot afford a 10 percent fee, but I cannot afford not to use the CSEA."

Tim Jones, the only man to testify, pointed out that he had been ordered by a judge to pay support to the agency, although both he and his ex-wife had asked that he be allowed to pay the money directly to her. Paying for a service he didn't want in the first place was doubly irritating, Jones said, adding that "regulation-makers, in their wisdom, are taking money away from the very person this system is set up to protect: the child."

Another woman said her ex-husband told her he would refuse to pay any child support at all if the state was taking a part of it.

The state court system had a fee schedule from 1965-1974, when it was in charge of collecting child support monies. A report issued by the state Department of Revenue labeled the fee schedule a failure, as fees were too low to be effective, fee collections tended to discourage any child support payment, and sometimes discouraged use of the state service altogether. Without the state's enforcement, the child often didn't receive the money intended for him, and mothers were sometimes forced to go on public assistance to make ends meet.

When the state formed the Child Support Enforcement Agency in 1975, it was funded 75

percent by the federal government and 25 percent by the state. The federal money — for Aid to Families with Dependent Children and non-AFDC child support cases — was cut in March 1980. The state legislature gave the agency the \$300,000 it would need for the coming year, but added a fee requirement to make sure the agency would not be caught short again.

In June, Congress unexpectedly approved the federal funding, and the agency was able to return the \$300,000 to the state. The agency doesn't need a fee schedule now, but the language requiring it remains on the books.

Three bills have been introduced in the current legislative session to deal with the problem. Proposed Senate Bill 181 and House Bill 167 would eliminate the fee requirement, but give the agency the option to charge a fee if it becomes necessary. HB 175 does away with any fees.

The hearing audience criticized the optional fees. But Dan Copeland, CSEA administrator who helped write HB 167, said he included it because he thought such a bill would have the best chance of passing the legislature.

Copeland has advised against the fee structure in letters to the legislature, and says his mail on the issue has been "voluminous — several hundred letters," all against the fee structure.

A second hearing, a teleconference broadcast from Juneau, will be held at 5 p.m. Thursday in the Legislative Information Office, 1024 W. Sixth

Introduced: 2/18/81  
Referred: Health, Education &  
Social Services

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY CLOCKSIN, GRUSSENDORF  
AND MILLER

2 HOUSE BILL NO. 175

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 TWELFTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the enforcement of child support."

7 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

8 \* Section 1. AS 47.23.100 is amended to read:

9 Sec. 47.23.100. ALL PERSONS MAY USE AGENCY. The agency shall  
10 without charge provide aid to any person due child support under the  
11 laws of this state upon application. [IF THE OBLIGEE IS INDIGENT OR  
12 OTHERWISE UNABLE TO PAY FOR THESE SERVICES, THE AGENCY SHALL ACT  
13 WITHOUT CHARGE TO THE OBLIGEE. IF THE AGENCY DETERMINES THAT THE  
14 OBLIGEE IS FINANCIALLY ABLE TO PAY, COSTS SHALL BE ASSESSED ACCORDING  
15 TO REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND BE PAID INTO THE FUND  
16 ESTABLISHED IN AS 47.23.030.]

17  
18 *Charge obligor not obligee*

19  
20 *Once a payment is missed it should*  
21 *become a debt owed.*  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

POSITION PAPER

ON

House Bill No. 175

"An Act relating to the enforcement of child support"

This measure would delete the Child Support Enforcement Agency's statutory mandate to charge reasonable fees for collecting child support payments on behalf of single parent who have the ability to pay such fees.

The Department of Health and Social Services is unaware of any harm which may have been worked upon single parent obligees by the Department of Revenue's authority to charge fees. We do not believe it is appropriate to charge any fee for serving single parents who have low or no income.

Nevertheless, we wish to call attention to the "preventive" aspect of child support enforcement activities. Providing effective child support services to middle-income single parents is clearly in their best interest and clearly in the public interest. In many cases, regular receipt of adequate child support payments can prevent a family from being compelled to seek public assistance in order to meet its living expenses.

If the existing appropriations to the Child Support Enforcement Agency are not adequate for that agency to provide full, prompt, and effective service to families not already receiving public assistance, and if charging reasonable fees to those able to pay would generate the funds necessary to provide high-quality service, this Department would support giving the Department of Revenue the discretion to charge fees.

Recommended by:

Rod Betit

Rod Betit, Director  
Division of Public  
Assistance

Date:

2-28-81

Approved by:

Helen D. Beirne

Helen D. Beirne  
Commissioner

Date:

2-28-81

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
TWELFTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. House Bill No. 175

Title An Act relating to the enforcement of child support

Requested by Clocksini

Date 2/27/81

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Health & Social Services

Program Category Affected Social & Economic Assistance for the General Population

BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Assistance Payments AFDC

(Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.		0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		0	0	0	0	0

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS

FULL TIME		0	0	0	0	0
PART TIME		0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY		0	0	0	0	0

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

House Bill No. 175 will have no measurable impact on AFDC expenditures.

IV. DATE

2/27/81

PREPARED BY

[Signature]

AGENCY

[Signature]

PHONE

465-2142

Original: Legislative Finance

cc: Budget and Management

Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named) M&B Approva?

[Signature]

Date 3/2/81

December 22, 1980

The Honorable Terry Martin  
Alaska State House of Representatives  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Representative Martin:

Enclosed is a copy of proposed legislation drafted by the Child Support Enforcement Agency which, it is our understanding, the Administration intends to introduce. We support this legislation. However, we understand that two sections, Section 47.23.092 Reducing Arrears to Judgement, and Section 47.23.182 Ratification by Court of Administrative Orders, have been deleted. The purpose for the deletion appears to be to make the legislation more palatable to the Legislature.

The Child Support Enforcement Agency and the Office of the Attorney General would be saved both time and money by the inclusion of these two sections and it is, therefore, our feeling that they should be a part of new legislation. Change in the law demanded by Section 47.23.092 is long overdue. Once a payment is missed it should become a debt owed.

The proposed legislation would amend Section 47.23.100 to say that costs may be assessed the obligee according to regulations adopted by the Department, whereas the existing statute makes it mandatory to levy a fee against the obligee (and hence the child). The monetary support due the obligee (custodial parent) is for the care of the child. Therefore, it seems cruel to further penalize the child by assessing a fee against the support legally due the child. The cause of the work of the Child Support Enforcement Agency is the obligor, not the obligee or the child. All concepts of basic justice point toward levying these fees on the delinquent obligor rather than on the obligee (and hence the child).

The proposed legislation does an admirable job for the areas it addresses. It is not enough. Areas of concern to us are outlined below:

\* Inflationary Adjustment

Divorce decrees make no provision for the monetary support obligation of the non-custodial parent to be increased through the years. What may have been a sufficient amount for a child's support five or ten years ago is totally inadequate today. Court orders presently processed through the Child Support Enforcement Agency average less than \$100 per month per child. A statute building in an inflationary (cost of living) adjustment

is necessary at this time. An example might be an increase each year according to the Anchorage C P I. This statutory provision would keep existing support orders from falling beneath the buying power they presently have. However, there must be a method for raising the long outdated support orders to the level of current inflation. This could be done by the Agency under present statutory authority if the Agency were properly funded and directed for this purpose by the Legislature.

Currently custodial parents are prevented from seeking amended support orders through private court action because the cost to them (and hence to the child) is normally several thousand dollars. Further, if all the custodial parents in Alaska who should have their orders raised were to privately go to the court to do so, the courts would be swamped.

#### Unreliable Support Income

The awesome responsibilities of the single parent are too often greatly increased by the unreliability of receiving child support income. For instance a family on AFDC may receive child support for several months in a row, long enough for them to lose their eligibility for AFDC. Then no child support may be received for months, but there is a time lag in getting back on to the AFDC rolls. During this time the family has had no or greatly reduced income. Children should not be subjected to the terror of knowing there is nothing with which to pay the rent or purchase the essential boots.

Families who do manage to stay off AFDC are often severely affected by the instability of child support income. Families who have entered into contractual agreements to purchase, such as a house or a car, have lost these purchases when child support income has not been paid, as ordered by the Court. Two concepts of dealing with this subject of undependable child support income have thus far been suggested.

A. The State of Alaska would establish a Child Support Payment Pool or Loan Fund. Currently the State of Alaska provides financial assistance to various segments of our State through loan funds to aid historical district restoration, commercial fishing, small businesses, fisheries enhancement, child care facilities, mining, residential care facilities, to name a few. A revolving fund or payment pool to benefit children in single-parent families would be an enlightened step a State, concerned about the welfare of a major portion of its people, could take.

The pool would operate under a revolving loan fund concept. Child Support payments registered through the Child Support Enforcement Agency would be made regularly from the Child

Page Three

Support Payment Pool/Revolving Fund. The children affected would no longer be subjected to the vagaries of unreliable income. The obligor, or noncustodial parent, would then owe the Child Support Payment Pool/Revolving Fund. A debt against this Pool/Fund, being a debt against the State, would be collected by the State. The State is empowered to zealously pursue and effectively collect its debts.

B. A self-activating enforcement mechanism such as that used in many of Michigan's counties. All child support orders are registered with the County's Friends of the Court. A child support payment which is late by a determined number of days evokes a computer signal. The Friends of the Court make a telephone call to the obligor. Letters of warning are also sent. The Friends of the Court may begin enforcement procedures as soon as a payment is late. Unlike the Alaska agency, they do not have to wait for the obligee to come to the agency and make a complaint. This procedure combined with Michigan's practice of jailing for non-support has made it the most effective state in the nation in collecting child support.

Additionally legislation should be enacted to provide that automatic wage assignments can be made in cases whenever practical. One obligor has stated that this method of meeting his child support obligation is the best for him because it is so "painless," he never sees it. The wage assignment would create a bookkeeping burden for employers. There would have to be a way to provide some type of reimbursement to employers who must bear this added bookkeeping expense. This cost cannot be borne by the child.

Studies show that throughout the nation the amount of child support dollars collected is in direct proportion to the amount of child support agency budget dollars appropriated. The Legislature should increase the Child Support Enforcement Agency budget substantially in order to adequately pursue the task of providing for the needs of a great percentage of Alaska's child population.

We are grateful for your willingness to obtain solutions for these children.

Sincerely,

ADVOCATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT

Judy Brakel  
Kathy Schenker

Enclosures

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

Rec'd

MAR 4 1981

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

POUCH 5  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811

March 5, 1981

The Honorable Donald E. Clocksin  
Chairman  
House Health, Education and Social  
Services Committee  
Room 106 - Capitol Building  
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Clocksin:

Re: House Bill No. 175

House Bill No. 175, an Act relating to the enforcement of child support, was introduced in the House on February 18, 1981 and was referred to the House Health, Education and Social Services Committee.

For the consideration of the House Health, Education and Social Services Committee, I am enclosing a copy of a Fiscal Note prepared by Mr. Dan R. Copeland, Director, Child Support Enforcement, Department of Revenue, Anchorage concerning the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,



R. D. Stevenson  
Special Assistant

RDS/rch

cc: Joseph K. Donohue  
Deputy Commissioner  
Department of Revenue

Dan R. Copeland, Director  
Child Support Enforcement  
Department of Revenue  
Anchorage, Alaska

Gary Jenkins, Director  
Audit Division  
Department of Revenue

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. House Bill 175  
 Title An Act relating to the enforcement of child support  
 Requested by Clocksinn, Grussendorf and Miller Date 3/2/81

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Department of Revenue  
 Program Category Affected Revenue Collection And Management  
 BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Audit Division, Child Support, Enforcement  
 (Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars) - None

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars) - None

GENERAL FUND	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS - None

FULL TIME	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

The current language in AS 47.23.100 mandates the agency to adopt regulations to charge reasonable fees for collecting child support payments on behalf of single parents who have the ability to pay such fees. At the public hearings required to adopt these regulations, the public unanimously requested this mandate be eliminated. As no fees have been collected to date, there would be no fiscal impact on eliminating the requirement to assess these fees. Although the agency does not anticipate charging a fee at any time in the foreseeable future, the agency does support maintaining the discretion to charge reasonable fees, if needed, to those individuals with the ability to pay such fees. This discretion would be critical in allowing the agency some latitude if the federal government changed its position with regard to the 75% funding or a mandatory requirement for fees. House Bill '67 is drafted to maintain the agency's discretion to respond to a specific need if ever required.

IV. DATE February 5, 1981 PREPARED BY Dan R. [Signature]  
 AGENCY Department of Revenue

Original: Legislative Finance PHONE 276-8148 / 465-2320  
 cc: Budget and Management Anchorage Juneau  
 Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST  
 Bill/Resolution No. House Bill 175  
 Title An Act relating to the enforcement of child support  
 Requested by Clocksinn, Grussendorf and Miller Date 3/2/81

II. FISCAL DETAIL  
 Agency Affected Department of Revenue  
 Program Category Affected Revenue Collection And Management  
 BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Audit Division, Child Support Enforcement  
 (Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)  
EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars) - None

	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 COMMODITIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars) - None

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS - None

FULL TIME						
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

The current language in AS 7.23.100 mandates the agency to adopt regulations to charge reasonable fees for collecting child support payments on behalf of single parents who have the ability to pay such fees. At the public hearings required to adopt these regulations, the public unanimously requested this mandate be eliminated. As no fees have been collected to date, there would be no fiscal impact on eliminating the requirement to assess these fees. Although the agency does not anticipate charging a fee at any time in the foreseeable future, the agency does support maintaining the discretion to charge reasonable fees, if needed, to those individuals with the ability to pay such fees. This discretion would be critical in allowing the agency some latitude if the federal government changed its position with regard to the 75% funding or a mandatory requirement for fees. House Bill 167 is drafted to maintain the agency's discretion to respond to a specific need if ever required.

IV. DATE February 5, 1981 PREPARED BY Dan R. [Signature]  
 AGENCY Department of Revenue  
 PHONE 276-8148 / 465-2320  
 Original: Legislative Finance  
 cc: Budget and Management  
Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)  
 Anchorage Juneau

Introduced: 2/17/81  
Referred: Health, Education &  
Social Services and Judiciary

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY THE RULES COMMITTEE BY  
REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

2 HOUSE BILL NO. 167

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 TWELFTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act relating to the enforcement of child support."  
7 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

8 \* Section 1. AS 25.25.010(1) is amended to read:

9 (1) "state" includes the State of Alaska and a state, terri-  
10 tory, or possession of the United States and the District of Columbia,  
11 and a foreign country in which this or a substantially similar recip-  
12 cal law has been enacted;

13 \* Sec. 2. AS 47.23.020(2)(A) is amended to read:

14 (A) schedules for determining the amount an obligor is  
15 liable to contribute toward the support of ~~a minor child~~ [AN  
16 OBLIGEE] under this chapter and under Title IV-D, Social Security  
17 Act;

18 \* Sec. 3. AS 47.23.060 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

19 (d) *Inflation factor*  
20 In any proceeding to modify the duty of support, a change of  
21 20 percent or more in the consumer price index which occurs after the  
22 establishment of or modification of a judicial or administrative sup-  
23 port order is evidence of a change of circumstances.

24 \* Sec. 4. AS 47.23.100 is amended to read:

25 Sec. 47.23.100. ALL PERSONS MAY USE AGENCY. The agency shall  
26 provide aid to any person due child support under the laws of this  
27 state upon application. If the obligee is indigent or otherwise unable  
28 to pay for those services, the agency shall act without charge to the  
29 obligee. *this clause cannot law from shall*  
[The agency may impose fees for services provided under this  
chapter, which] IF THE AGENCY DETERMINES THAT THE OBLIGEE IS FINAN-

*Tom William - Rev. - charges fees should  
be used with*

1 CIALLY ABLE TO PAY, COSTS] shall be assessed according to regulations  
2 adopted by the department and [BE] paid into the fund established in  
3 AS 47.23.030.

4 \* Sec. 5. AS 47.23.110(4) is amended to read:

5 (4) "obligee" means the custodial parent or person who has  
6 physical custody and responsibility for the minor child [A PERSON] to  
7 whom a duty of support is owed;

8 \* Sec. 6. AS 47.23.110 is amended by adding new paragraphs to read:

9 (7) "consumer price index" means the All Urban Consumer  
10 Price Index as compiled by the United States Department of Labor,  
11 Bureau of Labor Statistics, for Anchorage, Alaska or, if the obligor  
12 and obligee live in the same judicial district, the index for a muni-  
13 cipality within that judicial district, if the United States Department  
14 of Labor compiles an index;

15 (8) "earnings" (A) means compensation paid or payable for  
16 personal services, whether denominated as wages, salary, commission,  
17 bonus, or other similar description and includes the gain derived from  
18 the investment of capital, from labor, or from a combination of in-  
19 vestment and labor; and (B) ~~does not include profit gained from the~~  
20 ~~sale or conversion of a capital asset;~~

21 (9) "disposable earnings" means that part of the earnings of  
22 an individual which remains after the deduction from those earnings of  
23 any amount required by law to be withheld.

24 \* Sec. 7. AS 47.23.130 is repealed and reenacted to read:

25 Sec. 47.23.130. SUBROGATION OF STATE. (a) If the obligor is li-  
26 able to the state under AS 47.23.120(a) or (b), the state is subrogated  
27 to the rights of the obligee to:

28 (1) bring an action in the superior court seeking an order  
29 of support or modifying an existing order of support;

1 (2) proceed under AS 47.23.160 -- 47.23.270 to establish or  
2 modify a duty of support; or

3 (3) enforce by execution, in accordance with AS 47.23.230 --  
4 47.23.270, or otherwise, a support order entered in favor of the obli-  
5 gee.

6 (b) To establish, ~~modify~~ or enforce an order of support, based  
7 upon the subrogation of the state, the agency is not limited to the  
8 amount of assistance being granted to the minor child.

9 (c) The recovery of any amount for which the obligor is liable  
10 which exceeds the total assistance granted under AS 47.25.310 -- 47.25.-  
11 420 shall be paid to the obligee.

12 \* Sec. 8. AS 47.23.150 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

13 (c) Refusal by the obligor to accept the notice is considered  
14 service as of the time of the refusal.

15 \* Sec. 9. AS 47.23.160(b) is amended to read:

16 (b) The notice and finding of financial responsibility served  
17 under (a) of this section shall state

18 (1) the sum or periodic payments for which the alleged  
19 obligor is found to be responsible, calculated by taking into consid-  
20 eration the need of the minor child [ALLEGED OBLIGEE], the alleged  
21 obligor's liability to the state under AS 47.23.130 if any, and his  
22 duty of support under the law;

23 (2) the name of the alleged obligee and the minor child [HIS  
24 CUSTODIAN];

25 (3) that the alleged obligor may appear and show cause in a  
26 hearing held by the agency why the finding is incorrect, should not be  
27 finally ordered, and should be modified or rescinded, because (A) no  
28 duty of support is owed, or (B) the amount of support found to be owed  
29 is incorrect;

1 (4) that if the person served with the notice and finding of  
2 financial responsibility does not request a hearing within 30 days, the  
3 property of the person will be subject to execution in accordance with  
4 AS 47.23.230 -- 47.23.270 in the amounts stated in the finding without  
5 further notice or hearing.

6 \* Sec. 10. AS 47.23.160 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

7 (c) Refusal by the obligor to accept the notice is considered  
8 service as of the time of the refusal.

9 \* Sec. 11. AS 47.23.170(e) is amended to read:

10 (e) The hearing officer shall consider the following in making  
11 his determination under (j) of this section:

12 (1) the needs of the minor child [ALLEGED OBLIGEE], disre-  
13 garding the income or assets [OF THE CUSTODIAN] of the alleged obligee;

14 (2) the amount of the alleged obligor's liability to the  
15 state under AS 47.23.120 [AS 47.23.125] if any;

16 (3) the intent of the legislature that children be supported  
17 as much as possible by their natural parents;

18 (4) the ability of the alleged obligor to pay.

19 \* Sec. 12. AS 47.23.170(f) is amended to read:

20 (f) If the alleged obligor requesting the hearing fails to appear  
21 at the hearing, the hearing officer shall enter a decision declaring  
22 the property of the alleged obligor subject to execution in accordance  
23 with AS 47.23.230 -- 47.23.270 in the amounts stated in the notice and  
24 finding [FILING] of financial responsibility.

25 \* Sec. 13. AS 47.23.190(a) is amended to read:

26 (a) Unless a support order has been entered, the obligor, or the  
27 obligee [OR HIS CUSTODIAN], may petition the agency or its designer for  
28 a modification of the finding or decision of responsibility previously  
29 entered with regard to future periodic support payments.

1 \* Sec. 14. AS 47.23.190(c) is amended to read:

2 (c) If a hearing is granted, the agency shall serve a notice of  
3 hearing together with a copy of the petition and affidavits submitted  
4 on the obligee [OR HIS CUSTODIAN] and the obligor personally or by  
5 registered, certified, or insured mail, return receipt requested, for  
6 restricted delivery only to the person to whom the notice is directed  
7 or to the person authorized under federal regulation to receive his  
8 restricted delivery mail.

9 \* Sec. 15. AS 47.23 is amended by adding a new section to read:

10 Sec. 47.23.255. EARNINGS EXEMPT FROM ORDER OR LIEN. (a) Not  
11 more than 50 percent of the disposable earnings of the obligor is  
12 exempt from an order to withhold and deliver under AS 47.23.250. The  
13 exempt part of the disposable earnings may be paid to the obligor even  
14 if the earnings are paid monthly, weekly, or at other intervals.

15 (b) A person, political subdivision, or department of the state  
16 shall withhold the nonexempt part of the earnings of the obligor at  
17 each succeeding interval of payment until the entire amount of the debt  
18 stated in the order to withhold and deliver has been withheld.

19 (c) An order to withhold and deliver issued to the Department of  
20 Revenue remains in effect throughout the calendar year in which it is  
21 served. That order applies to any tax refund or other disbursements to  
22 which the obligor is entitled even if the tax refund or disbursement is  
23 issued more than 30 days after service of the order.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

Shirley Miss - Nat. Sec.

Need stronger support for enforcement.  
People want off welfare.

Most single people who participated made it  
very clear they want natural fathers made more  
responsible

Opposed to custodial fee

---

Anol. rev. - yes. she wants stronger law.

---

Ester Clark - <sup>Mother gone</sup> - had three children - was  
receiving only \$50<sup>00</sup> per child - total \$150<sup>00</sup>

Now her daughter is suffering - her ex-husband  
refused any support. Welfare she was forced  
on her. Daughter committed suicidal do to hard  
stresses of life forced to feel inadequate

She feels courts should make stricter  
law for irresponsible fathers.

Talb

Mr. Ayeland.

Fee charges - leave discretion to Director

Locating through identification numbers.

S.S. or PHS identification no., medical no.

Employment identification no.

State employment workers no.

\* Establish a revolving fund [call socialistic by some]  
Dept. of Per. can collect

\* automatic wage assignment "a painless way"

increase necessary in budget to increase amount  
of child support dollars.

SB181 -

Hypothetical Don if you do don if you don't

Begin the question of responsibility  
Mother to cooperate for help  
financial for children

Needs this  
Revise Section 47.23.092 - reducing arrears.

once a payment is missed it should become a debt owed.

and Sec. 47.23.182 - Ratification by court of Administration Orders. - Review or Discontinuance

Why not have all the tool available

Where is inflationary adjustment factor.

Kathy -

By parentment needs to change attitude to more aggressive and positive

Mina Stroma - #175 support.  
strong obligor or recalcitrant.

The Am I regret in conclusion that you feel  
the natural father, even so, less than not  
100% responsible.

She wants the father responsible.

IRS - why not allow last of obligor's payment  
be deductible.

Dean Sundahl - Father who pays support.  
objects to obligor paying cost - Need train investigators  
Very supportive of this program.  
Does not believe in revolving fund - we have AFDC

Kooliab - wants even stronger laws in 167 there  
needs to be more about.

Wants some stronger more like California.

Breelyn Halfield - strap up - don't let father  
get away - Once court and adjudication  
is completed

---

Siths - Ann Low - feels they need stronger laws  
She and divorcee Husband are doing fine in  
support agreement.

It is the department that is causing  
trouble - She did not need their help in the  
first place.

---

Anok - OK 175 + HB 67 - ATTY  
Put burden of cost on father  
Karla Huntington

---

Joyce Mansfield River -