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MS. DAVIS: Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Child Support Guidelines and Enforcement. We appreciate each of you taking the time to participate on the Committee either as a Committee member or those in public who will be giving comments.

We are fortunate to have Jeana Boggs with us again as our Court Reporter. Jeana, if you would wave so they can see your Brady picture.

THE COURT REPORTER: (Waving.)
MS. DAVIS: There you go.
And, again, I am the world's worst at identifying myself, particularly if you do not have a visual representation on screen. If you would, before you speak, it would help Jeana a lot if you would identify who you are either immediately when you speak; if not, if you think about it during your comments, that would be helpful.

Again, we are a numbers type of

Committee. So, it would be helpful, if at the time you speak about numbers, you would speak in terms of numbers and percentages. You would say, for example, three ninety-five should be stated three dollars and ninety-five cents, or three hundred and ninety-five dollars, or three point nine five percent, whichever way you are really intending to speak.

At this point, let's do a roll call. Bob, if you would, call the roll. And then after we have all the public members if you would ask them if they want to speak also.

MR. MADDOX: Yes, ma'am. Good morning, everyone. So, as I call your name, please unmute yourself and say "present" or "here" so we can identify you.

Honorable William Thompson?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: I believe he emailed me a few days ago he could not join. But I always like to make sure.

Honorable Don McMillan?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Honorable Michael
Sherman?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Honorable Aubrey
Ford?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Honorable Julie
Palmer?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Honorable Karen
Dunn-Burks?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Professor Davis is
on. We just heard from her. She's present.
MR. MADDOX: Amanda Cox?
MS. COX: Here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Angela
Campbell?
MS. CAMPBELL: Here.
MR. MADDOX: Drew Whitmire?
(No response).
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MR. MADDOX: Greg Starkey?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Jennifer Bush?
Jennifer, can you hear me? I can see her name. Can you -- Do you need me to unmute you, or can you unmute yourself?

Anyway, Jeana, Jennifer is showing up. She must be having audio trouble.

MR. MADDOX: Jessica Kirk
Drennan?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Jim Jeffries?
MR. JEFFRIES: (Waving).
MR. MADDOX: He is waving. I just admitted him. He is present.

MR. MADDOX: Katie Steinwinder?
MS. STEINWINDER: I am here, Bob.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. I may be pronouncing your last name incorrectly. I'm sorry.

MS. STEINWINDER: It's
Steinwinder, but that's okay.
MR. MADDOX: Steinwinder. Sorry.

Lathesia McClenney. Actually, I
think she just tried to get in. I just admitted her. Lathesia, are you on? I will come back to her. I think I just -Lathesia?

MS. MCCLENNEY: Good morning. Yes, I am on, Bob.

MR. MADDOX: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

MS. MCCLENNEY: Thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Melody Baldwin?
MS. BALDWIN: Present.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you.
Professor Brian Gray?
PROFESSOR GRAY: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: I need a voice like that. Stephen Arnold?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Rachel King?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: I think she emailed me. She probably won't be able to join. I think she had a trial or something.

Mallory Hall?
MS. HALL: I am here.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you.
Honorable Julie Weller?
MS. BLACKBURN: She is not going
to be able to make it today.
MR. MADDOX: Stephanie Blackburn? She just spoke. She is present.

MR. MADDOX: Nathan Wilson?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: All right. We have Dr. Venohr. If you would wave, Dr. Venohr, for everybody. She's in a different location. Looks good today. She is in her office for a change.

## Clifford Smith?

MR. SMITH: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Would you like to speak at the end, Cliff?

MR. SMITH: No, I don't have any plans to. Just be here.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Tiffany Gates? Tiffany Gates?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Lisa Clark?
MS. CLARK: Here.
MR. MADDOX: Would you like to
speak at the end?
MS. CLARK: No, thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Okay. Thank you.
Lee Wood? Lee Wood? Can you hear me?

MR. MADDOX: I admitted her. Maybe she's not able to unmute.

Honorable Patricia Stephens?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Vicki Porter? Vicki
Porter?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: All right. Penny, that's all I had for now.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you,
Bob. I appreciate you doing the roll call
for us. As we have others that come in, we
will -- Bob can admit them and that one person that's got a phone number, I'm sure
when he has a chance he will assign a name to that.

At this time, Stephanie, it doesn't look like we have a quorum.

MS. BLACKBURN: I think we are one shy of a quorum.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. So, we may very well have one later on.

Also, Stephanie, if you would, would you mention for the record the order authorizing -- Supreme Court authorizing the video conference?

MS. BLACKBURN: Yes, ma'am. That order is still in effect, I believe, until September. So, we are good.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. And, again, for the record, Bob, will you speak on the notice sent to the media?

MR. MADDOX: Yes. There was a media notice, a news release, was sent to all the media outlets statewide by Scott Hoyem, Public Information Officer in the Administrative Office of Courts, on

March 22nd by email. This media notice, of course, allowed the public to provide written comments to the Supreme Court Clerk's Office by last -- let's see, Wednesday -- or sorry, Thursday, April 15th, and also they could join by Zoom by 5:00 o'clock this past Wednesday, April 21st.

All the information, news release, agenda and other documents are posted on our website, Alacourt.gov, under Child Support and Child Support Guidelines Review under that.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you,
Bob. Did we receive any written reports this time?

MR. MADDOX: No, ma'am.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. I knew I had
not. I just hoped I didn't miss it in my email. So, I appreciate that clarification.

All right. Thank you for that information, Bob.

At this point, we need to ask for approval of the transcript of our last
meeting, which was March the 12th. So, are there any corrections or changes that anyone would like to submit at this time?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Then do I hear a motion of approval of the transcript?

MS. STEINWINDER: I move for approval. Katie Steinwinder.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Katie. And is there a second?

MS. CAMPBELL: Second from Angela Campbell.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Angela. All in favor, if you would, raise your hands.
(Committee members raising hands) .

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. And those who -- thank you, Melody. All those who are not visible, if you would unmute and say "yea" or "nay" -- well, all those in favor at this point. All right. (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Anybody opposed? If you would, unmute and say "nay" or do a thumbs down.
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. I hear no nays, or see no nays. So, it is approved. Thank you-all very much for that.

At this point, we are going to turn over the meeting to Dr. Venohr to continue our discussion on the updating or revising the self-support reserve Adjustment. Dr. Venohr?

DR. VENOHR: Thank you, Chair Davis. Good morning, everybody.

There are two versions of this memo that were posted on the Court website. They are both dated April 15th. One is longer than the other but contains the same core information. The difference is, the longer one also contains a side-by-side table comparison. I am not going to discuss that today. That's more for your benefit. That's where the proposed schedule is
standing right now.
So, I would encourage you to look at it on your own, and just look at the numbers and see where they land, and perhaps even run some case examples.

So, the shorter one doesn't include that table, but it includes the same core information, and I did that just because printing it out, you know, it can be cumbersome to print out a very, very -- a 30-some page document.

Any questions on that? Need for clarification?
(No response).
DR. VENOHR: Okay. So, I only
have the short one in front of me today. And I am actually in my office today and not working from home. So, I hope you don't have any questions of the side by sides because I don't have it right in front of me.

So, what we are going to do today is continue where we left off last time
which was, we were discussing the phaseout of the self-support reserve. We had some discussion about high incomes and arrears. And the high incomes had a significant schedule increase at high incomes. And there's just some follow-up information, particularly some things that were specifically requested from Professor Gray.

And as you-all know, we were able to obtain information from ALECS -- we are very fortunate that the Agency was able to do that. That really helped Alabama meet the federal requirements, and I can't thank the Agency enough. I mean, I know that they are dealing with a legacy system, and we are very appreciative to the team of their effort pulling the data. They did miracles for an automated system that is old, to be honest.

So, anyway, the intent was to meet the federal regulations: Analyzing case file data and guidelines deviation, income imputation and payment; and we were also
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We are a bit limited because this is IV-D cases only. In particular, ALECS tracks IV-D cases, and our sample was all orders that were effective in calendar year 2018. So, there would have been a guidelines calculation in that year assuming that the date of the hearing was the same year as the effective date.

And so, that resulted in about 7,000 orders. And then, because there's a guidelines calculator attached to ALECS -but that it is not always used -- we were able to obtain detailed information about incomes and what information was used for the guidelines calculation from 2,308 orders. And, again, the limitation is, this is reflective of the government caseload.

So, with regard to Professor Gray's question, only about 1\% of those cases were in the very, very high income
group. So, it's not going to affect a lot.
We were -- the reason we were
looking at the very high income is that we are concerned about some major increases, some -- the new economic data is saying that there should be some big increases at very high incomes, and we are defining a big increase as $10 \%$ or more. And the majority of orders are for one child, and that increase of more than $10 \%$ or more is going to happen at twelve -- a combined income of \$1,200 -- excuse me, $\$ 12,600$ per month for one child. And then, it would be \$7,100 for two children, and $\$ 6,800$ for three children. And there's only 1\% of the cases that fell into those categories at ALECS. But that doesn't mean that there isn't private cases that fall into that category.

And the maximum increases on that second paragraph from the top on page two where it shows that's a maximum increase of 22\% for one child, and that's going to occur at the highest end of the schedule of about
combined incomes of $\$ 20,000$.
So, where the Committee was leaning toward last time was not doing any sort of adjustment for high income. We've been working with some states on the new -with the new economic data, and there have been a few states that have elected to put a cap on the increase -- not a cap on the schedule amount, but a cap on how much the increase from the existing to the new schedule can be, just because they didn't want to have a price sticker shock. Those states were Iowa and Missouri. Arizona did not elect to do a cap.

And so, those are the three states that are -- have voted to approve using the BR5. So, just as reference.

Any questions on the high income before I move back to the low income? (No response).

DR. VENOHR: Okay. Seeing none, I am going to go back to the other thing that Professor Gray pointed out, which is on
the first page of the memo, is that last time I shared some data on arrears that Alabama has higher arrears per order on average than other states.

And so, he suggested that, since we collected arrears data, that we look at that. And our arrears data is going to be a little bit different than what I reported last time, because our sample is those with new effective dates of their order because they were either a modified order or it was an established order.

So, the arrears is a little bit less, and that is on page two of the memo. And about a third of the orders analyzed had arrears at the time order establishment. Among those orders in arrears, the average arrears was about $\$ 9,000$ and the median amount was $\$ 5,000$. And the last time, I reported about $\$ 20,000$, but remember, those are all cases, so they might have been five, ten, who knows, how many years old. We don't have that type of data.

And on average, arrears was two-and-a-half times the parent's income used for the guidelines calculation. And I think that's a good barometer. You know, as far as seeing the burden, that it would take two-and-a-half times of just earning income and not having any bills for them to pay that off.

I will say that this year Kentucky and New Mexico, as part of their guidelines' changes, they also put a limit on how much retroactive arrears can occur, meaning that, you know, can they go back to the data of the birth of the child, or both states went back, now go back to two years prior to the filing for support. So, some states include that in their Child Support Guidelines, that they put a limit on how far back arrears can go.

So, I am going to stop there and see if there are any questions before I plunge into going back into the self-support reserve.
(No response).
DR. VENOHR: Okay. Hearing none, where we are with the self-support reserve is that the Committee is favoring -- and again, this has not been to an official vote and this is just a straw poll. So, all these issues can be revisited is my understanding; and, you know, Penny can -Chair Davis can clarify or Stephanie can clarify if I say that wrong.

MS. DAVIS: That is correct. That is correct.

DR. VENOHR: Oh, good. So, where we are leaning is right now that self-support reserve is hidden in the schedule, taking it out, and putting it in the worksheet so it can be applied to both parents, and updating it to the 2021 federal poverty, adjusting it for Alabama incomes. And then the factor that is not so clear is that everybody is favoring a work incentive, but it's like, what percentage should be used? And a work incentive does two things:
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It recognizes -- since we are putting it, the self-support reserve in the schedule -I mean, in the worksheet, we can no longer assume a tax rate like we did with being incorporated in the schedule.

So, we grossed it up, and that results in a gross self-support reserve at \$981 a month. And if it was net, it would be $\$ 877$ a month. And so, because we are going to use that $\$ 981$ in the worksheet as a self-support reserve available to both parents, we don't want to take every single dollar above $\$ 981$ and apply it to child support. One reason we don't want to do that is because of taxes.

For instance, a single individual that was earning full-time minimum wage at $\$ 7.25$ an hour, that would be a gross income of $\$ 1,257$, and the taxes is approximately \$160. That's the payroll taxes using the Federal and Alabama income withholding formula. So, that's going to leave a net income of about $\$ 1,098$. So, you know, we
don't want to take every single dollar because then they wouldn't even be able to pay their payroll taxes.

And then the other thing is that, by not taking every single dollar, there's some economic incentive to work, you know, with their income increased from \$7.25 an hour to $\$ 8.00$ an hour. Not every single of that $\$ .75$ in increased income, some of it would go to taxes. But if it did all go to child support, there would be no incentive to earn more. So, there is some sort of sharing.

And so, what we considered is the memo, on page two, there's a table at the very bottom where we are looking at 85\%, 80\%, 75\%, 70\%. We dropped the 50\%.

So, the comparisons, as we go on to page three, that shows the comparisons that we are using, and we are doing the same scenarios as the March memo, and we are doing $\$ 7.25$ an hour because that's the current federal minimum wage. As part of
the American Rescue Act, the original bill included an increase to a minimum wage of $\$ 15.00$ an hour starting with $\$ 9.50$ proposed by summer of 2021. That was removed in the House bill. But President Biden said that he is committed to increasing federal minimum wage.

Most states have a state minimum wage greater than the federal amount. Alabama is one of the few that does not. And let's see. What else did I wanted to tell you about the minimum wage?

And usually when they propose it, it's a staggered increase. Like, if you look at this chart, that $\$ 9.50$ was proposed by summer of ' 21 , but they did not propose going up to \$15.00 an hour until 2025. There's quite a bit of pushback about this. One reason is, there was a congressional budget report that says even though increasing the minimum wage will lift about a million -- I can't remember if it was families or individuals out of poverty. It
will push about the same in number of individuals or families -- I think it was individuals -- into poverty, because some employers can't afford to pay, you know, the $\$ 15.00$ minimum an hour. You know, a lot of these minimum wage employers are small employers. And, you know, they are in a competitive environment. So, they can't always afford to pay their workers more. The last time the federal government increased the minimum wage was about 2006. So, it's been a while. It's going on about 13, 14 years.

So, in short, I think something is going to happen, but I'm not sure it's going to go up to $\$ 15.00$. And where this is significant is when income imputation is authorized at full-time minimum wage is usually used, and it's usually used for both parties.

And as I mentioned before, and I am repeating a lot of information because I do think this is going to be an issue that

Alabama has to face in the future when the feds do increase their minimum wage. And the big advantage that Alabama has is that you have a standing committee that is reviewing the guidelines. And you are the only state that I have known that can make changes -- the court doesn't seem to mind if you make changes six months and then six months down the road.

In other states, states are required to do the four-year review. So, usually they only make the changes to their guidelines every four years. So, the short of it is, I hope that you exercise that when there's changes.

Any questions before we plunge into the case examples?
(No response).
DR. VENOHR: Okay. Hearing none, I am on Figure 1, which is on page four.

So, this is one child. This is the majority of your cases. And that first cluster is where we have both parents
earning full-time minimum wage at $\$ 7.25$ an hour. Case 2, \$9.50 an hour. Case 3 is $\$ 11.00$. Case 4 is both earn $\$ 12.00$. And Case 5 is $\$ 15.00$. And the options that we are considering is the "existing," what the existing amount is. That's the first bar in the cluster that's really black, a dark black.

And Option A is just including it in the schedule. Then, again, the difference with including it in the schedule is we can adjust for taxes there. And then Option A.1.A -- and this is numbered a little odd, just to be consistent with the March memo -- is taking 85\% of the difference from his or her income, and his self -- and the self-support reserve.

So, before I mention that, the self-support reserve being proposed is \$981 a month. And if we had an obligated parent with an income of $\$ 1,081$ a month, that would mean a difference of $\$ 100$ between his or her income and the self-support reserve.

So, that $\$ 100$ in Option A.1.A would be multiplied by 85\%, and that would be an order of $\$ 85$. For Option B.2, it would be multiplied by 80\%, and it would be \$80. For Option B.2.A it would be \$100 times 75\%, so \$75. And Option B.3, it would be $\$ 100$ times $70 \%$ which would be $\$ 70$.

MS. DAVIS: Jane, excuse me for interrupting. Would you clarify for the Committee the difference between the "existing," and Option A, which is designated as "in the schedule".

DR. VENOHR: So, Option A would be updating the schedule to the Betson-Rothbarth 5th measurements where right now you are on an old set of Betson-Rothbarth, and then updating that self-support reserve in the schedule, which is -- I don't have it in front of me, but it's based on 2006 poverty. I think it's about \$772 in that.

HON. PALMER: It would basically using the same -- I'm going to use the word
"formula" probably incorrectly, but the same formula that we currently use without any changes, other than the economic numbers would be changed. Is that a fair layman's

DR. VENOHR: That's very --
HON. PALMER: Okay. Okay.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Yeah. The algorithm is what I would call it, the algorithm. So, it's using the same algorithm.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.
DR. VENOHR: And, again, the benefit of putting it in the worksheet is that it can be applied to both parents.

MS. DAVIS: Yes. Thank you.
DR. VENOHR: Absolutely.
So, what you will see is, it only affects the first cluster, that self-support reserve, and it doesn't affect the other clusters. And the other clusters, there's sufficient income of the obligated parent to meet that self-support reserve of $\$ 981$ per
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So, the after-tax income available to an obligated parent in Case 2 would be \$1,402. And you can see that if we take that $\$ 1,402$ and we subtract the existing order amount for that scenario, \$325, they are going to be left with about $\$ 1,075$. So, that is more than sufficient to make -- meet the self-support reserve.

And if we go to the other options, which is the updated schedule, it's going to be \$299. So, that's going to leave the obligated parent about $\$ 1,100$ a month after taxes. And even though these amounts are not adjusted for the self-support reserve, this \$299.99, as we know and we've talked about the new Betson-Rothbarth measurements show a decline at that very low end of the
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schedule; just a nominal decline. And that's because they have better data on income. We have better data on income at the low income, and they found out that they are actually spending a little less.

So, that's the cause of the
decrease in Case 2, Case 3, Case 4, and Case
5. They are all driven by those new BR5 measurements, not the self-support reserve.

I'm going to pause there for a second before I talk about Case 1 some more. Any questions on that BR5?

MS. DAVIS: I guess -- I guess I
have a question. And maybe now is a good time to look at it. We do -- There's been some concern expressed about a decrease in the money that's given in the lower end. And we know that we have a minimum $\$ 50$ a month built in currently.

And so, my question, I guess, is sort of twofold: And one is, in today's dollar, what would the $\$ 50$ be if we took that $\$ 50$, whatever year it was, that was
determined and then looked at the today's dollars? And you may not have that number in front of you, Jane, because I didn't think to ask you that ahead of time.

But the second question is: That if we decide to adjust that number also, will that not also mitigate some of the differences that we see on these lower ends? So, instead of decreasing the income for the child to the recipient parent maybe $\$ 25$, if you increase the other one from $\$ 50$ to, say, \$60 and then it becomes a \$15 difference am I off. Am I thinking correctly, or am I off?

DR. VENOHR: It probably won't, because the $\$ 50$ applies to when their income is below the self-support reserve. So, it would only apply if their income was below \$981. And I don't think I have a schedule in front of me.

MS. DAVIS: That's okay.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. The \$50 now applies at $\$ 800$ gross per month. So, and --
to be honest, I mean, you know, I appreciate the concern about lowering the amounts. But we also -- I mean, it makes sense because the federal regulation says to be more cognizant of ability to pay.

MS. DAVIS: Sure.
DR. VENOHR: And those -- And, I mean, it's a delicate balance between whose needs get first: The obligated parent, or the children and the custodial parent. And the way the rules are written, it's -- the federal rules, like, I would say it's a little bit more favoring of the obligated parent. But the intent is to keep him more involved with the child. Hopefully, he will increase his earnings sometime before the child reaches 18 and his ability to pay and be a role model for the child. And the data that was quoted in the federal regs says that, you know, you can set the order at $\$ 100$ or $\$ 50$, you are still going to get the same amount paid. You know, it might be \$30.
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MS. DAVIS: Right. So, the Case 1 scenario here that's $\$ 7.25$, the $\$ 50$, or whatever the amount is, minimum would fall below this Case 1 scenario is what you are
$\qquad$
DR. VENOHR: (Nodding in the affirmative).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah.
MS. DAVIS: I appreciate the clarification.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And just to -- I mean, I think it's a -- I mean, I really do hope that there's some increase in minimum wage. I think, you know, as an economist, you are always worried about the burden on employers and the indirect consequences. But, you know, if they -- if the minimum wage was $\$ 9.50$ an hour, not only does it bump the obligated parent's income up, but it bumps the amount of support that he or she could pay.

So, it would be a good thing. And
remember that the compliance on these are not full. You know, it's closer to 50\% when income is imputed, and it's closer to 70\% when it is not.

And just, too, when we talk about that self-support reserve of $\$ 981$, some of that is going to go to taxes, because it's a gross income; that $\$ 981$ is a gross amount. And then the net equivalent, once he or she pays those payroll taxes, is $\$ 877$.

And I looked up what the USDA food budgets are right now, and the USDA has a set of food budgets. The lowest is used to determine SNAP benefits, commonly known as food stamps, and that's based on a minimum diet of what you need to subsist. And, you know, the USDA even tells you what's in that diet, like, dried beans and things like that.

And then it also -- they have a liberal food budget which they use for military benefit allowances. So, based on the -- their second lowest food budget, an
adult would need about $\$ 250$ a month for food. And then rent, for a one-bedroom apartment in Alabama is about $\$ 800$. So, if you just look at food and rent, that would be $\$ 1,050$.

So, we are a little bit lower, and we are using the Federal Poverty Level. But if you look at a studio apartment, I mean, the biggest expense for anybody is housing, is generally going to be -- a studio apartment in Alabama on average is $\$ 530$. So, if you take that food of \$250 and \$530, that's \$780. And if that net is \$877, that leaves about \$100 extra for, you know, it could be medical; it could be something.

So, what I am saying is that self-support reserve is tight, but it is based on the Federal Poverty Level adjusted for Alabama incomes.

So, in other words, even though you see that those amounts are decreasing, in the spirit of the federal reg changes, I think they are appropriate amounts.
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Any questions on that?
PROFESSOR GRAY: Maybe a comment about it. Thinking about the arrears thing, as well. This is Brian Gray.

You know, those arrears numbers are pretty scary when we think about it. And when we are looking at these numbers, we are trying to figure out, you know, what is the appropriate amount. And it seems like one way of kind of gauging that is to see, well, how well are people able to pay it. And if we are that deep in arrears, it suggests that maybe the numbers are a little on the high side potentially.

In fact, the thing that scares me about that arrears number is, if you say that the average is two-and-a-half times income, two-and-a-half times the income, another rule of thumb that that's used for is for how much house you can afford to buy, you know.

So, think about that. Basically, you are in arrears as deep as the amount of
house you can afford to buy. That's pretty significant.

So, you know, what is the right number? Who knows. And it does seem like the new economic data suggests that it should be lower. We obviously don't want to short children, no doubt about that. But at the same time, you know, how much blood can you squeeze out of that turnip?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And I think you are echoing the federal reason for requiring that self-support reserve. And the data show that at these income levels they are not paying in full anyway. And part of the reason, as we already discussed is, you know, a lot of these jobs are in the lower income sector, such as hospitality, food and retail. And a lot of those jobs don't offer IV-D hours a week, and the hours are variable from week to week. And I think we all saw that during the pandemic, you know, and that there would be a restaurant open one week and then closed the next.

And I -- I, you know, the restaurant owners I know, they didn't even know they were going to close. It was just a last-minute decision. And so, the employees didn't know either.

And a lot of people -- There's
Federal Reserve data that says that the vast majority of people at the lower incomes don't have enough to meet like a $\$ 400$ crisis. You know, if their income -- if their car breaks down.

And so, we have people in these jobs, these service-sector jobs, that have sporadic income, maybe not a consistent hourly per week to week. And then what we have in our rules -- and this is because of the Federal requirement -- is that driver's license has to be suspended once arrears starts to accrue.

So, what can happen is that somebody that's working in the restaurant business, say, and, you know, they are not getting that IV-D hours a week at minimum
wage, COVID hits, they lose their job or the restaurant closes for a week or two, and then a month later they are already in arrears, and their driver's license is being suspended.

And so, you know, I just can't emphasize that enough where that's the reason I think the decreases, I think, from the federal perspective they will feel like Alabama is embracing the new rule.

I am going to stop there just to see if there's any more comments or questions.
(No response).
DR. VENOHR: Okay. Hearing none, so, again, the big issue is, you know, and if you want to revisit the amount of the self-support reserve, you certainly can. Right now, it's tentatively at \$981. And what the -- Where we were at was whether it should be the difference $70 \%$, $75 \%$, $80 \%$, $85 \%$.

And if you look at Figure 2 on
that same page, you will see the same sort
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of pattern that -- it is not that the self-support reserve is hitting Case 1. And it's only hitting Case 2, 3 and 4 and 5 for the one where it's -- is that right? -- 85\% of the difference. Or no -- yeah. It's not hitting those. It's all the same. And that with the other ones, and that's just because of the lower difference.

And the other thing that I want to point out is that, if you look at that first cluster Case 1, look at the amounts for one child and two children, and you will see that they are exactly the same for when we use Option A.1, the 85\%, 80\%, 75\%, 70\%, and that's because we don't have a different percentage applied for two children. And if you did, if you looked at the very last page of this document, if you just -- I don't think you need to go there, Bob. It's a long journey. And Bob is multi-tasking here. He is the Zoom command officer here.

But if you look at new line 12 on the very last page, you see that line 11
multiplied by 80\% -- and it could be 70\%, 75\%, whatever the Committee decides to recommend and the Court approves, and you could also say that it would be the $80 \%$ for three children; it would be 75\% for two children; 70\% for one child. And what that would do is, let's say that you wanted to use $85 \%$ for one child. So -- or I am sorry. You wanted to use -- let's say 75\% for one child. So, that would be Option B.2.A. So, then the amount would be $\$ 221$. And then let's say that you wanted to use $80 \%$ for two children, then the amount would be \$234. But you would have to put that in that line 12 of the worksheet, which is more cumbersome to explain, but there are some states that feel like it's really important for that order amount to go up because there are more children, because more children are expensive.

I'm going to stop there to see if there's any questions or comments on that concept.

MS. CAMPBELL: Hi. This is
Angela Campbell.
I actually like that idea. I saw that you put that in your memo. I actually like that idea because you do want the support to go up, at least a little bit, the more children that you have.

You know, I am a big proponent of not lowering the support, but I do understand why we do need to do this. And I was really glad to see that the information on $\$ 9.50$-- making $\$ 9.50$ an hour and above, it's almost statistically insig -- well, it is; they are all the same, the -- all the levels, whatever options we choose.

So, I was glad to see that, too.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And I hope -I think -- I really think the \$9.50 is probably a reasonable place that the feds might end up on their minimum wage. And it's a \$25 decrease. But, you know, the data is not showing that.

I am on a new computer, and it's
telling me my battery is low. So, I am going to fiddle a little bit to find my cord. If you guys don't mind talking among yourselves a little bit before I finish, just give me a couple of minutes. So...

MR. MADDOX: Yes, Penny. And while she's doing that, I wanted to point out Honorable Patricia Stephens joined the Zoom. She's a guest from the Jefferson County Family Court or Domestic Relations Division, I should say. And Honorable Julie Palmer joined us, as well.

MS. DAVIS: Good. Why don't we go to the Brady bunch until Jane is ready to go ahead and see if anybody has any comments they would like to make, and we could see people that way.

So, would anybody like to, at this point, make a comment or respond, particularly to the issue that we are speaking about now relating to the differing amounts that we would see with the updated figures on the lower income or on the higher
income. No one seemed to have any heartburn over the higher incomes.

Judge Palmer, I see you are lit up. Did you --

HON. PALMER: Well, of course, as somebody who knows, who is really seeing the child support on a semi day-to-day basis, you know, the person -- the custodial parent is the one who has the children and the three kids, and has to put a roof over their head, and with the pandemic, it's been shown that women have been losing their jobs more than the men.

So, that just gives me some concern that the federal guidelines, according to what the speaker, Jane, just said, you know, might be more worried about the payor versus the payee. So, that has my attention.

Also, the arrearage; how much of that -- somebody mentioned it was two-and-a-half times. And I apologize, I came in about 20 minutes late. How much of
that arrearage is actually cash owed versus interest? Was that ever broken down?

DR. VENOHR: I am back again. I have power. Sorry. So, I can answer that question.

That was among cases in our ALECS samples. So, they were new -- they were new orders or modified orders. So, we -- the new orders, I imagine, wouldn't have any interest. But the modified orders might, but we didn't break that down.

I think, if I remember right, Savannah, my research assistant, ran the numbers, and they weren't different between modified and new orders. So, it was a negligible difference. But we didn't -- So, that says to me there probably wasn't an interest thing and, as I talk about that, makes sense because when they modify an order they are usually a paying case, and they don't have as much arrears.

So, I would say the majority of that is principal.

HON. PALMER: Okay. Thank you. MS. STEINWINDER: Penny, it's Katie. I have got a question.

At the risk of sounding grossly ignorant, I guess, for those of us who don't have institutional knowledge like maybe those with the Department do, they are about the federal guidelines. Is there anything in any of our handouts that would kind of summarize what those federal guidelines -the updates that are required? Does that make sense?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. It's -- we did it in one -- it's the February memo, the comparison of federal requirements and state guidelines.

MS. DAVIS: And also I think that at one point Jennifer Bush had done one for us, too. She was always good about keeping us up to date.

So, if you want to look at sort of a historical perspective, Katie, about where the evolution from the federal guidelines,
then Jennifer could probably help you with that, too. She has done that for the Committee over the years.

MS. STEINWINDER: Thank you.
DR. VENOHR: But I do need to clarify that even though when you look at this memo it looks like, you know -- and I said it a little too crudely -- that it looks like a tradeoff between one parent and the other parent. And I made it sound like they are prioritizing the obligated parent. I want to make it clear that the federal reg is not that way, that the federal reg -what it recognizes is that it's better for a child to have two parents involved as long as it's a healthy relationship, you know, so that eliminates domestic violence cases and so forth. And that they are into the long term, the long haul, in that.

If you lower the order amount, the -- it's more likely that the obligated parent isn't going to work in the underground economy. He or she is going to
be a taxpayer, which is important. And he or she is more likely to stay engaged with the child.

There's data that shows that, if they don't pay, they also drop off. There is a correlation between that, not having contact with the child.

So, the intent of the federal reg is also just to think of the overall child well-being and recognizing that most of those arrears go unpaid. There's data from a nine-state study that says that only 10\% -- I think it's either $10 \%$ or $9 \%$-- of the arrears owed will be collected within ten years. And 70\% of that arrears is owed by obligated parents that have incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or less a year.

So, again, the federal reg isn't so much -- I misstated it -- prioritizing you know, one parent's needs over the other. It's the child and the long term benefit to the child.

> I am going to stop there to see if
there's any comments.
MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela
Campbell again.
If the concern is the arrears and in the data that you gave and not knowing how much of it is retroactive child support and how much of it is arrears that accrued because you were modifying the order, you made a statement earlier that if we changed how far back we can get a retroactive judgment, that would -- that actually would help because, I know in our county our judge routinely doesn't go back two years prior to the filing date. A lot of times -oftentimes, they go back to the filing date itself and get retroactive judgments so that they don't start off with -- in arrears that are insurmountable.

DR. VENOHR: I think that's a very good point. And the fact that both Kentucky and New Mexico changed their provision about that in the last month, you know, I don't know if -- I don't know where

[^0]Alabama's rule is on that. Is it part of the guidelines, or is it somewhere else?

MS. CAMPBELL: It's
discretionary. I mean, it's part of the -but it's up to the judge on whether -- how far back they go. But they can go back two years prior to the filing date. Or if it's a legal child, they can go all the way back to the child's date of birth.

DR. VENOHR: So, can you -- Would it be something you could address in the guidelines if you wanted to limit it?

MS. CAMPBELL: That I am not sure of. I'd need an attorney --

MS. DAVIS: But that's -- I think that's statutory, I believe. I'm -- maybe somebody can correct me that does that on a regular basis. It's been while since I have looked at that. I think it may be in the Uniform Parentage Act where it says you could go back.

HON. PALMER: Penny, it's Julie Palmer. I don't know if you all can hear me or not.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.
HON. PALMER: But I believe the statute is two years. Not necessarily two years from the date of filing, but two years from when the child was born, whichever is less. So, if I have got an 18-month old, I can't go back for two years, but I can go back for 18 months past the date of filing. And I believe that is statutory.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge Palmer.

So, if it's a statutory
implementation, then the rule -- we could not change it in a rule.

DR. VENOHR: Right. And then I guess the other issue that I am hearing is that it's already limited to two years. Like, you -- if the child is six, you could only go back to age four assuming the petition is being filed, and you couldn't go back to six years, right?

HON. PALMER: Correct.

DR. VENOHR: Correct. So, that's exactly what Kentucky and New Mexico, they limited it to two years.

So, you're in -- I don't know why Alabama has so much more arrears than those two states. You know, I mean, your interest rate is high, but -- what was the interest rate in Alabama, again? Somebody said it last time.

MS. CAMPBELL: 7.5\%.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah, because some or these interest rates are 10\%.

HON. PALMER: It got changed, I want to say, in September of 2011 from 12\%?

MS. CAMPBELL: That's right.
HON. PALMER: So, some of that old money owed is at 12\%. And oftentimes on those old cases, they only owe fifty -- they only owe a couple of thousand in back child support, but they owe $\$ 50,000$ in interest. So...

And then you have got your TANF and several other things that the State is
owed, as well, that has to be paid.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I mean, what it's saying to me just with the information that we have at hand that it's more your order amount. And what that does speak to is that, if you wanted to limit arrears, it wouldn't be a bad thing to decrease these order amounts, because they are going unpaid. I mean, if that's your goal or one of your goals, you know.

HON. PALMER: Well, a lot of that arrearage -- that old arrearage was before you could capture tax returns. They've been capturing a lot of the stimulus checks and that sort of thing. So, that part has had to come up. And then I do have a whole wrench to throw into this, but it's got nothing to do with what Jane is talking about, so I will save that until the end.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. Oh, come on, do it now.

HON. PALMER: No. You're on a roll, Jane. Go ahead while that computer is
charging up.
DR. VENOHR: No. I think it's important.

So, anyway, we were talking about one and two children and we were on page four. And the question is whether to use 85\%, 80\%, 75\%, and there's some interested in using a different percentage depending on the number of children.

And remember also that the Committee is favoring making that self-support reserve discretionary. So, at least that's what I understood. And you could correct me that it would be optional, and you looked at some language from New Jersey and Arizona in the memo -- I think it was last time -- that said that if the household where the custodial parent with the primary residential parent and the children live, if they don't have sufficient income that you wouldn't bring it down to these amounts. That this adjustment is discretionary.

So, keep that in mind. I mean, it's still a formula. But since you are favoring that, you could do one of two things: You could -- I have the adjustment shown on that worksheet at the end of the document, and some places tell me that if you put it in the worksheet, even if it's an advisory adjustment, it gets applied.

And so, you don't have to put it in the worksheet if you make it advisory or an optional adjustment. Nebraska is a state that doesn't. And I don't see it getting applied very often. The minute you put it -- you know, like I say, if you put it in a worksheet, it's more obvious. But our experience from looking at states that don't put it in the worksheet, it doesn't get applied.

I am going to skip the examples on the other ones that are -- it's just three children, and when the obligee has zero income -- but those are the charts on pages five and six. I mean, you can look at that,
but I -- you know, those also showed
decreases. But if you go with the discretionary, it's not going to happen.

What I wanted to spend the rest of my time with is just looking at some of the language, because there was a concern that, well, if we do the self-support reserve in the worksheet, do we have to do the dual calculation in every single case? And that comes up -- I will show you why that's an issue. Let me just find the right example. So, if you look at Figure 2 on the fourth page and we look at the amount for two children, and we will just show -- this is particularly a problem when you put it in the schedule. And if you see -- if we just updated the schedule for the new economic data and the new self-support reserve, so Option A, it would be $\$ 360$ when they both have income. But if he only has income, the obligated parent only has income, if you look at page six on Figure 5, two children, it's now \$232. Because his prorated share,
since she has income and the one on the earlier one -- well, I am saying that backwards. But the self-support reserve is intact on page six, but it's not when you consider both incomes.

So, that's why you have to do two calculations, because there is a -- there's a possibility -- I mean I'll just do an extreme example where she has $\$ 10,000$ in income and he has $\$ 1,000$ in income, then that order amount using the prorated share could be less than the self-support reserve adjusted amount.

So, the question was, well, do you have to do that in every case, or is there, like, a breaking point where there might be a situation where you don't have to do it? And you certainly could do it in every case, to do both calculations: The self-support reserve, adjusted amount, and then just the prorated amount. And -- but you don't have to. I mean, you could keep it simple and have every guidelines user use it, or you
could have an income threshold where it applies to.

And just -- because I feel like I am being really abstract just to drill it at home. Let's see.

If you look at page nine of this brief, this memo, this is the West Virginia worksheet. And you can see that they only apply the -- require the dual calculation at incomes below $\$ 1,550$ a month, and that works.

And so, for Alabama, the way it's lining up, is back on page seven, if you used a self-support reserve of $\$ 981$ per month and a 70\% work incentive, instead of saying that $\$ 1,550$ like West Virginia does, you would say $\$ 1,400$ for one child, $\$ 1,700$ for two children, $\$ 2,000$ for three children, $\$ 2,200$ for four children, and $\$ 2,500$ for five children, and $\$ 2,750$ for six children.

And the reason that increases with income is because that order, the basic obligation gets more as we add more
children. And note that those would be the income thresholds.

So, if there was -- the obligated parent's income was $\$ 1,600$, you don't need to do both calculations. Mathematically it takes care of itself. But if it was $\$ 1,200$, that obligated parent's income, you should do both calculations. And these thresholds work with 70\%. And they are going to be higher if you use a higher percentage. So, that's just $75 \%$ or $80 \%$ or $85 \%$. So, I would have to redo it.

And so, right now all we are talking about is a really small thing just with the wording to make it less cumbersome to use this calculation, the self-support reserve. And some of the things -- you know, we are already talking about, you know, considering the custodial parents, you know, whether her income is near poverty. I had some language in last month's memo from New Jersey where her income has to be at least $105 \%$ of the poverty before they apply
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the self-support reserve to the obligated parents. So, that's one language that's complicating it.

Two, is that we are talking about using a different percentage for the number of children. That's going to make the calculation complicated.

And, three, if you want to limit it so those that are doing the manual calculation, they don't have to do two worksheets and see what's lower. This is going to result in a more complicated language.

And then on top of that is, you are switching from including it in the worksheet to including it -- I mean, including it from the schedule, that's what you did before, and doing it in the worksheet.

So, the rest of this memo is just saying, yeah, we recognize that there's a bunch of new things happening, but you can do it simple. And --

MS. DAVIS: Can I --
DR. VENOHR: Go ahead.
MS. DAVIS: Excuse me. Can I
interrupt for a second before we go off this page.

If you look at what the amount here, like, from one child is $\$ 1,400$, would that be comparable to the West Virginia's example, which is $\$ 1,550 ?$

DR. VENOHR: Right. So, if you are looking at having some type of calculation in the formula, would under -if you are using something similar to West Virginia where you have the part two, ability to pay calculation, would you put in there, that it would be -- this example here where you go through six children, would you put that -- those amounts for each number of children, or would that be built in somewhere else?

DR. VENOHR: My recommendation, just to keep it simple, is just put it at the sixth child amount, $\$ 2,750$, because then

[^1]you have to explain why it differs for each child. And even though it means that a guidelines user would have to calculate two worksheets -- I mean, do that extra lines, those last four lines of the West Virginia, I don't think it's going to hurt them. It's just easier. You know, we know that it's going to be okay for incomes of $\$ 1,400$. I mean, that would -- So, in short, you could put those amounts, instead of $\$ 1,550$ and use the variable amounts by the number of children, or you could just put \$2,750.

MS. DAVIS: The $\$ 1,550$, is that the West Virginia equivalent to six children, or is it the equivalent to one child, or somewhere in between?

DR. VENOHR: It was the sixth child. I think we used the sixth child. That was done in 1999.

So, I am spacing out as far as -but I worked with West Virginia, and I am pretty sure it was -- we just decided to go with the sixth child amount. Because if you
notice, the self-support reserve is \$500. MS. DAVIS: Right.

DR. VENOHR: And they haven't updated their guidelines since 1999. In fact, we have a contract with them right now. So, they are looking into increasing that self-support reserve.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I just wanted to make sure, because when you see this, these six different numbers I thought we are really going to get it complicated if they are going to have to calculate based on the number of children that they have. So, that helps clarify that for me. Thank you.

DR. VENOHR: I think that's a good question. Now, remember that the Federal Poverty Level for one person is \$1,073 right now in the year 2021.

Okay. So, the only state that provides a work incentive in the worksheet is actually West Virginia. I thought more states did that, but they don't. And that's that line ten on page nine where you see the

[^2]80\% of the difference. And I am going to show you some examples of states that don't have any work incentive. I am going to go sequential because I am jumping around here.

So, I am on page seven. The 2019
Kentucky Child Support Commission proposed to put the self-support reserve in the worksheet, include a work incentive. Their guidelines are legislatively promulgated, and the House Judiciary did not favor that. It was -- it just did not like that self-support reserve.

So, they did not approve it. But if you want to look at Kentucky's proposed language, it was drafted by -- on their commission that had judges and attorneys, but they didn't have any legislators. That's on page ten.

And what Kentucky wanted to use was $82 \%$ of the difference for their self-support reserve. And notice that on line eight it says that -- what they did was, instead of using that threshold like
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And the reason I am just showing you all this is that, these are just examples of language that you could adopt from other states.

And then on page 11, it shows the proposed Kentucky worksheet. And line 16 shows where they put that $82 \%$.

What's interesting is West Virginia, their worksheet is in the statute. So, there's no explanation about why it's, you know, 80\% or narrative like Kentucky has, you know, no provision. They just stick that worksheet in their legislation, so they don't explain it. Wherein, Kentucky, their worksheet is done by the courts, but the provision for the $82 \%$ was done in the statute.

So, that's just to help clarify. You know, if somebody says, well, where is

[^3]the Kentucky language? Well, they didn't need to do it.

I am going to show you a couple of things of what not to do. On page 12, this is the beginning of Arizona's worksheet, and then page 13 is where their self-support reserve is.

And Arizona is a state where, in their guidelines -- and I didn't put the narrative -- it says that the application of the self-support reserve is discretionary, you know, that the court is to consider the needs of the household -- the primary household with custody. But what they do is, they put this self-support reserve in the worksheet. It's at the very bottom of page 13 or at the last line. See where it shows that $\$ 1,456 ?$ That's -- it's kind of tucked about a third of the way in the row.

So, then, everybody in Arizona applies it. Even though in their provisions and their guidelines, which are established in court rule, it says you can apply this
discretionary. We just worked with Arizona. We did a hard case file review. And every time that number was populated, and they applied the self-support reserve.

So, nobody is using it discretionary. And, again, that might be because they have it on the worksheet.

The reason that they have it set aside and you see it's kind of bold -- it's $\$ 1,456$-- is that Arizona relates it to their minimum wage, and they have a minimum wage of $\$ 12.15$ an hour. And their self-support reserve is 80\% of self -- their full-time earnings at minimum wage.

So, this allows them to change it year to year as their minimum wage changes, without changing their form.

But what you see is that there's no work incentive. So, it's totally the difference. If we had an obligated parent whose income was $\$ 1,500$, then the difference between $\$ 1,500$ and $\$ 1,456$ would be $\$ 44$. And the Arizona guidelines doesn't even say what
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to do with that. But most judges -- what we learned from the guidelines review -- would be setting the order at $\$ 44$ in that case.

And then Arizona doesn't provide -- what do you do when the income is less than the self-support reserve? So, let's say he has an income of $\$ 1,300$ and they're not imputing at minimum wage, then it's going to be negative. So, we would have $\$ 1,300$. We minus $\$ 1,456$, and we would get a negative \$156. And Arizona doesn't provide a minimum order in their guidelines. They are one of the few states that doesn't. And so, what most judges do in that case is they just order a zero order.

So, I just want to show you some nuances, because I think this is important for when you write it up, the provisions, and if you include it in the worksheets.

So, I am going to move on to page 14, which is New York's worksheet. And New York has like a two-tier self-support reserve. It's -- or a two-tiered minimum
order. It's -- I am trying to see if I could see it right in here. It's so complicated.

If their income is below poverty -- and these are annual amounts when you read it -- then the minimum order is $\$ 600$ a year, which is $\$ 50$ a month. But then if the income is greater than -- if you look at line three -- greater than the self-support reserve of a hundred and -- I think that's 135\% in the Federal Poverty; that's income amount of $\$ 1,703.88$, then it's a different minimum order.

And this just shows you what not to do. I think this is very complicated. So, I mean, I think Alabama is a very pragmatic state, and you want to keep things simple. But, you know, when you are thinking of, you know, this scenario and that scenario and sometimes it's easy to say, well, we should do this and this. This shows you that the math isn't always that easy.

If we go to page 15, this is Washington State self-support reserve. And if you look at the very bottom they -- on line eight, they have a self-support reserve equivalent to $125 \%$ of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.

So, they are one of the handful of states that adjust it every year since the Federal Poverty Guidelines are updated every year. And then you can see they don't have any work incentive, so they don't do that percentage adjustment like West Virginia does.

And then you can see that last line is very simple about how they apply their minimum order. You know, as a combined net income less than a \$1,000, we'll stick in $\$ 50$ just to show some simple language.

And then the next page shows it's a little bit more complicated. Well, not on line 1. That, again, just shows that if their income is less than the self-support

[^4]reserve, just use the minimum order.
And then the rest of the lines -let's see. And then this is just how to deal with it when his income is more than the self-support reserve.

And then the last page of this memo is just the worksheet that what we did here at CPR is we took your existing worksheet, and we just wanted to see where you would fit in the self-support reserve. And this is what we came up with.

And so, there's a new line 10, which would be the self-support reserve. And then a new line 11, which would be the difference between each parent's income and the self-support reserve.

And then the new line 12 would be whatever percentage you wanted to multiply it with. So, we could do a little scale that showed one child, and then an arrow that said, you know, use 75\%, and then two kids, you know, use 80\%, something like that. And then, you know, it can't be less
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than $\$ 50$, which is a policy decision. You could change your minimum order. I think -let's see. It's been $\$ 50$ since you first promulgated guidelines.

So, if I was to adjust it for inflation, that would be close to $\$ 100$, if $I$ was to go back to, like, about 1990. And then from your last review, I don't know that off the top of my head.

And, again, as I talk about this, I realize you don't even have to put this in the worksheet. Like, Nebraska has a self-support reserve that is in their narrative similar to what I showed you in Alabama, but they don't put it in their worksheet. It never gets used, though, you know, and theirs is supposed to be presumptive. But if it doesn't show up in the worksheet, chances are it is not going to get used. I mean, it all depends on the state.

So, I am going to stop there. Hopefully that gives you some ideas on the
work incentive and just what sort of language you want to draft in your guidelines provision. And I will send you Nebraska for the next time and then whether you want to put the adjustment in your worksheet and how.

So, I would say the lingering questions are, one, you want to confirm that you want to do the adjustment; whether you want to have some language like Arizona or New Jersey that limits it depending on the income of the other party, the party where the children nearly -- usually reside; reconfirm that that's the amount of the self-support reserve you want to use; decide whether you want to put it in the worksheet; or you don't have to like Nebraska does. And if you do put it in the worksheet, well, you still have to address what the percentage difference should be, you know, because you seem to favor a work incentive: $70 \%, 75 \%, 80 \%$, $85 \%$.

So, I am going to stop there.

I think I gave you some concrete questions and let you talk.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I think we -let me confirm. Do we have a quorum at this point? I think we did at one point.

MS. BLACKBURN: Yes, we do.
MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Okay.
So, I think we are at the point that we need to give Jane some firmer directions to go, although I think it's been helpful thus far to narrow it down by straw votes. And the simple vote may be to start with whether we want the self-support reserve test to show up on the worksheet so that it would be included for both parent A and parent B, or Plaintiff or Defendant, however you want to categorize it.

So, can we maybe go back to the Brady bunch. Well, you see the formula. You got it -- you don't have it in front of you. You have a written copy, that a way to do that, if we want to do it, would be fairly simple the way that Jane has done it
there on the last page.
So, let's see if we have some discussion about that first. Anybody have any --

MS. COX: Amanda Cox. Sorry.
What percentage -- does anybody -I'm not sure if Jane answered this. But what percentage of cases would actually even use that self-support reserve?

DR. VENOHR: Right now your -the case file data is based on ALECS. So, it's limited to those that are in the IV-D system. It's about a third that have income imputed at full-time minimum wage.

So, that would apply -- that would be scenario one. That's the most common. If the feds change that minimum wage, though, it doesn't matter. You know, you are kind of -- you would be probably in Case Scenario 2.

MS. COX: Thank you.
MS. DAVIS: Judge Palmer?
HON. PALMER: Well, I don't know
about the worksheet so much, that to put it in the worksheet. So much of it -- Where would it go? Would it be like a footnote on CS-42? Would it be on the 41 so that would be noted there? Everything is done online now.

So, is there some way that the electronic CS-42 that the judge would calculate would pop up and say, this is in the self-support reserve? Or I guess that's my question is where would it go and that sort of thing.

DR. VENOHR: I think what -- I mean, that would be at the discretion on the Committee and the court. But what we did was that last page of our memo shows our recommendation of where it would go in the worksheet.

So, it would go at the -- there would be a new line. I put -- I am looking at something else. But if you flip, there would be the new line 10, new line 11, and so forth.

So, what we did was take your worksheet as is and recommend where it could go. You don't have to do it. You know, you could make it -- if you make it discretionary, you could just put it in a narrative and then treat it as like a deviation. And then wherever you put the deviation, now, that's where the self-support reserve would go.

I feel like I am not making sense, you know, because I keep talking because I keep -- but I think it's really that you are just thinking about it.

So, I really do need to hear from you because, otherwise, you are just going to have me say more stuff, and I am going to confuse you.

MS. CAMPBELL: Jane, this is Angela Campbell, again.

And you have probably said this 100 times, and I am just -- may be just missing it.

But if we do the self-support
reserve in the guideline itself, that -would that be just for the obligor? And if we do it on the worksheet, then both parties would get the benefit of the self-support reserve? Is that correct or incorrect?

DR. VENOHR: Partially. The last part where you said that, if you do it in the worksheet where both get it?

MS. CAMPBELL: Uh-huh (positive response).

DR. VENOHR: Right now it's only in the schedule. So, if you put it in the schedule, it only goes to the obligated parent. But you could -- and I wish -- I might have it. I'm on Zoom, and we usually use often teams. I wish I could find Nebraska's language. I'm going to try to find it.

You could put -- let me just find an example. Because what I think I am confusing you with is there's actually three options that I am talking about is: Do it like Alabama does now where you have it in
the schedule. A second option would be to put it in the worksheet where it can be applied to both parents. And now today, I never said this in front of you-all, so that's why it's very confusing. So, I am very glad you asked that question is, you could put the language for it to go in the worksheet but not necessarily put it in the worksheet. And that -- and the purpose of that would still be applied to both parents. But since it doesn't show up at the worksheet, the judge would have to make a decision and, like, put it on the same line that you would put a deviation and probably have to calculate manually.

MS. DAVIS: I don't think we would want to go that route, I think, just from a pragmatic standpoint. I don't want to speak on behalf of the judges because we certainly have good judges here that can speak.

But I think the value of having it there on the worksheet is that both people
see that they are equally -- they are treated equally in terms of the self-support reserve, both parents.

MR. MADDOX: Yes. This is Bob.
I think that was mentioned at a previous meeting. That was the purpose of having it on the worksheet was to show the parties how it's calculated.

MS. DAVIS: I think there's value to that. And if we decide to have it, I don't want the judges to have to go through a lot of the extra calculations to do that when it could be done -- I mean, it's fairly simple the way you have drawn it here. You basically look at the amount, which would be the $\$ 981$, assuming the number remains the same than you do the subtraction, and you come up with the new amount that's available.

So, I don't see that as being that difficult to put it in the existing Alabama process. Of course, this is a -- it looks a little different than our current form
because, you know, you've skipped the existing lines five and six, you know, just because you're focusing on the self-support reserve. But this is basically how our form would look just with the self -- what is now hidden in the calculation is the self-support reserve that goes solely to the paying parent. If you put it in the workshop, it's visible and includes both parents equally.

Is that stating it correctly, Jane?

DR. VENOHR: Right. Bob, can you scroll it down to the bottom because I'm not sure if I can -- oh, could you -- yeah.

MS. DAVIS: Really it only
involves one subtraction.
DR. VENOHR: I'm sorry?
MS. DAVIS: I said it seems
simple to me because, once you put in the self-support reserve amount, then you do that one subtraction and that comes up with the amount that you have available for
support. And then obviously the pay only goes in one direction.

DR. VENOHR: Bob, can you just show the line above there if you can. It's going to be $\$ 250$, yeah. I mean, this would convolute it, but it would make it more cumbersome, but this is a concern that I have heard the Committee will -- you know, the other parent, which is the first column, she's the primary custodial parent, you see on line eight that they are both going to be responsible for $\$ 250$ because it's an equal-income case where they are both minimum wage earners.

And you see that the one column that carries all the way down, it's going to go \$221. You could put wording in that line 14 that says if the parent with the majority of the time, if they are line eight and line 13, if they don't -- you know, if they can't meet there -- if their line 13 is more -- is less than line eight, don't apply the self-support reserve to the parent due
support. Because in that case, she doesn't have enough income to even make that \$250 either.

Am I making sense? You know, I mean, that's the way to do it. I haven't seen a state do that. So, the language would have to be developed by -- crafted by you-all. There's not a state to inform it, but it would address your concern. I mean, that's what I have been hearing from the Committee members.

MS. DAVIS: Can you say that again real slowly, and let me understand what you are saying or suggesting to do on line 13?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. So, what you would do is, on line 14, you would say something like, if SSR-adjusted amount of the parent with primary custody on line 13 is less, that the parent's amount on line 18 (sic) -- or in the amount on line 18 (sic) for that same parent, you can't do a self-support reserve adjustment for the
obligated parent.
MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela Campbell. You mean line 8.? You said line 18. But you meant line 8?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Thank you. You paid attention. You get the "A" in the class.

MS. DAVIS: So, if the custodial parent, the amount that they have is lower than the $\$ 250$, then the payor parent would pay the $\$ 250$ as opposed to the $\$ 221$; is that what you are saying?

DR. VENOHR: Uh-huh (positive response).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. So, the effect of that is, if one parent cannot get the self-support reserve benefit, the other parent does not get the self-support reserve benefit.

DR. VENOHR: Right. Right.
MS. DAVIS: So, the payor parent
would only get the self-support reserve benefit if the recipient parent was able to
benefit from that too?
DR. VENOHR: Exactly.
MS. DAVIS: So, you would wind up being, if the line 13 is smaller than line 8, then you would apply line 8?

DR. VENOHR: Yes.
MS. DAVIS: I mean, I'm not trying to reword how you are saying, but that's the effect.

DR. VENOHR: No. I think it's good you reword it. Because I think -yeah.

MS. DAVIS: If we do the self-support reserve test, the children would not receive less in -- if the self-support reserve could not be applied equally to both parents. Okay.

DR. VENOHR: I mean, that's one way to address it. I mean, that's just a visual way.

MS. DAVIS: Let's stop here for a minute and let other people ask questions about that third concept that you brought
up, Jane.
MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela again.

I don't have any more questions, but I do like the work-around you just presented because the custodial parent is the one who has the burden of most of the support for the children, and it would not be fair for her not to be able to meet her portion, you know, whatever you just said. It just makes the most sense.

MS. DAVIS: It's the goose-organder concept. What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

MS. CAMPBELL: I agree.
MS. DAVIS: All right. Anybody else have a comment about that?

PROFESSOR GRAY: This is Brian Gray. I don't have a comment about that. But thinking back to Option 1 and Option 2, and not Option 3, I think Dr. Venohr talked about this before. The concept of keeping the schedule as clean as possible, without

[^5]adjustments embedded in it, helps us out a lot if we want to make changes in the future.

So, the more we keep the adjustments on the worksheet, the better. Plus it's a lot more clear, I think, to the parents in looking at the calculations that happen on that worksheet. And the worksheet is not any more complicated than a 1040-EZ.

So, it doesn't seem like it's overly complicated by these adjustments that we are making currently.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Dr. Gray. Other comments?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. I want to suggest, then, if you would, Dr. Venohr, if for the next meeting if you would do an example with this third concept that you have presented to the Committee, and let the Committee look at that and give us time to cogitate a little bit on the underlying principles, as well as the calculations.

DR. VENOHR: Certainly. And I think, you know, there's some anomalies that will happen mathematically when his or her income is just slightly above the self-support reserve.

So, I will run that. But, you know, there's always a tradeoff between keeping it simple and making it work for every single scenario. So, that's what I am battling with in my head mathematically.

But, yeah, we will identify that by doing that in the worksheet. But I think it addresses what I am hearing from the Committee that they are concerned of shortchanging the custodial parent's household when that household is also very low income.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Any other comments from Committee members before we leave this particular area? Of course, obviously, if something pops up in your mind, we are not precluded from bringing it up. But I think we need --

MS. STEINWINDER: When I --
MS. DAVIS: Go ahead.
MS. STEINWINDER: I have a quick question. This is Katie.

When I go back to the comments to the '09 amendments and it's the $\$ 851$ per month, Jane, and then we would be raising it to the $\$ 981$ based on what we are looking at, if we look at the schedule the way it's done, was that self-support reserve applied to custodial and noncustodial when it was built into the schedule in the shaded sections?

DR. VENOHR: It was only applied to the noncustodial parent.

MS. STEINWINDER: Okay. And that -- okay. I was just making sure I understood that. Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Katie. Any other questions?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Well, let's --
I think the next issue that I think we ought
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to try to clarify for the next meeting is the percentage that we want to apply. Well, I guess the first question is: Are we still in favor of a work incentive to be included? So, let's do sort of a -- back to the Brady bunch and see if most people are in favor of that. We will start with a discussion on that, just the -- and then we will go from, if we are in favor of a work incentive, then what percentage?

So, let's open up the discussion for a work incentive.

MS. DAVIS: Judge Palmer?
HON. PALMER: I say, yes. That's all I have got to say.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. That's fine. That's helpful. I pause for another comment, and then we'll just kind of have a -- go ahead and have a vote on that. We will need to take a vote, and then proceed on percentage. Any other comment?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Going once. Going
twice. Gone.
All right. Let's go ahead and take a vote. Those who are in favor of having a work incentive included in the Child Support Guidelines, if you would, raise your hands.
(Committee members raising hands.)

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. Those who are not visible, if you would, unmute and vote -- the Committee members unmute and vote.

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela Campbell. I vote in favor.

HON. PALMER: Julie Palmer. I think I just voted in favor before I was supposed to, but I vote in favor.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge.
MS. DAVIS: Anyone else who want to vote in favor?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Those that are opposed, if you would, unmute and register
your opposition to the motion.
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. The motion carries. So, we will include a work incentive.

And now the question is what percentage, and obviously we have seen several percentages. I guess one option is to have the same percentage regardless of the number of children. And one option would be to have a different percentage based on the number of children.

So, does anyone have any thoughts on those issues?

MS. COX: This is Amanda Cox. I
just had a quick question about percentages.
Dr. Venohr, can you remind us what the percentage would be that would effectively cancel out the taxes; was that the $80 \%$ ?

DR. VENOHR: The tax rates varied depending on the income. So, I might have it in my rate memo.

MS. DAVIS: Somebody was thinking it was around $82 \%$, but I might be wrong.

DR. VENOHR: Right. It's -- at minimum wage, the tax rate is about $13 \%$. And this is -- the entire payroll taxes, this Alabama State, Federal and FICA. And then it's about 18\% at \$15 an hour full-time.

MS. DAVIS: Those who were looking at the memo on page three, she had the option of using the number of children. The example she gave was 70\% for one child, 75\% for two, 80\% for three or more. The pros she listed was the approach would increase the amount for children. The con, that it would be a little more complicated.

MS. HALL: This is Mallory Hall. I mean, I like the idea of keeping a consistent number. It's nothing else but a simplicity of it. I guess I don't see much of a benefit bearing it based on the number of children as I do of just keeping it, you know, consistent and simple.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Simple is a good version. Go ahead, Jane.

DR. VENOHR: I just wanted to comment with -- because it's a variable percentage as income increases, what you could be in a situation in Alabama is that right now, you know, for -- at \$7.25 an hour, if you really care about the payroll taxes, you definitely have to have one that's at least 85\%, right? Because the payroll taxes is about $12 \%$ to $13 \%$ of that income.

And if minimum wage goes up to \$15 an hour, which I think is beginning to think is unlikely, then you would definitely have to have one that's at least 80\%.

So, right now, 85\% is the maximum percentage you could use with the $\$ 7.25$ an hour. And then $80 \%$ is the maximum you could use with the $\$ 15$ an hour.

So, what $I$ am saying is, if the feds change their minimum wage, you could be in a situation that changes your percentage
too because it sounds like what I am hearing from the Committee is that you really do respect that whole issue with the payroll taxes.

So, I just want to throw that out there that, you know, as you are talking about -- thinking about simplicity and making changes as the feds change the minimum wage, you might be in a position to tweak that percentage.

I am going to stop there.
MS. DAVIS: So, if you wanted to actually give some type of work incentive, it would have to be a percentage less than 85\%, because 85\% is a break-even once you consider taxes; is that correct?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I mean, that's rounding to the --

MS. DAVIS: Yeah. Rounding up. Yeah. Rounding up. Okay.

DR. VENOHR: And then if you
were -- if minimum wage went up to $15 \%$ and you wanted at least give the $80 \%$.

MS. DAVIS: Melody, you are muted. I don't know if you are trying to talk to us or somebody else.

MS. BALDWIN: Oh, sorry. Yeah.
I have probably a dumb question. But because we keep asking about the percentage based on the taxes that we expect to be paid by that individual. But was that not also included in the amount of self-support reserve that we have already taken off the top.

DR. VENOHR: No. That's a really good question. Yeah. We did take that into consideration. But now we are talking about those that their income is just above the self-support reserve.

MS. BALDWIN: Okay.
DR. VENOHR: So, they might -you know, we could look at that example where the self-support reserve we are talking about is \$981, and we are talking about that difference. If he has income of \$1,081, so there's a $\$ 100$ difference in his
gross income, should every single dollar of that $\$ 100$ go to child support, or should it be \$85, \$80, \$75, \$70.

MS. BALDWIN: Okay. I think that addressed the concern I had. Because now we are looking at already taking the amount after the self-support reserve to determine work incentive percentage, right? Am I --

DR. VENOHR: (Nodding in the affirmative).

MS. BALDWIN: Okay.
MS. DAVIS: You-all are asking very good questions.

Any other? Jane, go ahead. Were you waving?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I was just kind of curious. There is silence. I mean, what kind of information would tip the scale would make somebody more opinionated?

MS. BALDWIN: Dr. Venohr, this is Melody Baldwin.

In contrast to Mallory, while I understand the need for simplicity, we are
complicating it anyway, if we agree on any of this, I'm not sure -- is it going to complicate it that much further to have a sliding scale based on the number of children? Because obviously if I make a certain amount and I continue to have more children, I anticipate that I am going to have less to spend on things that I might ordinarily want to purchase.

So, I think that it makes sense to have it -- the work incentive percentage on a sliding scale based on the number of children for that reason. Somebody might disagree. Obviously, somebody does. But that's my effort to start a conversation. DR. VENOHR: I think it's a good question. I'm sorry. I just want to say mathematically, no, the programmers can deal with it easily. It's really the manual calculator that they may see that line and find it confusing.

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela Campbell.

As someone who used to do it manually when I was in court, I think we can put enough language on the line. It's line 12, correct? Am I looking at it right?

On line 12 to basically make it very clear what percentage you use for however many children. I think there's enough room to do that on the form itself.

HON. PALMER: Well, hello, again. It's Julie Palmer.

You know, in child support court, I have learned I have got three children by three different people. Do I get on that sliding scale for three? Is each case done separately? Is it just one child, one child, one child? We already give them credit for the child support that they are paying in other cases. What do we do about that?

DR. VENOHR: My recommendation is that the worksheet is per the children of the order, the children at the bar, that that would just be the clear language. If
there's any sort of adjustment for prior orders, I don't put all the lines in there between line one and two. That's the only place that they would address that.

HON. PALMER: Okay.
MS. DAVIS: You all are raising some very good practical points, and I appreciate your willingness to share that to the Committee members. We may not have all thought of each of those particular points. Additional thoughts? Comments? (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Maybe we will address the issue of the -- what I am going to call the staggered work incentive based on the number of children. So, let's get a -- an up or down vote on that. And then whatever we vote on, we can get Jane to give us some examples for the next meeting and then look at them. And then if -- then we can revote if we have some concerns about that. So, that way we will have something in front of us.

So, those that would be in favor of staggering the percentage of -- the work incentive percentage based on the number of children with increasing as the number of children increased, if you would, raise your hand.
(Committee members raising hands).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Those that are not visible, if you would unmute and vote if you are in favor.

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela Campbell. I am in favor.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. Judge Palmer, I see you are unmuted. Would you like to vote?

HON. PALMER: Well, I am going to vote to make it simple. Just one flat. So, I didn't know that was a question in front of me.

MS. DAVIS: No, that's fine. I
just -- you light up when you are unmuted.
HON. PALMER: But I still have
that one question $I$ want to throw in here when we get finished with the doctor here.

MS. DAVIS: All right. We will save time for that.

Okay. Anything -- any other votes in favor before we tally the votes in opposition?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: All right. Those opposed to using a staggered work incentive for children, if you would, raise your hand. (Ms. Hall raising hand).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.
And those opposed other than -- Judge, I can't see other than Judge Palmer, who has already voted in opposition, would you unmute and vote.
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Well, then we will direct Dr. Venohr to come forward with some examples using a staggered amount. And then obviously we can revisit that issue once she presents those to us.

Does anyone want to propose a starting amount? Her example was 70\% for one child. I think we have established that anything -- that if you do a staggered amount, you don't want to go above 85\% if you want to consider the taxes.

So, you could do, you know, for example, the -- if you did the 75\% for two, one child, 70\% for one, 75\% for two, or 80\% for three or more was her example. Or you could do 75\% for one, $80 \%$ for two, and $85 \%$ for three or more is a second example.

Does anybody have a preference as to the starting point?

MS. COX: This is Amanda Cox. I prefer the second example.

MS. DAVIS: So, it would be 75\% for one child, 80\% for two children and 85\% for three or more?

MS. COX: Yes, ma'am.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Anybody else favor that one? Dr. Venohr?

DR. VENOHR: Oh, go ahead. I
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don't want to lose your train of thought.
MS. DAVIS: I'm sorry. Go ahead. All right. Let's take a vote on that. Then, all in favor of the $75 \%$, $80 \%$ and $85 \%$, raise your hand.
(Ms. Cox raising hand).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Unmute if you would like to vote in favor.

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela Campbell. I am in favor of that.

MS. DAVIS: All right. Anybody else?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: All right. The other suggestion was what Dr. Venohr had here on page three, which was 70\% for one child, 75\% for two children and 80\% for three children. All in favor of that, raise your hand.
(Mr. Jeffries and Professor
Gray raise hands).
MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Those who unmute and vote, if you would.
(No response).

MS. DAVIS: All right. Thank you. I didn't get a lot of votes in favor of either one. So, I am going to give a third alternative. Let's see if you want to go with 80\%, 85\% and -- maybe for one child for $80 \%$, and two or more for $85 \%$. So, the minimum amount would be 80\% -- I mean, that would be the most common since $80 \%$ is the -one child is the most common. So, 80\% for that. If there's more than one child, then it would be 85\%. All in favor of that scenario, if you would, raise your hand. (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Anybody unmute, be in favor of that?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: All right. Well, it doesn't seem like I can come up with any suggestions that we have more than a couple of people in favor of. So, I think we will need to leave that.

Dr. Venohr, if you could give us some examples. The consensus seems to be
that we would like it to be different percentages based on the number of children, but with the amount of time we have -- and I am going to leave time for Judge Palmer to raise her question -- I think we are going to need more direction from you, if you could help us on that. Maybe look at what other states have done who have staggered.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I have a question. Just quickly. What was the second scenario? I didn't hear.

MS. DAVIS: Your scenario was one. The second one was basically to increase yours by a 5\% on each increment which was starting at $75 \%$, $80 \%$ and then $85 \%$. And then the last one was to have one child, 80\%, and then more than one child, 85\%, and nobody seemed to be in favor of that one.

DR. VENOHR: Is there any
interest in going to uneven percentages such as like 80\%, 84\%, you know, or do you want to keep it in 5\%? I mean, it's a small difference, but, I mean, just for
mathematical options I am asking, not officially.

MS. DAVIS: Asking for help in telling her what kind of direction we would like for her to go.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. If you are okay with not using the 5, even 5\%, like $81 \%, 83 \%$ ?

PROFESSOR GRAY: This is Brian Gray.

I voted for the second option, but I am wondering, is there truly a work incentive at 85\%? It sounds like you are basically working for nothing in that. You know, I am wondering if maybe people are reluctant because we are not a little bit lower on the scale. You know, maybe starting at $70 \%$ or $60 \%$ and working our way up, if you are really talking about a work incentive.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. That's a good point.

Would anyone like to comment?

MS. COX: This is Amanda Cox. I could probably, you know, be convinced, but I am not super sold on the work incentive. I just wonder how many people are actually going to calculate it out. Maybe I'm, you know, thinking incorrectly. Maybe some other people could kind of enlighten me.

But I just wonder how many people are going to actually calculate it out and say, well, I am going to work this number of hours so I won't have to pay. I mean, do people really do that in real life? I am just not sure if that's really going to have that much of an effect. But I welcome other people's comments on that.

MS. DAVIS: I think that raises an interesting question. Anybody have some thoughts or are there any research, Dr. Venohr, that you can present the next time to indicate that there is.

DR. VENOHR: There definitely is.
MS. DAVIS: Okay.
DR. VENOHR: I mean, it's more
from a tax incentive, but in the economic literature, yeah, tax rates matter a lot. PROFESSOR GRAY: This is Brian Gray again. I think there's another example that we are seeing these days that is a great analogy. Look at all the people who are basically taking unemployment and not working and don't want to go to work because basically the additional amount that they are making is not enough to justify them going back to work.

MS. DAVIS: That's a good point.
DR. VENOHR: Penny, I think I have enough to work on some examples.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. I am sorry we can't give more directions. I think the reason is everybody is being very thoughtful mentally in their deliberations, and we just haven't reached a consensus in our own minds.

Okay. Judge Palmer, if you would, go ahead with your bombshell.

HON. PALMER: Okay. Well, it's
not really a bombshell, and it has to do with taxes since we just finished that.

But starting July the 1st through at least December, rather than get the child credit on your taxes -- I make $\$ 27,000$ a year, I have got one child, now my taxable income is $\$ 24,000$ a year -- people are going to start actually getting checks in their bank account for $\$ 300$ a month. Or if you have a child, I believe, under six years old, of $\$ 320$ a month, at least July through December. I'm not worried about that as much, but now the last article I read is that they are looking to extend that through 2025.

So, is that going to be income for the person who is receiving the actual money versus, in the past, it was just a credit towards taxes that you might owe? Now, this is actual cash in your pocket in your bank account, and that's per child up to 18 years old.

DR. VENOHR: If I may, it isn't
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through 2025 yet.
HON. PALMER: Not yet, but that's the article that I read that they are looking to extend it.

DR. VENOHR: Right. That was part of the America Rescue Act -- yeah, American Rescue Act. And what it did was, it increased the child tax credit. And right now, it's $\$ 2,000$. And now with the new legislation, it's \$3,000, and then \$3,400 -- I think it's \$3,400 for young kids. And it affects the very, very low income because, it's a child tax credit and -- I have a heater on here -- you can't -- but before you --

HON. PALMER: Was that actual cash in their pocket?

DR. VENOHR: What, hun?
HON. PALMER: I was just going to say, isn't that actual cash in their pocket? Isn't that the difference before I got a credit on my taxes so it would lower my tax rate versus now I am going to be getting
that $\$ 300$ or I think $\$ 320$ in my bank account every month?

DR. VENOHR: Right. For just those six months. There's no legislation that's going to take it yet to December. But that's what President Biden wants to do.

So, it's just for this year. And if we run out of time, go to the minutes when I explained it from the last meeting. I explained how it's going to work. And my recommendation would be, if you wanted to address it, treat it as a deviation and maybe tweak your deviation criteria to deal with that tax credit. I think there was some language in it.

I don't have your deviation criteria right now, but there's some -parents can divide the tax credits associated with the kids. You know, for instance, a divorcing couple, Jane might claim the children; and if there's one child in 2021 and then the father claims them in 2022, and -- or you can -- that might not
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work because of this situation. But there's thing like that that you -- it's the same amount of income that's going into that parent's income. It's just that now it's being advanced. They are not -- you know, like you say, it's going directly to their bank account rather than them having to wait for the year, and it's going to be more because just for this calendar year.

Am I answering your question or helping?

HON. PALMER: You are. I am just looking at it from a lawyer's point of view that's going to be arguing in front of $a$ judge. I am going to need my child support reduced or I need my arrearage reduced. There's all this extra money that this person got. I mean, we are already seeing that with the incentive checks that have gone out.

So, I don't know if Judge Thompson is on this call or not. But I can just see that coming down the pipe, especially if it
gets extended. If it's just for this six months, probably not so much. But if it gets extended, I think it's something we really need to address or at least the courts are going to have to address how is that money calculated. Because right now, it's not calculated for the purposes of child support, that I get the tax credit. But it is used as a negotiation tool. It is used. The judge does have the discretion: I get them one year; you get them the next year. But I can definitely see that the fight is over all of that.

So, that's just what I have been reading. I just had to share that with you-all.

MR. MADDOX: This is Bob Maddox. Would it be, Judge, the deviation criterion assets or income received by or on behalf of a child or children?

HON. PALMER: I think it could. Because I don't know if it's taxable or not or if that's just a tax credit that wouldn't
have been taxable to begin with. But I
think it would be at least on earned income, under that line.

MR. MADDOX: Maybe it would be a deviation criterion for this short period of time.

HON. PALMER: Yeah. I mean, like I said, the six months I am not so worried about. But I can hear both -- even in my court so much, but in Judge Stephens' court, I bet you something like that is going to come up. I just bet you money.

DR. VENOHR: It is a tax credit, so it is -- just to clarify that.

MS. DAVIS: Judge Stephens, would you like to comment? I see a picture, but she may have stepped away from the screen.

Well, it's something that maybe we need to address again just as a reminder next week if you include that information again -- and not next week, next month, and which will be -- by then there may be some legislation that's clarified whether it's
going to go forward or whether it's just going to be for six months. Certainly it's something we can keep an eye on.

HON. PALMER: Yeah.
MS. DAVIS: Go ahead. I am sorry. Any last comments? We do need to open it up for our public. We didn't have many that suggested they wanted to speak. But just I think some more have come on.

Any other comments before we ask the public, see if they want to speak? (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Bob, would you call the roll of the public again and see if anybody has changed their mind about whether they would like to speak?

MR. MADDOX: Sure. Cliff Smith, did you want to say anything?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Tiffany Gates? I don't think she is on.
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Lisa Clark?

MS. CLARK: No, thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Lee Wood, did you want to say anything?

MS. WOOD: No, thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Judge Stephens, would you like to say anything before we leave?

HON. STEPHENS: I'm just glad to be here and know about what you all are doing. Thank you.

MR. MADDOX: Thanks for joining us today. We are glad to have you. That's it, Penny.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I see Vicki Porter, but I don't think she ever joined us.

MR. MADDOX: Oh, yeah. Vicki Porter. I'm sorry. Yes.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. So, we have no public comments. So, we still have a couple of more minutes if anybody has any more questions or comments regarding Julie's point about the taxes or
if any other questions that you would like to direct. I believe Dr. Venohr's picture has disappeared, but I think she is still here if anybody has any --

MR. MADDOX: Before you leave, Penny, I found the provision on the retroactive support limited to a period of two years. It's in the Uniform Parentage Act 26-17-636(h).

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. I thought it was in the Parentage Act.

MR. MADDOX: And it does except the provisions of the retroactive support in Title 30, Chapter 3, which begins I think at 30-3-110, and I don't believe those provisions have a two-year limitation, if I read them correctly.

MS. DAVIS: It's always helpful
to have Bob who knows so much. He is a wealth of information for all of us.

MR. MADDOX: Plus I have a phone right now for me to look it up.

MS. DAVIS: That does help. You
didn't have to confess to that, Bob, but we appreciate it. Most of us also had a phone who didn't look it up.

All right. Any other comments or questions you would like Dr. Venohr to address at our next meeting?
(No response).

MS. DAVIS: All right. Our next meeting is scheduled for May 21st. It will be Zoom again. It's a Friday, the same time. We will start at 10:00. And we do appreciate everyone's time. And we will continue probably to be making some decisions.

So, particularly we would encourage the Committee members to participate so we can have a quorum to vote.

All right. Unless you have anything else, Bob, then that will be all I guess.

MR. MADDOX: All right. Thank you-all for joining.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

MR. MADDOX: Have a good weekend. MS. DAVIS: Thank you.
(Conclusion of Advisory Committee Meeting at 12:20 P.M.)
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after [4] 6/12 32/7 32/18 100/7
after-tax [1] 32/7 again [25] 5/10
5/15 5/23 12/17
18/19 23/5 29/10
31/13 42/16 48/3
51/18 52/3 55/8
70/6 73/22 75/10
80/19 86/13 89/3
102/9 112/4 118/19
118/21 119/14
122/10
age [1] 54/20
Agency [2] 17/11 17/14
agenda [1] 13/9 ago [1] 6/22
agree [2] 89/15
101/1
ahead [13] 34/4
46/15 56/23 64/2
92/2 93/19 94/2
97/2 100/14 106/23

107/2 112/22 119/5 ALABAMA [48]
1/3 1/18 1/19 2/7
2/7 2/10 2/12 2/12
2/15 2/17 2/18 2/20
2/22 3/2 3/3 3/5 3/8
3/8 3/10 3/13 3/15
3/16 3/18 3/18
17/12 21/3 23/19
24/21 26/10 28/1
28/3 38/3 38/11
38/19 42/10 55/5
55/8 61/12 72/16
75/15 81/23 83/21
96/6 97/6 124/2
124/5 124/8 125/1
Alabama's [1] 53/1
Alacourt.gov [1]
13/10
ALECS [6] 17/10 18/5 18/14 19/16 48/6 78/11
algorithm [3] 31/9 31/10 31/11
all [60] 6/12 10/11 11/17 11/18 12/21
13/8 13/20 14/14 14/19 14/21 14/22 15/7 17/9 18/6
21/21 23/6 25/10
33/8 40/21 43/6
45/14 45/14 53/8

| A | 91/16 99/8 122/2 | 112/16 114/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| all... [37] 53/23 | alternative [1] | 6/10 116/12 |
| 62/13 68/6 75/20 | 108/4 | 116/15 118/8 119/5 |
| 82/4 85/16 86/8 | although [1] 77/10 | 124/16 124/18 |
| 89/16 93/15 94/2 | always [8] 6/23 | 124/20 124/23 |
| 100/12 103/2 103/6 | 18/15 27/9 36/16 | AMANDA [6] 2/11 |
| 103/9 105/3 105/9 | 49/19 72/22 91/7 | 7/17 78/5 95/15 |
| 107/3 107/4 107/11 | 121/18 | 106/15 111/1 |
| 107/14 107/18 | am [79] 5/15 8 | amendment |
| 108/1 108/11 | 9/7 9/15 10/2 10/17 | 92/6 |
| 108/17 112/6 | 15/21 16/17 20/22 | America [1] 114/6 |
| 116/17 117/13 | 22/20 27/22 28/20 | American [2] 26/1 |
| 117/16 120/9 | 34/12 34/13 34/13 | 114/7 |
| 121/20 122/4 122/8 | 38/16 42/11 44/8 | among [3] 21/17 |
| 122/18 122/19 | 45/8 45/23 46/1 | 46/3 48/6 |
| 122/21 122/22 | 48/3 51/23 53/13 | amount [46] 20/9 |
| 124/21 | 54/17 58/19 60/2 | 21/19 26/9 29/6 |
| allowances [1] | 61/4 65/20 65/21 | 32/11 35/22 36/3 |
| 37/22 | 67/1 67/3 67/4 67/5 | 36/21 37/8 39/9 |
| allowed [1] 13/2 | 68/5 69/3 71/20 | 39/23 42/17 44/11 |
| allows [1] 70/15 | 72/1 75/22 76/23 | 44/13 44/18 50/20 |
| almost [1] 45/13 | 79/20 80/10 80/16 | 56/5 59/13 60/11 |
| already [9] 40/15 | 80/21 81/20 81/22 | 60/13 60/20 60/21 |
| 42/3 54/18 62/18 | 82/5 86/4 91/9 | 64/6 64/23 65/23 |
| 99/10 100/6 102/16 | 91/13 97/21 98/1 | 72/12 76/14 83/15 |
| 105/16 116/18 | 98/11 100/8 101/7 | 83/18 84/21 84/23 |
| also [20] 6/14 12/9 | 102/4 103/14 | 86/18 86/20 86/21 |
| 13/6 15/20 17/23 | 104/13 104/17 | 87/9 96/15 99/9 |
| 22/11 34/6 34/7 | 107/10 108/3 109/4 | 100/6 101/6 105/21 |
| 35/3 37/20 44/4 | 110/1 110/12 | 106/2 106/5 108/7 |
| 47/20 49/17 51/5 | 110/15 111/3 | 109/3 112/9 116/3 |
| 51/9 57/10 59/1 | 111/10 111/12 | amounts [12] 32/19 |


| A | 67/3 67/17 73/11 | APPEARANCES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| amounts... [11] | 78 | [3] 1/22 3/11 3/19 |
| 35/2 38/21 38/23 | 91/18 92/20 93/21 | application [1] |
| 43/11 46/22 56/8 | 95/13 100/14 101/1 | 69/10 |
| 57/22 64/18 65/10 | 103/1 105/5 108/18 | applied [12] 23/17 |
| 65/11 72/5 | 109/19 111/18 | 31/15 43/16 58/8 |
| analogy [1] 112/6 | 119/6 119/10 | 58/13 58/18 70/4 |
| analyzed [1] 21/15 | 120/22 121/1 121/4 | 82/3 82/10 88/16 |
| Analyzing [1] | 122/4 124/17 | 92/10 92/14 |
| 17/21 | anybody [15] 15/1 | applies [4] 34/16 |
| ANGELA [13] 2/13 | 38/9 46/15 46/18 | 34/23 61/2 69/21 |
| 7/19 14/11 14/13 | 78/3 78/6 89/16 | apply [10] 24/13 |
| 45/2 52/2 80/19 | 106/13 106/21 | 34/18 61/9 62/23 |
| 87/2 89/2 94/13 | 107/11 108/14 | 69/23 73/15 78/15 |
| 101/22 104/12 | 111/17 119/15 | 85/22 88/5 93/2 |
| 107/9 | 120/22 121/4 | appreciate [9] 5/4 |
| annual [1] 72/5 | anybody has [1] | 9/9 11/20 13/19 |
| anomalies [1] 91/2 | 121/4 | 35/1 36/10 103/8 |
| another [3] 39/19 | anyone [5] 14/2 | 122/2 122/12 |
| 93/17 112/4 | 94/19 95/13 106/1 | appreciative [1] |
| answer [1] 48/4 | 23 | 17/16 |
| answered [1] 78/7 | anything [7] 49/8 | approach [1] 96/ |
| answering [1] | 105/5 106/4 119/18 | appropriate [2] <br> 38/23 39/9 |
| 116/10 | 120/3 120/6 122/19 <br> anyway [5] 8/7 | 38/23 39/9 <br> approval [3] 13/23 |
| anticipate [1] 101/7 | 17/20 40/14 57/4 | approval [3] 13/23 $14 / 614 / 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { any }[44] \quad 10 / 20 \\ & 13 / 1414 / 2 \quad 16 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 101/1 | 14/6 14/8 approve [2] 20/16 |
| 16/19 20/3 20/18 | apartment [3] 38/3 | 67/13 |
| 22/7 22/21 28/16 | 38/8 38/11 | approved [1] 15/6 |
| 31/2 33/12 39/1 | apologize [1] 47/22 | approves [1] 44/3 |
| 42/12 44/22 46/15 | Appeals [1] 2/12 | approximately [1] |
| 47/1 48/9 49/9 52/1 | APPEARANCE [1] $4 / 5$ | 24/19 |


| A | article [2] 113/13 | Associate [1] 3/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| APRIL [6] 1/4 1/20 | 114/3 | associated [1] |
| 13/5 13/7 15/17 | as [60] 5/6 5/10 | 115/19 |
| 124/12 | 6/16 11/21 17/9 | assume [1] 24/4 |
| April 15th [2] 13/5 | 18/11 19/8 20/17 | assuming [3] 18/9 |
| 15/17 | 22/4 22/5 22/10 | 54/20 83/16 |
| April 21st [1] 13/7 | 24/10 25/18 25/21 | attached [1] 18/14 |
| are [167] | 25/23 27/21 30/12 | attention [2] 47/19 |
| area [1] 91/20 | 32/21 36/15 37/14 | 87/6 |
| arguing [1] 116/14 | 39/4 39/23 39/ | attorney [10] 2/9 |
| Arizona [10] 20/13 | 40/15 40/17 46/12 | 2/11 2/17 2/19 2/21 |
| 57/16 69/8 69/20 | 47/5 48/18 48/21 | 3/10 3/15 3/17 |
| 70/1 70/10 70/23 | 50/15 50/16 56/1 | 53/14 124/17 |
| 71/4 71/11 76/10 | 61/23 65/20 65/20 | Attorney's [1] 3/4 |
| Arizona's [1] 69/5 | 70/16 73/16 75/10 | attorneys [1] 67/16 |
| Arnold [1] 9/17 | 80/2 80/6 83/20 | Aubrey [1] 7/6 |
| around [3] 67/4 | 87/11 89/23 89/23 | audio [1] 8/8 |
| 89/5 96/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90/23 90/23 96/22 } \\ & \text { 97/5 98/6 98/8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { authorized [1] } \\ & 27 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| arrearage [5] 47/20 |  | 27/18 |
| 48/1 56/12 56/12 | 102/1 104/4 106/13 | authorizing [2] |
| 116/16 | 109/21 113/12 | 12/11 12/11 |
| arrears [28] 17/3 | 115/12 117/9 | automated [1] |
| 21/2 21/3 21/6 21/7 | 118/19 125/1 125/2 | 17/18 |
| 21/13 21/16 21/17 | aside [1] 70/9 | available [4] 24/11 |
| 21/18 22/1 22/12 | ask [5] 6/13 13/22 | 32/7 83/19 84/23 |
| 22/18 39/3 39/5 | 34/4 88/22 119/10 | average [5] 21/4 |
| 39/12 39/16 39/23 | asked [1] 82/6 | 21/17 22/1 38/11 |
| 41/18 42/4 48/21 | asking [4] 99/6 | 39/17 |
| 51/11 51/14 51/15 | 100/12 110/1 110/3 | away [1] 118/17 |
| 52/4 52/7 52/17 | assets [1] 117/19 | B |
| 55/5 56/6 | assign [1] 12/1 | B. 2 [1] 30/3 |
| arrow [1] 74/20 | assistant [1] 48/13 | B.2.A [2] 30/5 |

B.2.A... [1] 44/10 B. 3 [1] 30/6
back [28] 9/4 20/19 20/22 22/13 22/15
22/15 22/18 22/22 48/3 52/10 52/13
52/15 53/6 53/6
53/8 53/21 54/8
54/9 54/20 54/22
55/19 61/13 75/7
77/18 89/20 92/5
93/5 112/11
backwards [1] 60/3 bad [1] 56/7
balance [1] 35/8 BALDWIN [3] 3/4 9/11 100/21
bank [4] 113/9
113/20 115/1 116/7 bar [2] 29/6 102/22 barometer [1] 22/4 based [15] 30/20 37/15 37/22 38/18 66/12 78/11 92/8 95/12 96/21 99/7 101/4 101/12 103/15 104/3 109/2 basic [1] 61/22 basically [9] 30/22 39/22 83/15 84/4 102/5 109/13

110/14 112/7 112/9 bedroom [1] 38/2 basis [2] 47/7 53/18 been [16] 18/8 20/5 battery [1] 46/1 battling [1] 91/10 be [149]
beans [1] 37/18 bearing [1] 96/21 because [68] 16/9
16/20 18/4 18/13
20/11 21/9 21/10
24/9 24/15 25/2
25/22 27/3 27/22
33/2 34/3 34/16
35/3 37/7 41/16
43/7 43/15 44/18
44/19 45/5 48/19
52/8 52/12 55/11
56/8 59/6 59/23
60/7 61/3 61/22
64/23 65/23 66/9
67/4 70/7 71/17
76/21 80/11 80/11
80/15 81/20 82/19
84/1 84/3 84/14
84/20 85/12 86/1
88/11 89/6 97/4
97/10 98/1 98/15 99/6 100/5 101/5 110/16 112/8
114/13 116/1 116/9
117/6 117/22
becomes [1] 34/12

20/7 21/21 23/5
27/12 33/15 47/11
47/12 53/18 56/13
75/3 77/10 86/10
117/14 118/1
before [24] 1/16
5/18 20/19 22/21
27/21 28/16 29/18
33/11 35/16 46/4
56/12 62/23 63/18
64/4 89/22 91/19
94/16 105/6 114/15
114/21 119/10
120/7 121/5 124/8
begin [1] 118/1
beginning [2] 69/5 97/14
begins [1] 121/14 behalf [2] 82/19 117/19
being [10] 24/4 29/19 42/4 51/10
54/21 61/4 83/20 88/4 112/17 116/5 believe [8] $6 / 21$
12/14 53/16 54/3
54/10 113/10 121/2 121/15
below [6] 34/17
34/18 36/4 61/10
below... [2] 72/4 125/3
benefit [10] 15/22 31/14 37/22 51/21 81/4 87/17 87/19 87/23 88/1 96/21 benefits [1] 37/14 bet [2] 118/11
118/12
Betson [3] 30/15 30/17 32/22
Betson-Rothbarth
[3] 30/15 30/17
32/22
better [4] 33/2 33/3 50/14 90/5
between [11] 29/22 30/10 35/8 48/14
50/9 51/6 65/16
70/22 74/15 91/7
103/3
Biden [2] 26/5
115/6
big [5] 19/6 19/7
28/3 42/16 45/8
biggest [1] 38/9
bill [2] 26/1 26/5
bills [1] 22/7
Birmingham [1]
3/10
birth [2] 22/14 53/9
bit [12] 18/4 21/8 21/13 26/18 35/13 38/6 45/6 46/2 46/4
73/21 90/22 110/16 black [2] 29/7 29/8
BLACKBURN [2] 3/14 10/7
blood [1] 40/8
Board [1] 125/1
BOB [19] 3/17 6/11
8/17 9/7 11/20
11/22 12/17 13/14
13/21 43/19 43/20
83/4 84/13 85/3
117/17 119/13
121/19 122/1
122/19
Boggs [6] 1/17 3/12 brief [1] 61/7
3/13 5/10 124/4
125/9
bold [1] 70/9
bombshell [2]
112/22 113/1
born [1] 54/6
both [27] 15/17
22/14 23/17 24/11
27/19 28/23 29/3
31/15 52/20 59/19
60/5 60/19 62/5
62/8 68/3 77/15
81/3 81/8 82/3
82/10 82/23 83/3

84/9 85/11 85/13 88/17 118/9
bottom [4] 25/16 69/16 73/3 84/14
BR5 [3] 20/17 33/8
33/12
Brady [4] 5/12
46/14 77/19 93/5
break [2] 48/11
98/15
break-even [1]
98/15
breaking [1] 60/16 breaks [1] 41/11
BRIAN [6] 3/6 9/14
39/4 89/18 110/9
112/3
bring [1] 57/21
bringing [1] 91/22
broken [1] 48/2
brought [1] 88/23
budget [3] 26/20
37/21 37/23
budgets [2] 37/12
37/13
built [3] 33/19
64/19 92/12
bump [1] 36/20
bumps [1] 36/21
bunch [4] 46/14
63/22 77/19 93/6

| B | came [2] 47/23 | 26/22 27/4 27/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| burden [3] 22/5 | 74/11 | 42/6 54/8 74/23 |
| 36/17 89/7 | CAMPBELL [11] | 85/20 86/22 105/15 |
| Burks [1] 7/13 | 2/13 7/20 14/12 | 112/16 114/15 |
| BUSH [3] 2/16 8/3 | 45/2 52/3 80/19 | cancel [1] 95/19 |
| 49/18 | 87/3 94/14 101/23 | cannot [1] 87/16 |
| business [1] 41/22 | 104/13 107/10 | cap [4] 20/8 20/8 |
| buy [2] 39/20 40/1 | can [69] 5/11 6/18 | 20/9 20/14 |
| C |  | capture [1] 56/ |
| calculate [6] 65/3 | 22/12 22/13 22/18 | car [1] 41/11 |
| 66/12 79/9 82/15 | 23/7 23/8 23/9 23/9 | care [2] 62/6 97/8 |
| 111/5 111/9 | 23/17 24/3 28/6 | carries [2] 85/16 |
| calculated [3] 83/8 | 29/12 31/15 32/1 | 95/4 |
| 117/6 117/7 | 32/9 35/21 39/20 | case [32] 16/5 17/21 |
| calculation [11] | 40/1 40/8 41/20 | 28/17 29/2 29/2 |
| 18/9 18/18 22/3 | 42/18 48/4 52/10 | 29/3 29/4 32/1 32/2 |
| 59/9 61/9 62/16 | 53/6 53/8 53/10 | 32/8 33/7 33/7 33/7 |
| 63/7 63/10 64/12 | 53/17 53/23 54/8 | 33/7 33/11 36/1 |
| 64/15 84/6 | 58/23 61/8 63/22 | 36/4 43/2 43/3 |
| calculations [8] | 64/1 64/3 69/23 | 43/11 48/20 59/9 |
| 60/7 60/19 62/5 | 73/10 73/14 77/18 | 60/15 60/18 70/2 |
| 62/8 68/3 83/12 | 82/2 82/20 84/13 | 71/3 71/14 78/11 |
| 90/7 90/23 | 84/15 85/3 85/4 | 78/19 85/13 86/1 |
| calculator [2] 18/14 | 86/12 95/17 101/18 | 102/14 |
| 101/20 | 102/2 103/18 | caseload [1] 18/20 |
| calendar [2] 18/7 | 103/20 105/22 | cases [13] 18/2 18/5 |
| 116/9 | 108/18 111/19 | 18/6 18/23 19/15 |
| call [8] 6/11 6/11 | 115/18 115/23 | 19/17 21/21 28/22 |
| 6/16 11/20 31/9 | 116/22 117/12 | 48/6 50/17 55/18 |
| 103/14 116/22 | 118/9 119/3 122/17 | 78/8 102/18 |
| 119/14 | can't [12] 17/13 | cash [4] 48/1 |

## C

cash... [3] 113/20 114/17 114/20
categories [1] 19/16 categorize [1]

## 77/17

category [1] 19/18 cause [1] 33/6 CCR [1] 125/9
Center [1] 2/3
Central [1] 3/15 cents [1] 6/6
certain [1] 101/6 certainly [5] 42/18 60/18 82/20 91/1 119/2
CERTIFICATE [1] 124/1
Certified [4] 1/17
124/4 125/2 125/10 certify [3] 124/6 124/16 124/23
Chair [3] 2/6 15/13 23/9
chance [1] 12/1 chances [1] 75/19 change [7] 10/15 54/15 70/15 75/2 78/17 97/22 98/8 changed [5] 31/4 52/9 52/21 55/13 119/15
changes [12] 14/2 22/11 28/7 28/8 28/12 28/15 31/3 38/22 70/16 90/2 97/23 98/8 changing [1] 70/17 Chapter [1] 121/14 charged [1] 124/21 charging [1] 57/1 chart [1] 26/15 charts [1] 58/22 checks [3] 56/14 113/8 116/19 child [75] 1/2 1/15 2/14 2/17 3/2 3/5 5/3 13/10 13/11 19/9 19/13 19/22 22/14 22/17 24/13 25/11 28/21 34/10 35/15 35/17 35/18 43/12 44/6 44/8 44/10 47/7 50/15 51/3 51/7 51/9
51/21 51/22 52/6 53/8 54/6 54/19
55/19 61/17 64/7 64/23 65/2 65/16 65/18 65/18 65/23 67/6 74/20 94/5
96/12 100/2 102/11 102/15 102/16 102/16 102/17

106/3 106/9 106/18 107/16 108/5 108/9 108/10 109/16
109/17 113/4 113/6
113/10 113/21
114/8 114/13
115/21 116/15
117/8 117/20 124/9 child's [1] 53/9 children [56] 19/14 19/14 35/10 40/7 43/12 43/16 44/5 44/6 44/13 44/19 44/19 45/7 47/9 57/5 57/9 57/20
58/21 59/14 59/22
61/18 61/18 61/19
61/20 61/20 62/1
63/6 64/17 64/19
65/12 65/15 66/13
76/13 88/14 89/8
95/10 95/12 96/11
96/15 96/22 101/5
101/7 101/13 102/7
102/12 102/21
102/22 103/16
104/4 104/5 105/11
106/18 107/17
107/17 109/2
115/21 117/20
choose [1] 45/15
Civil [1] 2/12

| C | collected [2] 21/6 | 67/6 67/16 125/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| claim [1] 115/21 | 5 | Commissioner [2] |
| claims [1] 115/22 | College [1] 3/7 | 1/18 124/5 |
| clarification [3] | Colorado [1] 2/4 | committed [1] 26/6 |
| 13/19 16/13 36/11 | column [2] 85 | committee [33] 1/1 |
| clarified [1] 118/23 | 85/15 | 1/15 2/5 5/3 5/6 5/6 |
| clarify [8] 23/9 | combined [3] 19/11 | 6/1 14/16 20/2 23/4 |
| 23/10 30/9 50/6 | 20/1 73/17 | 28/4 30/10 44/2 50/3 57/11 79/15 |
| 66/14 68/22 93/1 | come [9] 9/4 11/21 | 50/3 57/11 79/15 |
| 118/14 | 56/16 56/20 83/18 | 85/8 86/11 90/20 |
| CLARK [3] 4/3 | 105/20 108/18 | 90/21 91/14 91/19 |
| 11/2 119/23 | 118/12 119/9 | 94/7 94/11 98/2 |
| class [1] 87/7 | comes [2] 59/10 | 103/9 104/7 122/16 |
| clean [1] 89/23 | $84 / 22$ | 123/6 124/9 124/14 |
| clear [5] 23/20 | coming [1] 116/23 <br> command [1] 43/21 | 124/18 124/19 <br> common [3] 78/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50/12 90/6 102/6 } \\ & 102 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | command [1] 43/21 commencing [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { common [3] 78/16 } \\ & 108 / 8108 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| Clerk's [1] 13/4 | 1/20 | commonly [1] |
| Cliff [2] 10/19 | comment [9] 39/2 | 37/14 |
| 119/17 | 46/19 89/17 89/19 | comparable [1] |
| CLIFFORD [2] 4/2 | 93/18 93/21 97/4 | 64/8 |
| 10/16 | 110/23 118/16 | comparison [2] |
| close [2] 41/3 75/6 | comments [17] 5/8 | 15/21 49/15 |
| closed [1] 40/23 | 5/22 13/3 42/12 | comparisons [2] |
| closer [2] 37/2 37/3 | 44/22 46/15 52/1 | 25/18 25/19 |
| closes [1] 42/2 | 90/14 91/19 92/5 | competitive [1] |
| cluster [4] 28/23 | 103/11 111/15 | 27/8 |
| 29/7 31/19 43/11 | 119/6 119/10 | compliance [1] |
| clusters [2] 31/21 | 120/20 120/22 | 37/1 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 / 2 1}$ <br> cogitate [1] 90/22 cognizant [1] 35/5 | 122/4 <br> Commerce [1] 3/7 commission [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { complicate [1] } \\ & 101 / 3 \\ & \text { complicated [9] } \end{aligned}$ |


| C | 82/5 | correct [10] 23/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| complicated... [9] | congressional [1] | 23/12 53/17 54/23 55/1 57/14 81/5 |
| 63/7 63/12 66/11 | 26/19 | 55/1 57/14 81/5 98/16 102/4 124/13 |
| 72/3 72/15 73/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { consensus [2] } \\ & 108 / 23112 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | corrections [1] 14/2 |
| 90/9 90/11 96/16 complicating [2] | consequences [1] | correctly [3] 34/13 |
| $63 / 3101 / 1$ | 36/18 | 84/11 121/17 |
| computer [3] 45/23 | consider [4] 60 | correlation [1] 51/6 |
| 56/23 124/13 | 69/12 98/16 106/6 | could [50] 6/22 |
| computer-printed | consideration [1] | 13/6 36/22 38/15 |
| [1] 124/13 | 99/14 | 38/15 44/1 44/4 |
| con [1] 96/15 | considered [1] | 46/16 50/1 53/11 |
| concept [5] 44/23 | 25/14 | 53/21 54/14 54/19 |
| 88/23 89/13 89/22 | considering [2] | 56/13 57/14 58/3 |
| 90/19 | 29/5 62/19 | 58/4 60/12 60/18 |
| concern [8] 33/16 | consistent [4] 29/14 | 60/22 61/1 65/9 |
| 35/2 47/15 52/4 | 41/14 96/19 96/23 | 65/12 68/7 72/2 |
| 59/6 85/7 86/9 | contact [1] 51/7 | 74/19 75/2 80/2 |
| 100/5 | contain [1] 124/13 | 80/4 80/5 81/14 |
| concerned [2] 19/4 | contains [2] 15/18 | 81/16 81/19 82/7 |
| 91/14 | 15/20 | 83/13 84/15 85/17 |
| concerns [1] 103/21 | continue [4] 15/10 | 88/16 97/6 97/18 |
| Conclusion [1] | 16/23 101/6 122/13 | 97/19 97/22 99/19 |
| 123/5 | contract [1] 66/5 | 106/7 106/11 |
| concrete [1] 77/1 | contrast [1] 100/22 | 108/22 109/7 111/2 |
| conference [1] | conversation [1] | 1/7 117/21 |
| 12/12 | 1/1 | couldn't [1] 54/21 |
| confess [1] 122/1 | convinced [1] | counsel [1] 124 |
| confirm [2] 76/8 | convolute [1] 85 | county [5] 2/9 2/14 |
| 14 | copy [1] 77/21 | 46/10 52/12 124/3 |
| confuse [1] 80/1 | cord [1] 46/3 <br> core [2] 15/19 16/8 | couple [6] 46/5 <br> 55/19 69/3 108/19 |


| C | 118/5 | $8 / 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| couple... [2] 115/20 | crudely [1] 50/8 | [9] |
| 20/21 | CS [2] 79/4 79/8 | 18/11 49/20 52/1 |
| course [4] 13/2 47/5 | CS-42 [2] 79/4 79/8 | 52/15 53/7 53/9 |
| 83/22 91/20 | Culverhouse [1] | 54/ |
| court [23] 1/17 2/12 |  | dated [1] 15/17 |
| 3/12 3/15 5/2 5/10 | cumbersome [4] | dates [1] 21/10 |
| 12/11 13/3 15/16 | 16/10 44/16 62/15 | DAVIS [4] 2/6 7/1 |
| 28/7 44/3 46/10 | 85/7 | 15/14 23/9 |
| 69/12 69/23 79/15 | curious [1] 100/17 | day [3] 47/7 47/7 |
| 2 102/11 | current [2] 25/23 | 125/4 |
| 118/10 118/10 | 83/23 | days [2] 6/22 112/5 |
| 124/4 125/1 125/2 | currently [3] 31/2 | deal [3] 74/4 101/18 |
| 125/10 | 33/19 90/12 | 115/13 |
| courts [4] 3/18 | custodial [9] 35/10 | dealing [1] 17/15 |
| 12/23 68/20 117/5 | 47/8 57/18 62/19 | Dean [1] 3/7 |
| COVID [1] 42/1 | 85/10 87/8 89/6 | December [3] |
| COX [7] 2/11 7/17 | 91/15 92/11 | 113/4 113/12 |
| 78/5 95/15 106/15 | custody [2] 69/14 | decide [3] 34/6 |
| 107/6 111/1 |  | /15 83/10 |
| CPR [1] 74/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { customary [1] } \\ & \mathbf{1 2 4 / 2 2} \end{aligned}$ | decided [1] 65/22 decides [1] 44/2 |
| credit [10] 102/17 | D | decision [3] 41/4 |
| 113/5 113/18 114/8 | Da | /1 82/13 |
| 13 114/22 | dark [1] 29/7 | cisions [1] |
| 14 117/8 | data [21] 17/17 |  |
| 23 118/13 | 17/22 19/5 20/6 | decline [2] 32/23 |
| ts [1] 115/18 | 621/7 |  |
| crisis [1] 41/10 | /13 33/2 | crease [4] 33/7 |
| criteria [2] 115/13 | 33/3 35/19 40/5 |  |
| 115/17 criterio | 40/13 41/7 45/22 | $59 / 2$ |

D
decreasing [2] 34/9 38/21
deep [2] 39/12
39/23
Defendant [1]

## 77/16

defining [1] 19/7 definitely [4] 97/9
97/15 111/21
117/12
deliberations [1]
112/18
delicate [1] 35/8
Denver [1] 2/4
Department [4]
2/14 2/17 3/2 49/7
depending [3] 57/8
76/11 95/22
depends [1] 75/20
designated [1]
30/12
detailed [1] 18/16 determine [2] 37/14 100/7 determined [1] 34/1
developed [1] 86/7 developed by [1] 86/7
deviation [9] 17/22 80/7 80/8 82/14

115/12 115/13
115/16 117/18 118/5
did [28] 13/14 16/8
17/17 20/13 24/4
25/10 26/11 26/16
43/17 47/4 49/14
63/18 66/22 67/10
67/11 67/13 67/22
68/1 70/2 74/7 77/5
79/15 80/1 99/13
106/8 114/7 119/18
120/3
didn't [16] 13/18
20/11 34/3 41/2
41/5 48/11 48/16
67/17 69/1 69/9
104/19 108/2
109/11 119/7 122/1
122/3
diet [2] 37/16 37/18
difference [20]
15/19 29/11 29/16
29/22 30/10 34/12
42/21 43/5 43/8
48/16 67/1 67/20
70/20 70/21 74/15
76/20 99/22 99/23
109/23 114/21
differences [1] 34/8
different [12] 10/13 divide [1] 115/18
21/8 43/15 48/14

57/8 63/5 66/10

## 72/13 83/23 95/11

102/13 109/1
differing [1] 46/21
differs [1] 65/1
difficult [1] 83/21
direct [2] 105/20
121/2
direction [3] 85/2 109/6 110/4
directions [2] 77/9 112/16
directly [1] 116/6
Director [1] 3/1
disagree [1] 101/14
disappeared [1] 121/3
discretion [2] 79/14
117/10
discretionary [8]
53/4 57/12 57/23
59/3 69/11 70/1
70/6 80/5
discuss [1] 15/21
discussed [1] 40/15
discussing [1] 17/1
discussion [5]
15/10 17/3 78/3
93/7 93/11
District [1] 3/4
Division [4] 3/2 3/5

## D

Division... [2] 3/17 46/11
divorcing [1]
115/20
do [94] 5/17 6/10 8/5 14/5 15/2 16/22 17/12 20/14 24/14 27/23 28/2 28/11 33/15 36/14 44/7 45/5 45/9 45/10 45/10 49/7 50/5 56/16 56/18 56/21 58/3 59/7 59/8 59/8 60/6 60/8 60/14 60/15 60/17 60/18 60/19 62/5 62/8 63/10 63/23 65/4 68/3 69/2 69/4 69/14 71/1 71/5
71/5 71/14 72/15
72/21 73/11 74/19
76/9 76/18 77/4
77/6 77/22 77/22
80/3 80/14 80/23
81/3 81/7 81/22 83/12 83/17 84/21 86/5 86/6 86/14 86/17 86/22 88/13 89/5 90/18 93/5 96/22 98/2 102/1 102/8 102/13

102/18 102/18
106/4 106/7 106/11 109/21 111/11
111/12 113/1 115/6 Don [1] 7/1
119/6 122/11 124/6 don't [65] 10/20 doctor [1] 105/2 document [3] 16/11 43/18 58/6 documents [1] 13/9 does [20] 23/23
26/10 36/20 40/4 49/11 53/17 56/5 61/16 73/13 76/17
78/6 81/23 87/18 95/13 101/14 106/1 106/13 117/10 121/12 121/23 doesn't [18] 12/4 16/6 19/17 28/7 31/20 52/13 58/12 58/17 70/23 71/4 71/11 71/13 75/18 78/18 82/11 86/1 90/10 108/18 doing [9] 11/20 20/3 25/20 25/22 46/7 63/9 63/18 91/12 120/10 dollar [5] 24/13 25/1 25/5 33/22 100/1
dollars [3] 6/5 6/7

## $34 / 2$

domestic [2] 46/10

## 50/17

16/18 16/20 21/23
24/12 24/14 25/1
30/19 34/19 40/6 40/19 41/9 43/15 43/18 46/3 46/13 48/21 49/5 51/5
52/17 52/23 52/23
53/23 55/4 57/20
58/9 58/12 58/16
60/17 60/21 62/4
63/10 65/6 66/22
67/2 68/18 73/10
73/11 75/8 75/11
75/15 76/17 77/20
78/23 80/3 82/16
82/18 83/11 83/20
85/20 85/22 89/4
89/19 96/20 99/2
103/2 106/5 107/1
112/8 115/16
116/21 117/22
119/21 120/15
121/15
done [11] 49/18
50/2 65/19 68/19 68/21 77/23 79/5
83/13 92/10 102/14


| E |  | 96/12 99/19 106/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| encourage... [1] | blishment [ | 106/8 106/10 |
| 122/16 | 21/16 | 106/12 |
| end [8] 10/19 11/5 | 26/20 32/19 37/17 | examples [9] |
| 19/23 32/23 33/17 | 38/20 41/2 50/6 | 28/17 58/19 67/2 |
| 56/19 58/5 | 8/7 65/2 69/21 | 68/7 103/19 105/21 |
| ENFORCE | 70/23 75/11 | 108/23 112/14 |
| [5] 1/2 1/16 3/2 5/4 | 86/2 98/15 110 | except [1] 121/12 |
| 124/10 | 118/9 | excuse [3] 19/12 |
|  | ever [2] | 30/8 64/3 |
| enlighten [1] 111/7 | 120/15 | exercise [1] |
| enough [8] 17/14 | every [15] 24/12 | existing [8] 20/10 |
| 41/9 42/7 86/2 | 25/1 25/5 25/8 | 29/5 29/6 30/11 |
| 102/3 102/8 112/10 | 28/13 59/9 60/1 | 32/10 74/8 83/21 |
| 10 | 60/18 60/23 70/2 | 84/2 |
| entire [1] 96/5 | 73/8 73/9 91/9 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { E x p }}$ [1] 125/10 |
| environment [1] | 115 | expect [1] 99/7 |
|  | everybody [6] | expense [1] 38/9 |
| equal [1] 85 | 10/13 15/14 23/2 | expensive [1] 44 |
| equal-income [1] | 112/1 | perience [1] |
| 85/13 | everyone [1] 6/1 | 58/16 |
| equally [4] 83/1 | everyone's [1] | expires [1] 125/11 |
| 83/2 84/10 88/17 | 12 | explain [3] 44/16 |
| equivalent [4] 37/9 | Everything [1] 79 | 1 68/18 |
| $65 / 1465 / 1573 / 5$ <br> especially [1] | evidenced [1] 125/2 <br> evolution [1] 49/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explained [2] } \\ & 115 / 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| /23 | exactly [3] 43/13 | explanation [1] |
| Esquire [8] 2/11 | 55/2 88/2 | 68/14 |
| 2/16 2/19 2/21 3/4 | example [15] 6/4 | expressed [1] 33/1 |
| 3/9 3/14 3/17 | 59/11 60/9 64/9 64/16 81/20 90/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extend [2] 113/14 } \\ & 114 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |


| E | 107/10 107/18 | 39/8 42/22 59/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| extended [2] 117/1 | 108/2 108/1 | 59/22 |
| 117/3 | 108/15 108/20 | figures [1] 46/23 |
| extra [4] 3 | 109/18 | file [3] 17/22 70/2 |
| 83/12 116/17 | favoring [5] 23/4 | 78/11 |
| extreme [1] 60/9 | 23/21 35/13 57/11 | filed [1] 54/21 |
| eye [1] 119/3 | 58/3 | filing [6] 22/16 |
| EZ [1] 90/9 | February [1] 49/14 | 52/14 52/15 53/7 |
| F | federal [32] 17/13 | 54/5 54/9 |
|  | 17/21 23/18 24/21 | financially [1] |
| face [1] 28/1 | 25/23 26/6 26/9 | 124/20 |
| fact [3] 39/15 52/20 | 27/10 35/4 35/12 | find [6] 46/2 59/11 |
| 66/5 | 35/20 38/7 38/18 | 81/16 81/18 81/19 |
| factor [1] 23/20 | 38/22 40/11 41/7 | 101/21 |
| fair [2] 31/4 89/9 | 41/17 42/9 47/15 | fine [2] 93/16 |
| fairly [2] 77/23 | 49/8 49/10 49/15 | 104/21 |
| 83/13 | 49/23 50/12 50/13 | finish [1] 46/4 |
| fall [2] 19/18 36/3 | 51/8 51/18 66/17 | finished [2] 105/2 |
| families [2] 26/23 | 72/11 73/5 73/9 | 113/2 |
| 27/2 | 96/6 | firmer [1] 77/9 |
| Family [1] 46/10 | feds [5] 28/2 45/19 | first [10] 21/1 28/22 |
| far [6] 22/5 22/18 | 78/17 97/22 98/8 | 29/6 31/19 35/9 |
| 52/10 53/6 65/20 | feel [4] 42/9 44/17 | 43/10 75/3 78/3 |
| 77/10 | 61/3 80/10 | 85/9 93/3 |
| father [1] 115/22 | fell [1] 19/15 | fit [1] 74/10 |
| favor [26] 14/14 | few [4] 6/22 20/7 | five [8] 6/5 6/6 6/7 |
| 14/22 67/10 76/21 | 26/10 71/13 | 6/8 21/21 58/23 |
| 93/4 93/6 93/9 94/3 | FICA [1] 96/6 | 61/20 84/2 |
| 94/14 94/16 94/17 | fiddle [1] 46/2 | flat [1] 104/18 |
| 94/20 104/1 104/11 | fifty [1] 55/18 | flip [1] 79/21 |
| 104/13 105/6 | fight [1] 117/13 | focusing [1] 84/3 |
| 106/22 107/4 107/8 | figure [5] 28/20 | follow [1] 17/6 |


| F | 16/20 30/19 34/3 | gets [5] 58/8 61/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| follow-up [1] 17/6 | 34/20 77/20 82/4 | 75/16 117/1 117/3 |
| following [1] 125/3 | 103/22 104/19 | getting [4] 41/23 |
| food [9] 37/11 | 116/14 | 58/12 113/8 114/23 |
| 37/13 37/15 37/21 | full [8] 24/17 27/18 | give [10] $46 / 5$ 77/9 |
| 37/23 38/2 38/4 | 29/1 37/2 40/14 | 90/21 98/13 98/23 |
| 38/12 40/18 | 70/14 78/14 96/8 | 102/16 103/18 |
| footnote [1] 79/3 | full-time [6] 24/17 | 108/3 108/22 |
| Ford [1] 7/7 | 27/18 29/1 70/14 | 112/16 |
| foregoing [1] | 78/14 96/8 | given [1] 33/17 |
| 124/12 | further [3] 101/3 | gives [2] 47/14 |
| form [4] 70/17 | 124/16 124/23 | 75/23 |
| 83/23 84/4 102/8 | future [2] 28/1 90/3 | giving [1] 5/7 |
| formula [6] 24/22 | G | glad [5] 45/11 |
| 31/1 31/2 58/2 | gander [2] 89/13 | $45 / 1682 / 6120 / 8$ |
| 64/12 77/19 | 89/14 | 120/12 |
| forth [2] 50/18 | Gates [3] 10/23 | glean [1] 18 |
| 79/23 | 10/23 119/20 | go [66] 5/1 |
| fortunate [2] 5/9 | gauging [1] 39/10 | 25/10 25/10 25/18 |
| 17/11 | gave [3] 52/5 77/1 | 27/16 32/15 37/7 |
| forward [2] 105/20 | 96/12 | 27/16 32/15 34/18 45/6 |
| 119/1 | generally [1] 38/10 | $46 / 1446 / 1551 / 11$ |
| found [3] 33/4 | get [24] 9/2 35/9 | 52/13 52/15 53/6 |
| 121/6 125/3 | 35/22 52/10 52/16 | 53/6 53/8 53/21 |
| four [7] 28/11 | 58/17 66/11 71/11 | 54/8 54/8 54/20 |
| 28/13 28/20 54/20 57/6 61/19 65/5 | 75/20 81/4 81/8 | 54/21 56/23 59/2 |
| 57/6 61/19 65/5 <br> four-year [1] 28/11 | 87/6 87/16 87/18 | 64/2 64/4 64/17 |
| four-year [1] 28/11 <br> fourth [1] 59/13 | 87/22 102/13 | 65/22 67/3 73/1 |
| FRIDAY [4] 1/4 | 103/16 103/18 | 75/7 77/9 77/18 |
| 1/20 122/10 124/12 | 105/2 108/2 113/4 | 79/3 79/11 79/17 |
| front [10] 16/16 | 117/11 | 79/19 80/3 80/9 |


| $\mathbf{G}$ | 85/16 93/23 93/23 | 114/21 116/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| go... [22] 82/7 82/17 | 98/11 101/2 101/7 | government [2] |
| 83/11 85/17 92/2 | 103/14 104/17 | 18/20 27/11 |
| 92/5 93/8 93/19 | 108/3 109/4 109/5 | GRAY [10] 3/6 |
| 94/2 97/2 100/2 | 109/20 111/5 111/9 | 9/14 17/8 20/23 |
| 100/14 106/5 | 111/10 111/13 | 39/4 89/19 90/13 |
| 106/23 107/2 108/5 | 112/11 113/7 | 107/20 110/10 |
| 110/5 112/8 112/22 | 113/16 114/19 | 112/4 |
| 115/8 119/1 119/5 | 114/23 115/5 | Gray's [1] 18/22 |
| goal [1] 56/9 | 115/10 116/3 116/6 | great [1] 112/6 |
| goals [1] 56/10 | 116/8 116/14 | greater [3] 26/9 |
| goes [4] 81/13 84/7 | 116/15 117/5 | 72/8 72/9 |
| 85/2 97/13 | 118/11 119/1 119/2 | Greg [1] 8/1 |
| going [88] 10/5 | gone [2] 94/1 | gross [7] 24/7 24/18 |
| 15/8 15/21 16/22 | 116/20 | 32/1 34/23 37/8 |
| 19/1 19/10 19/22 | $\operatorname{good}[26] ~ 4 / 76 / 15$ | 37/8 100/1 |
| 20/22 21/7 22/20 | 9/6 10/14 12/15 | grossed [1] 24/6 |
| 22/22 24/10 24/22 | 15/14 22/4 23/13 | grossly [1] 49/4 |
| 26/17 27/13 27/15 | 33/14 36/23 46/13 | group [1] 19/1 |
| 27/15 27/23 30/23 | 49/19 52/20 66/16 | guess [10] 33/13 |
| 32/12 32/16 32/17 | 82/20 88/11 89/13 | 33/13 33/20 49/5 |
| 33/10 35/22 37/7 | 89/14 97/2 99/13 | 54/17 79/10 93/3 |
| 38/10 41/3 42/11 | 100/13 101/16 | 95/8 96/20 122/20 |
| 44/21 46/2 50/22 | 103/7 110/22 | guest [3] 2/2 4/5 |
| 50/23 51/23 56/8 | 112/12 123/1 | 46/9 |
| 58/19 59/3 62/9 | goose [2] 89/12 | guideline [1] 81/1 |
| 63/6 63/12 65/6 | 89/13 | guidelines [34] 1/2 |
| 65/8 66/11 66/12 | goose-or [1] 89/12 | 1/16 5/4 13/11 |
| 67/1 67/3 69/3 71/9 | got [12] 11/23 49/3 | 17/22 18/9 18/14 |
| 71/20 75/19 75/22 | 54/7 55/13 55/22 | 18/18 22/3 22/17 |
| 76/23 80/15 80/16 | 56/17 77/20 93/15 | 28/5 28/13 47/15 |
| 81/17 85/5 85/11 | 102/12 113/6 | 49/8 49/10 49/16 |


| G | 104/8 107/20 | 60/10 71/7 99/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| guidelines... [18] | happen [6] 19/11 | 121/19 |
| 49/23 53/2 53/12 | 27/15 41/20 59/3 | head [3] 47/11 75/9 |
| 60/23 65/3 66/4 | 90/8 91/3 | 91/10 |
| 67/9 69/9 69/22 | happening [1] | healthy [1] 50/16 |
| 70/23 71/2 71/12 | 63/22 | hear [8] 8/4 11/8 |
| 73/6 73/9 75/4 76/3 | hard [1] 70/2 | 14/5 15/5 53/23 |
| 94/5 124/10 | has [35] 12/1 21/3 | 80/14 109/11 118/9 |
| guidelines' [1] | 23/5 28/1 28/3 | heard [2] 7/16 85/8 |
| 22/10 | 37/12 41/18 46/15 | hearing [8] 18/10 |
| guys [1] 46/3 | 47/9 47/10 47/18 | 23/2 28/19 42/15 |
| H | 56/15 58/21 59 | 98/1 |
| had [18] 9/23 11/18 | 59/21 60/1 60/9 | heartburn [1] 47/1 |
| 13/17 17/2 17/4 | 60/10 62/22 68/16 | heater [1] 114/14 |
| 21/15 29/20 49/18 | 71/7 71/22 75/12 | held [1] 1/16 |
| 56/15 62/21 67/16 | 77/23 89/7 99/22 | hello [1] 102/9 |
| 70/20 95/16 96/10 | 105/15 113/1 | help [7] 5/19 50/1 |
| 100/5 107/15 | 119/15 120/22 | 52/12 68/22 109/7 |
| 117/15 122/2 | 121/3 121/4 | 110/3 121/23 |
| half [5] 22/2 22/6 | haul [1] 50/19 | helped [1] 17/12 |
| 39/17 39/18 47/22 | have [170] | helpful [5] 5/22 6/1 |
| HALL [4] 3/9 10/1 | haven't [3] 66/3 | 77/10 93/17 121/18 |
| 96/17 105/12 | 86/5 112/19 | helping [1] 116/11 |
| hand [8] 56/4 104/6 | having [8] 8/8 22/7 | helps [2] 66/14 90/1 |
| 105/11 105/12 | 51/6 64/11 82/22 | her [18] 7/16 8/4 |
| 107/5 107/6 107/18 | 83/6 94/4 116/7 | 9/3 9/4 10/14 11/10 |
| 108/12 | he [19] 6/21 6/22 | 29/16 29/22 62/20 |
| handful [1] 73/7 | 8/14 8/15 12/1 12/1 | 62/22 89/9 89/9 |
| handouts [1] 49/9 | 21/5 26/6 35/15 | 91/3 106/2 106/10 |
| hands [6] 14/15 | 36/22 37/9 43/21 | 109/5 110/4 110/5 |
| 14/17 94/6 94/8 | 50/23 51/1 59/20 | here [26] 6/18 7/18 |


| H | HON [1] 4/6 | housing [1] 38/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| here... [24] 7/21 | honest [2] 17/19 | how [23] 20/9 |
| 8/17 9/15 10/2 | 35/1 | 21/22 22/11 22/18 |
| 10/17 10/21 11/3 | HONORABLE [12] | 39/11 39/20 40/8 |
| 36/2 43/21 43/21 | 2/8 2/11 6/19 7/1 | 47/20 47/23 52/6 |
| 64/7 64/16 67/4 | 7/3 7/6 7/9 7/12 | 52/7 52/10 53/5 |
| 72/2 74/8 82/20 | 10/4 11/12 46/8 | 73/15 74/3 76/6 |
| 83/14 88/21 105/1 | 46/11 | 83/7 84/4 88/8 |
| 105/2 107/15 | Hoover [1] 2/10 | 111/4 111/8 115/10 |
| 114/14 120/9 121/4 | hope [4] 16/18 | 117/5 |
| Hi [1] 45/1 | 28/14 36/14 45/17 | however [2] 77/16 |
| hidden [2] 23/15 | hoped [1] 13/18 | 102/7 |
| 84/6 | Hopefully [2] 35/15 | Hoyem [1] 12/22 |
| high [11] 17/3 17/4 | 75/23 | huh [2] 81/9 87/13 |
| 17/5 18/2 18/23 | hospitality [1] | Human [3] 2/15 |
| 19/3 19/7 20/4 | 40/17 | 2/17 3/2 |
| 20/18 39/14 55/7 | hour [18] 24/18 | hun [1] 114/18 |
| higher [5] 21/3 | 25/8 25/8 25/22 | hundred [2] 6/6 |
| 46/23 47/2 62/10 | 26/3 26/17 27/5 | 72/10 |
| 62/10 | 29/2 29/2 32/3 | hurt [1] 65/6 |
| highest [1] 19/23 | 36/19 45/12 70/1 | I |
| him [2] 8/15 35/14 | 96/7 97/8 97/14 97/19 97/20 | I'd [1] 53/14 |
| his [9] 29/16 29/16 |  | I'll [1] 60/8 |
| 29/22 35/16 35/17 | hourly [1] 41/15 | I'm [20] 8/19 11/23 |
| 59/23 74/4 91/3 | hours [5] 32/4 40/19 40/19 41/23 | 27/15 30/23 33/10 |
| 99/23 |  | 44/21 53/16 78/7 |
| historical [1] 49/22 | house [4] 26/5 | 81/15 81/17 84/14 |
| hits [1] 42/1 | $39 / 2040 / 167 / 10$ | 84/18 88/7 101/2 |
| hitting [3] 43/2 | household [5] | 101/17 107/2 111/5 |
| 43/3 43/6 | household [5] <br> 57/18 69/13 69/14 | 113/12 120/8 |
| home [2] 16/18 | 57/18 69/13 69/14 <br> 91/16 91/16 | 120/18 |
| 61/5 | 91/16 91/16 | idea [3] 45/3 45/5 |

idea... [1] 96/18 ideas [1] 75/23 identify [3] 5/19 6/18 91/11
identifying [1] 5/16 ignorant [1] 49/5 imagine [1] 48/9 immediately [1] 5/20
implementation [1] 54/14
important [4] 44/17 51/1 57/3 71/17
imputation [2]
17/23 27/17
imputed [2] 37/3
78/14
imputing [1] 71/8 incentive [28]
23/21 23/23 25/6
25/11 61/15 66/20 67/3 67/8 70/19
73/11 76/1 76/21
93/4 93/9 93/12
94/4 95/5 98/13
100/8 101/11
103/15 104/3
105/10 110/13
110/20 111/3 112/1 116/19
include [6] 16/7
22/16 67/8 71/19 95/4 118/20 included [5] 26/2 77/15 93/4 94/4 99/9
includes [2] 16/7 84/9
including [5] 29/9 29/11 63/15 63/16 63/17
income [83] 17/22 18/3 18/23 19/3
19/11 20/4 20/18
20/19 22/2 22/6
24/18 24/21 24/23
25/7 25/9 27/17
29/16 29/21 29/23
31/22 32/2 32/7
33/3 33/3 33/4 34/9
34/16 34/18 36/20
37/3 37/8 39/18
39/18 40/13 40/17
41/10 41/14 46/23
47/1 57/21 58/22
59/20 59/20 59/21
60/1 60/10 60/10
61/1 61/22 62/2
62/4 62/7 62/20
62/22 70/21 71/5
71/7 72/4 72/8
72/12 73/17 73/23

74/4 74/15 76/12 78/13 85/13 86/2 91/4 91/17 95/22 97/5 97/12 99/15 99/22 100/1 113/7
113/16 114/13
116/3 116/4 117/19 118/2
incomes [14] 17/3 17/4 17/5 18/17
19/7 20/1 23/19
38/19 41/8 47/2
51/16 60/5 61/10 65/8
incorporated [1] 24/5
incorrect [1] 81/5 incorrectly [3] 8/19 31/1 111/6
increase [14] 17/5 19/8 19/10 19/21 20/8 20/10 26/2 26/14 28/2 34/11 35/16 36/14 96/15 109/14
increased [5] 25/7 25/9 27/11 104/5 114/8
increases [5] 19/4
19/6 19/19 61/21 $97 / 5$
increasing [4] 26/6

I
26/21 66/6 104/4 increment [1] 109/14
indicate [1] 111/20 indirect [1] 36/17 individual [2] 24/16 99/8 individuals [3] 26/23 27/2 27/3 inflation [1] 75/6 inform [1] 86/8 information [15] 12/22 13/8 13/21 15/19 16/8 17/6 17/10 18/16 18/17 27/22 45/11 56/3 100/18 118/20 121/20 insig [1] 45/13 instance [2] 24/16 115/20 instead [4] 34/9 61/15 65/10 67/23 institutional [1] 49/6
insurmountable [1]

## 52/18

intact [1] 60/4
intending [1] 6/9 intent [3] 17/20

35/14 51/8 interest [8] 48/2 48/10 48/18 55/6 55/7 55/12 55/20 109/20
interested [2] 57/7 124/20 interesting [2] 68/12 111/17 interrupt [1] 64/4 interrupting [1] 30/9
involved [2] 35/15 50/15
involves [1] 84/17
Iowa [1] 20/13
is [328]
isn't [7] 19/17
50/22 51/18 72/22
113/23 114/20
114/21
issue [9] 27/23
42/16 46/20 54/17
59/11 92/23 98/3
103/14 105/22
issues [2] 23/7
95/14
it [308]
it's [126]
itself [4] 52/16 62/6 81/1 102/8
IV [5] 18/5 18/6

40/19 41/23 78/12 IV-D [5] 18/5 18/6 40/19 41/23 78/12

JANE [18] 2/3 30/8
34/3 46/14 47/16
56/18 56/23 77/9
77/23 78/7 80/18
84/12 89/1 92/7
97/2 100/14 103/18 115/20
Jeana [8] 1/17 3/12
5/9 5/11 5/19 8/7
124/4 125/9
Jefferson [1] 46/9
JEFFRIES [3] 2/19
8/12 107/19
JENNIFER [6] 2/16 8/3 8/4 8/7 49/18 50/1
Jersey [3] 57/16
62/22 76/11
Jessica [1] 8/9
JIM [2] 2/19 8/12
job [1] 42/1
jobs [5] 40/16 40/18
41/13 41/13 47/12
join [3] 6/22 9/22 13/6
joined [3] 46/8
46/12 120/15
joining [2] 120/11

| J | 29/9 29/14 33/1 | 115/3 115/7 116/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| joining... [1] 122/22 | 36/12 37/5 38/4 | 116/9 116/12 |
| journey [1] 43/20 | 41/3 42/6 42/11 | 116/22 117/1 |
| judge [22] 2/12 | 43/7 43/18 46/5 | 117/14 117/15 |
| 47/3 52/12 53/5 | 47/14 47/16 51/9 | 117/23 118/12 |
| 54/11 78/22 79/8 | 56/3 58/20 59/5 | 118/14 118/19 |
| 82/12 93/13 94/18 | 59/11 59/14 59/16 | 119/1 119/9 120 |
| 104/15 105/14 | 60/8 60/20 61/3 | justify [1] 112/10 |
| 105/15 109/4 | 1/4 62/11 62/14 | K |
| 112/21 116/15 |  | Karen [1] 7/12 |
| 116/21 117/10 | 65/ | KATIE [8] 2/21 |
| 117/18 118/10 |  | 8/16 14/8 14/9 49/3 |
| 118/15 120/5 |  | 49/22 92/4 92/19 |
| judges [6] 67/16 | 68/22 70/1 71/15 <br> $71 / 16$ <br> $72 / 14$ | keep [11] 35/14 |
| 71/1 71/14 82/19 | $71 / 1672 / 1473 / 18$ $73 / 2274 / 174$ | 58/1 60/22 64/22 |
| 82/20 83/11 | 74/7 74/9 76/1 80/5 | 72/17 80/11 80/12 |
| judgment [1] 52/11 | $74 / 774 / 976 / 180 / 5$ $80 / 1380 / 1580 / 21$ | 90/4 99/6 109/22 |
| judgments [1] | 80/13 80/15 80/21 $80 / 21$ 81/2 | 119/3 |
| 52/16 | $80 / 2181 / 281 / 19$ $82 / 1784 / 284 / 5$ | keeping [5] 49/19 |
| Judiciary [1] 67/10 | 82/17 84/2 84/5 | 89/22 91/8 96/18 |
| JULIE [7] 2/8 7/9 | 89/10 89/11 91/4 | 96/22 |
| 10/4 46/11 53/22 | 92/17 93/8 93/18 | Kentucky [9] 22/9 |
| 94/15 102/10 | $94 / 16 \text { 95/16 96/22 }$ | 52/21 55/2 67/6 |
| Julie's [1] 120/23 | 94/16 95/16 96/22 $97 / 3$ 98/5 | 67/19 68/10 68/15 |
| July [2] 113/3 | 97/3 98/5 99/15 100/16 101/17 | 68/19 69/1 |
| 113/11 | 102/15 102/23 | Kentucky's [1] |
| jumping [1] 67/4 | 104/18 104/22 | 67/14 |
| just [122] 7/16 8/15 | 104/18 104/22 | kids [4] 47/10 |
| 9/2 9/2 9/4 10/8 | 109/10 109/23 | 74/22 114/12 |
| 10/21 13/18 16/3 |  | 115/19 |
| 16/8 17/6 20/11 |  | kind [10] 39/10 |
| 20/17 22/6 23/6 | 113/18 114/19 | 49/9 69/18 70/9 |


| K | 80/11 84/1 84/2 | 43/23 52/22 55/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kind... [6] 78/19 | 85/8 85/20 86/4 | 57/17 62/21 65/5 |
| 93/18 100/17 | 89/10 91/2 91/7 | 69/17 73/14 74/6 |
| 100/18 110/4 111/7 | 96/23 97/7 98/6 | 75/8 78/1 79/16 |
| King [1] 9/19 | 99/2 99/19 102/11 | 81/6 109/16 113/13 |
| Kirk [1] 8/9 | 104/19 106/7 | 115/9 119/6 |
| knew [1] 13/17 | 109/21 110/15 | last-minute [1] |
| know [101] 16/9 | 110/17 111/2 111/6 | 41/4 |
| 17/9 17/14 22/4 | 115/19 116/5 | late [1] 47/23 |
| 22/13 23/8 24/23 | 116/21 117/22 | later [2] 12/8 42/3 |
| 25/6 27/4 27/5 27/7 | 120/9 | LATHESIA [4] 3/1 |
| 32/21 33/18 35/1 | knowing [1] 52/5 | 9/1 9/3 9/5 |
| 35/20 35/23 36/15 | knowledge [1] 49/6 | Law [2] 2/6 2/7 |
| 36/18 37/2 37/17 | known [2] 28/6 | lawyer's [1] 116/13 |
| 38/14 39/5 39/8 | 37/14 | layman's [1] 31/4 |
| 39/21 40/3 40/8 | knows [4] 21/22 | leaning [2] 20/3 |
| 40/16 40/22 41/1 | 40/4 47/6 121/19 | 23/14 |
| 41/2 41/3 41/5 | L | learned [2] 71/2 |
| 41/10 41/22 42/6 | land [1] 16/4 |  |
| 42/16 45/8 45/21 | language [17] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { least [10] 45/6 } \\ & 57 / 13 ~ 62 / 23 ~ 97 / 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47/8 47/17 50/7 | 57/15 59/6 62/21 | 57/13 62/23 97/10 |
| 50/16 51/20 52/12 | 63/2 63/13 67/15 | 113/11 117/4 118/2 |
| 52/23 52/23 52/23 | 68/7 69/1 73/19 | leave [7] 24/22 |
| 53/23 55/4 55/6 | 76/2 76/10 81/17 | 32/17 91/20 108/21 |
| 56/10 58/14 59/1 | 82/7 86/6 102/3 | 109/4 120/7 121/5 |
| 62/18 62/19 62/20 | 102/23 115/15 | leaves [1] 38/14 |
| 65/7 65/7 68/15 $68 / 1668 / 23$ 69/12 | Large [2] 1/18 | LEE [4] 4/4 11/8 |
| 68/16 68/23 69/12 | $124 / 5$ | $11 / 8120 / 2$ |
| 72/18 72/19 73/16 | last [28] 8/19 13/4 | $\operatorname{left}[2] \quad 16 / 2332 / 12$ |
| 74/21 74/22 74/23 | 13/23 16/23 20/3 | legacy [1] 17/15 |
| 75/8 75/17 76/20 | 21/1 21/9 21/19 | legacy [1] 17/15 |
| 78/18 78/23 80/3 | 27/10 41/4 43/17 | legal [2] 3/17 53/8 |


| L | life [1] 111/12 | 63/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| legislation [4] | lift [1] 26/21 | limitation [2] 18/19 |
| 68/17 114/10 115/4 | light [1] 104/22 | 121/16 |
| 118/23 | like [70] 6/23 9/16 | limited [5] 18/4 |
| legislatively [1] | 10/19 11/4 12/4 | 54/18 55/3 78/12 |
| 67/9 | 14/3 18/1 23/22 | 121/7 |
| legislators [1] | 24/4 26/14 35/12 | limits [1] 76/11 |
| 67/17 | 37/18 37/18 39/9 | line [42] 43/22 |
| less [15] 21/14 33/5 | 40/4 41/9 42/9 | 43/23 44/14 66/23 |
| 51/17 54/7 60/12 | 44/17 45/3 45/5 | 67/22 68/10 69/17 |
| 62/15 71/6 73/17 | 46/16 46/18 49/6 | 72/9 73/4 73/15 |
| 73/23 74/23 85/22 | 50/7 50/9 50/10 | 73/22 74/12 74/14 |
| 86/20 88/15 98/14 | 54/19 58/14 60/16 | 74/17 79/20 79/22 |
| 101/8 | 61/3 61/16 64/7 | 79/22 82/13 85/4 |
| let [7] 59/11 77/2 | 67/11 67/23 68/15 | 85/11 85/17 85/19 |
| 77/4 81/19 86/13 | 71/22 73/12 74/22 | 85/19 85/21 85/22 |
| 88/22 90/20 | 75/7 75/12 76/10 | 86/15 86/17 86/19 |
| let's [19] 6/10 13/4 | 76/17 79/3 80/6 | 86/20 86/21 87/3 |
| 26/11 44/7 44/9 | 80/10 81/23 82/13 | 87/3 87/4 88/4 88/4 |
| 44/12 61/5 71/7 | 86/18 89/5 90/10 | 88/5 101/20 102/3 |
| 74/3 75/3 78/2 | 96/18 98/1 104/16 | 102/3 102/5 103/3 |
| 88/21 92/22 93/5 | 107/8 108/18 109/1 | 118/3 |
| 93/11 94/2 103/16 | 109/21 110/5 110/7 | lines [5] 65/4 65/5 |
| 107/3 108/4 | 110/13 110/23 | 74/2 84/2 103/2 |
| Level [4] 2/17 38/7 | 116/2 116/6 118/7 | lingering [1] 76/7 |
| 38/18 66/17 | 118/11 118/16 | lining [1] 61/13 |
| levels [2] 40/13 | 119/16 120/6 121/1 | LISA [3] 4/3 11/2 |
| 45/15 | 122/5 | 119/23 |
| liberal [1] 37/21 | likely [2] 50/21 | listed [1] 96/14 |
| license [2] 41/18 | 51/2 | lit [1] 47/3 |
| 42/4 | limit [5] 22/11 | literature [1] 112/2 |
| licensed [1] 124/23 | 22/18 53/12 56/6 | little [17] 21/8 |

little... [16] 21/13
29/14 33/5 35/13
38/6 39/13 45/6
46/2 46/4 50/8
73/21 74/19 83/23
90/22 96/16 110/16 live [1] 57/20
LLC [1] 3/13
location [1] 10/14 long [5] 43/20
50/15 50/18 50/19
51/21
longer [3] 15/18 15/20 24/3
look [34] 12/4 16/2 16/3 21/6 26/15
32/2 33/15 38/4
38/8 42/22 43/10
43/11 43/22 49/21
50/6 58/23 59/12
59/13 59/22 61/6 64/6 67/14 72/8
73/3 83/15 84/5
90/21 92/9 99/19
103/19 109/7 112/6 121/22 122/3
looked [5] 34/1 37/11 43/17 53/19 57/15
looking [16] 19/3
25/16 39/7 58/16

59/5 64/11 66/6
$79 / 20$ 90/7 92/8
$96 / 10 ~ 100 / 6 ~ 102 / 4$
$113 / 14 ~ 114 / 4$
$116 / 13$
looks [4] 10/14 50/7 50/9 83/22
Lord [1] 125/5
lose [2] 42/1 107/1
losing [1] 47/12
lot [15] 5/19 19/1
27/5 27/22 40/16 40/18 41/6 52/14
56/11 56/14 83/12
90/2 90/6 108/2
112/2
low [6] 20/19 32/23
33/4 46/1 91/17
114/12
lower [14] 33/17
34/8 38/6 40/6 40/17 41/8 43/8 46/23 50/20 63/11 68/4 87/9 110/17 114/22
lowering [2] 35/2 45/9
lowest [2] 37/13
37/23
M
ma'am [4] 6/15
12/13 13/16 106/20

MADDOX [2] 3/17 117/17
made [2] 50/10 52/9
major [1] 19/4
majority [5] 19/8
28/22 41/8 48/22
85/18
make [25] 6/23
10/6 28/6 28/8
28/12 32/13 46/16
46/19 49/12 50/12
58/10 62/15 63/6
66/9 80/4 80/4
82/12 85/6 86/2
90/2 100/19 101/5
102/5 104/18 113/5 makes [4] 35/3 48/19 89/11 101/10 making [10] 45/12 57/11 80/10 86/4 90/12 91/8 92/17
98/8 112/10 122/13
MALLORY [4] 3/9
10/1 96/17 100/22
Manager [1] 2/14
manual [2] 63/9
101/19
manually [2] 82/15 102/2
many [5] 21/22
102/7 111/4 111/8
many... [1] 119/8 March [4] 13/1
14/1 25/21 29/15 March 22nd [1] 13/1
math [1] 72/22
mathematical [1] 110/1
mathematically [4] 62/5 91/3 91/10 101/18
matter [3] 78/18
112/2 124/7
maximum [4]
19/19 19/21 97/17 97/19
may [13] 8/18 12/8 34/2 53/19 77/12
80/21 101/20 103/9
113/23 118/17
118/22 122/9 125/4 May 21st [1] 122/9 maybe [19] 11/11
33/14 34/10 39/2
39/13 41/14 49/6
53/16 77/18 103/13 108/5 109/7 110/15
110/17 111/5 111/6 115/13 118/4
118/18
MCCLENNEY [2]

## 3/1 9/1

McMillan [1] 7/1 me [32] 6/22 8/4 8/5 9/22 11/9 16/16 16/21 19/12 30/8 30/19 34/20 39/15 46/1 46/5 47/14 48/17 53/17 53/23 56/3 57/14 58/6
59/11 64/3 66/14
77/4 80/16 81/19
84/20 86/13 104/20
111/7 121/22
mean [42] 17/14
19/17 24/3 29/22
35/1 35/3 35/8
36/13 36/13 38/8
53/4 55/6 56/2 56/9
58/1 58/23 60/8
60/22 63/16 65/4
65/9 72/16 75/20
79/14 83/13 85/5
86/5 86/9 87/3 88/7 88/18 88/19 96/18
98/17 100/17 108/7
109/22 109/23
111/11 111/23
116/18 118/7
meaning [1] 22/12
means [1] 65/2
meant [1] 87/4
measurements [3]

30/15 32/22 33/9 media [4] 12/18
12/20 12/21 13/1 median [1] 21/18 medical [1] 38/15 meet [7] 17/12
17/20 31/23 32/13
41/9 85/21 89/9
meeting [12] $1 / 1$ 1/16 14/1 15/9 83/6 90/18 93/1 103/19
115/9 122/6 122/9 123/6
MELODY [5] 3/4 9/11 14/19 99/1 100/21
member [1] 5/7
members [13] 2/5
6/13 14/16 86/11
91/19 94/7 94/11
103/9 104/7 122/16
124/15 124/18 124/19
memo [17] 15/16 21/1 21/14 25/15 25/21 29/15 45/4 49/14 50/7 57/16 61/7 62/21 63/20
74/7 79/16 95/23
96/10
men [1] 47/13
mentally [1] 112/18
mention [2] 12/10 29/18
mentioned [3] 27/21 47/21 83/5 Mexico [3] 22/10
52/21 55/2
Michael [1] 7/3 might [17] 21/21
35/23 45/20 47/17 48/10 60/16 70/6 81/15 95/22 96/2 98/9 99/18 101/8 101/13 113/19

## 115/20 115/23

military [1] 37/22 million [1] 26/22 mind [5] 28/7 46/3 58/1 91/22 119/15 minds [1] 112/20 minimum [41]
24/17 25/23 26/2 26/7 26/8 26/12 26/21 27/5 27/6 27/11 27/18 28/2 29/1 33/18 36/3 36/15 36/19 37/15 41/23 45/20 70/11 70/11 70/14 70/16 71/8 71/12 71/23
72/6 72/13 73/16 74/1 75/2 78/14

78/17 85/14 96/4 97/13 97/22 98/9 98/22 108/7 minus [1] 71/10 minute [3] 41/4 58/13 88/22
minutes [4] 46/5 47/23 115/8 120/21 miracles [1] 17/17 miss [1] 13/18 missing [1] 80/22 Missouri [1] 20/13 misstated [1] 51/19 mitigate [1] 34/7 Mobile [3] 2/14 2/15 2/20
model [1] 35/18 modified [4] 21/11 48/8 48/10 48/15 modify [1] 48/19 modifying [1] 52/8 money [6] 33/17
55/17 113/17 116/17 117/6 118/12
Montgomery [9]
1/19 2/12 2/18 2/22
3/3 3/13 3/16 3/18 124/3
month [21] 19/12 24/8 24/9 29/20 29/21 32/1 32/18

33/19 34/23 38/1 42/3 52/22 54/7 61/10 61/15 72/7 92/7 113/9 113/11 115/2 118/21 month's [1] 62/21 monthly [1] 32/4 months [7] 28/8 28/9 54/9 115/4 117/2 118/8 119/2 Moore [1] 2/11
more [54] 15/22 19/8 19/10 19/10 25/12 27/9 32/13 33/11 35/4 35/13 35/14 42/12 44/15 44/19 44/19 45/7
47/12 47/17 50/21
51/2 55/5 56/4
58/15 61/23 61/23
63/12 66/21 73/21
74/4 80/16 85/6
85/21 89/4 90/4
90/6 90/9 96/13
96/16 100/19 101/6 106/10 106/12
106/19 108/6 108/10 108/19 109/6 109/17
111/23 112/16 116/8 119/9 120/21 120/22

| M | my [25] 13/18 | \| 50/5 53/14 62/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| morning [4] 5/1 | 16/17 23/7 33/20 | 99/2 77/8 80/14 |
| 6/16 9/6 15/14 | 46/1 46/2 47/18 | 91/23 93/20 100/23 |
| most [11] 26/8 | 48/13 59/5 64/21 | 108/21 109/6 |
| 51/10 71/1 71/14 | 75/9 79/11 91/10 | 116/15 116/16 |
| 78/16 89/7 89/11 | 95/23 101/15 | 117/4 118/19 119/6 |
| 93/6 108/8 108/9 | 102/20 113/6 | needs [3] 35/9 |
| 122/2 | 114/22 114/22 | 51/20 69/13 |
| motion [3] 14/6 | 115/1 115/10 | negative [2] 71/9 |
| 95/1 95/3 | 116/15 116/16 | 71/11 |
| move [3] 14/7 20/19 | 118/9 125/3 | negligible [1] 48/16 |
| 71/20 | myself [1] 5/16 | negotiation [1] |
| Mr [1] 107/19 | N | 117 |
| Ms [2] 105/12 | name [5] 6/16 8/5 | er |
| 107/6 | 8/19 12/1 125/3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { net [5] 24/8 24/22 } \\ \mathbf{3 7 / 9} 38 / 1373 / 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| much [21] $15 / 7$ $20 / 922 / 1139 / 2$ | narrative [4] 68/15 | never [2] 75/16 |
| 0/9 22/11 | 69/10 75/14 80/6 | 82/4 |
| 21 51/19 | narrow [1] 77/11 | new [34] 19/5 20/5 |
| 52/7 55/5 79/1 79/2 | Nathan [1] 10/9 | 20/6 20/10 21/10 |
| 96/20 101/3 111/14 | nay [2] 14/21 15/2 | 22/10 32/22 33/8 |
| 113/13 117/2 | nays [2] 15/6 15/6 | 40/5 42/10 43/22 |
| 118/10 121/19 | nearly [1] 76/13 | 45/23 48/7 48/7 |
| multi [1] 43/20 | Nebraska [4] 58/11 | 48/9 48/15 52/21 $\mathbf{5 5 / 2} 57 / 15$ 59/17 |
| multi-tasking [1] | 75/12 76/4 76/17 | 55/2 57/15 59/17 <br> 59/18 62/22 63/22 |
| $43 / 20$ | Nebraska's [1] | 71/21 71/21 74/12 |
| $30 / 444 / 1$ | 81/17 | 74/14 74/17 76/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { multiply [2] } 32 / 3 \\ & 74 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | 82/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79/20 79/22 79/22 } \\ & \text { 83/18 114/10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| must [1] 8/8 muted [1] 99/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 22 ~ 16 / 12 ~ 37 / 16 \\ & 38 / 143 / 1945 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | news [2] 12/20 13/8 <br> next [14] 40/23 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 108/13 108/16 | 78/7 80/10 82/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| next... [13] 73/20 | 115/4 119/12 | 84/14 86/8 87/18 |
| 76/4 90/18 92/23 | 119/19 119/22 | 88/7 88/15 88/16 |
| 93/1 103/19 111/19 | 120/1 120/4 120/20 | 89/8 89/9 89/21 |
| 117/11 118/20 | 122/7 125/10 | 90/9 91/22 94/10 |
| 118/21 118/21 | nobody [2] 70/5 | 99/8 101/2 103/9 |
| 122/6 122/8 | 109/18 | 104/10 110/1 110/7 |
| nine [4] 6/7 51/12 | Nodding [2] 36/6 | 110/16 111/3 |
| 61/6 66/23 | 100/9 | 111/13 112/7 |
| nine-state [1] 51/12 | nominal [1] 33/1 | 112/10 113/1 |
| ninety [3] 6/5 6/6 | noncustodial [2] | 113/12 114/2 |
| 6/7 | 92/11 92/15 | 115/23 116/5 |
| ninety-five [3] $6 / 5$ | none [4] 20/21 23/2 | 116/22 117/2 117/7 |
| 6/6 6/7 | 28/19 42/15 | 117/22 118/8 |
| no [63] 6/20 7/2 7/5 | not [90] 5/17 5/21 | 118/21 |
| 7/8 7/11 7/14 7/23 | 6/22 10/5 11/11 | Notary [1] 125/11 |
| 8/2 8/11 9/18 9/20 | 13/18 14/20 15/21 | note [1] 62/1 |
| 10/10 10/20 11/1 | 16/17 18/15 19/1 | noted [1] 79/5 |
| 11/6 11/13 11/16 | 20/3 20/8 20/14 | nothing [3] 56/18 |
| 13/16 14/4 14/23 | 22/7 23/5 23/20 | 96/19 110/14 |
| 15/4 15/5 15/6 | 25/5 25/8 26/10 | notice [5] 12/18 |
| 16/14 20/20 23/1 | 26/16 27/15 32/20 | 12/20 13/1 66/1 |
| 24/3 25/11 28/18 | 33/9 34/2 34/7 | 67/21 |
| 40/7 42/14 43/5 | 36/19 37/2 37/4 | now [38] 11/18 |
| 47/1 56/22 57/2 | 40/14 41/14 41/22 | 16/1 22/15 23/14 |
| 68/14 68/16 70/19 | 43/1 43/5 45/9 | 30/16 33/14 34/22 |
| 88/10 90/15 92/21 | 45/22 50/13 51/6 | 37/12 42/19 46/21 |
| 93/22 94/21 95/2 | 52/5 53/13 54/1 | 56/21 59/23 62/13 |
| 99/12 101/18 | 54/4 54/15 59/3 | 66/6 66/16 66/18 |
| 103/12 104/21 | 60/4 67/10 67/11 | 78/10 79/6 80 |
| 105/8 105/18 | 67/13 69/4 71/8 | 81/11 81/23 82/3 |
| 107/13 107/23 | 72/14 73/21 75/19 | 84/5 95/6 97/7 |


| $\mathbf{N}$ | 62/7 63/1 70/20 | 10/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| now... [13] 97/17 | $387 /$ | 120/17 |
| 99/14 100/5 113/6 | obligation [1] 61/23 | okay [58] 8 |
| 113/13 113/19 | obligee [1] 58/21 | 11/7 11/19 12/7 |
| 11/9 114/9 114/23 | obligor [1] 81/2 | 13/13 13/17 14/5 |
| 115/17 116/4 117/6 | obtain [2] 17/10 | 14/18 15/5 16/15 |
| 121/22 | 18/16 | 20/21 23/2 28/19 |
| nuances [1] 71/17 | obvious [1] 58/15 | 1/7 31/7 31/12 |
| number [26] 11/23 | obviously [7] 40/6 | 34/21 36/8 42/15 |
| 27/1 34/2 34/6 | 85/1 91/21 95/7 | 49/1 56/20 65/8 |
| 39/16 40/4 57/9 | 101/5 101/14 | 66/8 66/19 77/3 |
| 63/5 64/18 65/11 | 105/22 | 77/7 87/15 88/17 |
| 66/13 70/3 83/16 | occur [2] 19/22 | 90/16 92/16 92/17 |
| 9510 95/12 96/11 | 22/12 | 92/22 93/16 94/9 |
| 19 96/21 101/4 | odd [1] 29/14 | 94/22 95/3 97/1 |
| 101/12 103/16 | off [9] 16/23 22/8 | 98/20 99/17 100/4 |
| 104/3 104/4 109/2 | 34/13 34/14 51/5 | 100/11 103/5 104/9 |
| 11/10 125/3 | 52/17 64/4 75/9 | 105/5 |
| numbered [1] | 99/10 | 105/13 105/1 |
| 29/13 | offer [1] 40/19 | 106/21 107/7 1 |
| numbers [10] 5/23 | office [6] 3/4 3/18 | 111/22 112/15 |
| 6/2 6/3 16/4 31/3 | 10/15 12/23 13/4 | 112/21 112/23 |
| 39/13 39/5 39/7 | 16/17 | 119/13 120/14 |
| 48/14 | officer [2] 12/22 | 120/19 |
| 0 | 3/21 | old [9] 17/18 21/2 |
|  | official [1] 23/5 | 30/16 54/7 55/17 |
| ck [1] 13/7 | officially [1] 110/2 | 55/18 56/12 113/11 |
| obligated [17] | often [2] 58/13 | 113/22 |
| 29/20 31/22 32/8 | 81/16 | once [6] 37/9 41/1 |
| 32/18 35/9 35/13 | oftentimes [2] | 8/20 93/23 98/15 |
| 36/20 50/11 50/21 | 52/15 55/17 | 105/23 |
| 51/16 59/21 62/3 | oh [6] 23/13 56/20 | one [85] 11/22 12/6 |


| 0 | one where [1] 43/4 | options [5] 29/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| one... [83] 12/8 | one-bedroom [1] | 32/15 45/15 81/2 |
| 15/17 15/20 16/6 | 38/2 | 110/1 |
| 16/16 19/9 19/13 | ones [2] 43/7 58/20 | order [29] 12/10 |
| 19/22 24/14 26/10 | online [1] 79/5 | 12/14 21/3 21/10 |
| 26/19 28/21 33/21 | only [25] 16/15 | 21/11 21/12 21/16 |
| 34/11 38/2 39/10 | 18/5 18/22 19/15 | 30/3 32/11 35/21 |
| 40/23 43/4 43/11 | 28/6 28/12 31/18 | 44/18 48/20 50/20 |
| 44/6 44/8 44/9 47/1 | 34/18 36/19 43/3 | 52/8 56/5 56/8 |
| 47/9 49/14 49/18 | 51/12 54/20 55/18 | 60/11 61/22 71/3 |
| 49/18 50/9 51/20 | 55/19 59/20 59/21 | 71/12 71/15 71/1 |
| 56/9 57/5 58/3 60/1 | 61/8 66/19 81/11 | 72/1 72/6 72/13 |
| 60/2 61/17 63/2 | 81/13 84/16 85/1 | 73/16 74/1 75/2 |
| 64/7 65/15 66/17 | 87/22 92/14 103/3 | 102/22 |
| 71/13 73/7 7 | open [3] 40/23 | orders [12] 18/7 |
| 76/8 77/5 | 93/11 119/7 | 18/13 18/19 19 |
| 84/17 84/22 85/2 | opinionated [1] | 21/15 21/17 |
| 85/15 87/16 88/18 | 100/19 | 48/8 48/9 48/10 |
| 89/7 95/8 95/10 | opposed [5] 15/1 | 48/15 103/2 |
| 96/12 97/9 97/16 | 87/11 94/23 105/1 | ordinarily [1] |
| 102/15 102/15 | 105/14 | 101/9 |
| 102/16 103/3 | opposition [3] | original [2] 1/11 |
| 104/18 105/1 106/3 | 105/7 105/16 | 26/1 |
| 6/9 106/9 106/11 | option [19] 29/9 | other [45] 3/11 1 |
| 106/18 106/22 | 29/13 30/1 30/3 | 15/18 18/1 20/22 |
| 107/16 108/3 108/5 | 30/5 30/6 30/11 | 21/4 25/4 28/1 |
| 108/9 108/10 | 30/13 43/14 44/10 | 31/3 31/20 31/2 |
| 109/13 109/13 | 59/19 82/1 89/20 | 32/15 34/11 38/20 |
| 109/16 109/16 | 89/20 89/21 95/8 | 7 43/9 50/10 |
| 109/17 109/18 | 95/10 96/11 110/11 | /20 54/17 |
| 113/6 115/21 | optional [2] 57/14 | 58/20 68/8 76/1 |
| 117/11 | 58/11 | 85/9 87/17 88/22 |


| 0 | 117/13 | 104/15 105/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| other... [19] 90/14 | overall [1] 51/9 | 109/4 1 |
| 91/18 92/20 93/21 | overly [1] 90/11 | pandemic [2] 40/21 |
| 100/14 102/18 | owe [4] 55/18 55/19 | 47/11 |
| 105/5 105/14 | 55/20 113/19 | paragraph [1] |
| 105/15 107/14 | owed [5] 48/1 51/14 | 19/20 |
| 109/8 111/7 111/14 | 51/15 55/17 56/1 | parent [36] 29/20 |
| 119/10 121/1 122/4 | own [2] 16/3 | 31/22 32/8 32/18 |
| 124/15 124/18 | 112/20 | 34/10 35/9 35/10 |
| 124/20 | owners [1] 41/2 | 35/14 47/8 50/9 |
| others [1] 11/21 | P | 50/10 50/11 50/22 |
| otherwise [1] 80/15 | P.M [1] 123/7 | 57/18 57/19 59/21 |
| ought [1] 92/23 | page [32] 16/11 | 70/20 77/15 77/15 |
| our [23] 5/10 13/9 | page $19 / 20$ 21/1 21/14 | 81/14 84/8 85/9 |
| 13/23 15/10 18/6 | 25/15 25/19 28/20 | 85/10 85/18 85/23 |
| 21/7 21/9 41/16 | 42/23 43/17 43/23 | 86/19 86/22 87/1 |
| 48/6 49/9 52/12 | 57/5 59/13 59/22 | 87/9 87/10 87/16 |
| 52/12 58/15 79/16 | 50/4 61/6 61/13 | 87/18 87/21 87/23 |
| 79/16 83/23 84/4 | 64/5 66/23 67/5 | 89/6 92/15 |
| 110/18 112/20 | 67/18 68/9 69/4 | parent's [9] 22/2 |
| 119/7 122/6 122/8 | 69/6 69/17 71/20 | 36/20 51/20 62/4 |
| 125/4 | 73/1 73/20 74/6 | 62/7 74/15 86/20 |
| out [18] 16/9 16/10 | 73/1 73/20 74/6 | 91/15 116/4 |
| 20/23 23/16 26/23 | 18/179/16 96/10 | Parentage [3] |
| 33/4 39/8 40/9 | pages [2] 58/22 | 53/20 121/8 121/11 |
| 43/10 46/8 65/20 | 124/13 | parents [15] 23/18 |
| 90/1 95/19 98/5 | paid [4] 35/22 56/1 | 24/12 28/23 31/15 |
| 111/5 111/9 115/8 | 87/6 99/7 | 50/15 51/16 62/19 |
| 116/20 | PALMER [14] 2/8 | 63/2 82/3 82/10 |
| outlets [1] 12/21 | 7/10 46/12 47/3 | 83/3 84/10 88/17 |
| over [6] 15/9 47/2 | 53/23 54/12 78/22 | 90/7 115/18 |
| 47/10 50/3 51/20 | 93/13 94/15 102/10 | part [10] 2/9 22/10 |


| P | payee [1] 47/18 | 93/10 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| part... [8] 25/23 | paying [4] 40/14 | 95/9 95/11 95/18 |
| 40/15 53/1 53/4 | 48/20 84/8 102/18 | 97/18 |
| 56/15 64/14 81/7 | payment [1] 17/23 | 98/10 98/14 99 |
| 114/6 | payor [3] 47/18 | 100/8 101/11 102 |
| Part-time [1] 2/9 | $87 / 1087 / 21$ | per |
| Partially [1] 81/6 | payroll [7] 24/20 | percentages [5] |
| participate [2] 5/5 | 25/3 37/10 96/5 | 95/8 95/16 109/2 |
| 122/17 | 97/8 97/11 98/3 | 109 |
| particular [3] 18/5 | pays [1] 37/10 | perhaps [1] 16/4 |
| 91/20 103/10 | PENNY [9] 2/6 | period [2] 118/5 |
| particularly [5] | 11/17 23/8 46/6 | 121 |
| 5/16 17/7 46/20 | 49/2 53/22 112/ | person [5] 11/23 |
| 5 122/15 | 120/13 121/6 | 47/8 66/17 113/17 |
| parties [3] 27/20 | people [17] 39/11 | 116/18 |
| 81/3 83/7 | 41/6 41/8 41/12 | persons [3] 124/15 |
| party [2] 7 | 46/17 82/23 88/22 | 124/18 124/20 |
| 12 | 93/6 102/13 108/20 | perspective [2] |
| past [3] 13/7 54/9 | 110/15 111/4 111/7 | 42/9 49/22 |
| 113/18 | 111/8 111/12 112/6 | petition [1] 54/21 |
| PATRICIA [3] 4/6 | 113/7 | phaseout [1] 17/1 |
| 12 46/8 | people's [1] 111/15 | phone [3] 11/23 |
| ttern [1] 43/1 | per [9] 19/12 21/3 | 121/21 122/2 |
| pattern that [1] | 31/23 34/23 41/15 | picture [3] 5/12 |
|  | 61/14 92/6 102/ | 118/16 121/2 |
| pause [2] 3310 | 11 | pipe [1] 116/23 |
| 93/17 | percent [1] 6/8 | place [2] 45/19 |
| pay [13] 22/7 | percentage [29] | 103/4 |
| 27/4 27/9 35/5 | 18/2 23/22 43/16 | places [1] 58/6 |
| 35/17 36/22 39/11 | 57/8 62/10 | Plaintiff [1] 77/1 |
| 51/5 64/15 85/1 | 73/12 74/18 76/20 | plans [1] 10/21 |
| 87/11 11 | 78/6 78/8 93/2 | please [1] 6/17 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | posted [2] 13/9 | price [1] 20/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| plunge [2] 22/22 | 15/ | primary [4] 57/19 |
| 28/16 | potentially [1] | 69/13 85/10 86/19 |
| Plus [2] 90/6 | 39/14 | principal [1] 48/23 |
| 121/21 | poverty [13] 23/19 | principles [1] 90/23 |
| pocket [3] 113/20 | 26/23 27/3 30/20 | print [1] 16/10 |
| 114/17 114/20 | 38/7 38/18 62/20 | printed [1] 124/13 |
| point [19] 6/7 6/10 | 62/23 66/17 72/5 | printing [1] 16/9 |
| 13/22 14/22 15/8 | 72/11 73/5 73/9 | prior [4] 22/15 |
| 43/10 46/7 46/19 | power [1] 48/4 | 52/13 53/7 103/1 |
| 49/18 52/20 60/16 | practical [1] 103/7 | prioritizing [2] |
| 77/5 77/5 77/8 | Practice [4] 2/9 | 50/11 51/19 |
| 106/14 110/22 | 2/19 2/21 3/10 | private [5] 2/9 2/19 |
| 112/12 116/13 | pragmatic [2] | 2/21 3/10 19/17 |
| 120/23 | 72/17 82/18 | probably [13] 9/22 |
| pointed [1] 20/23 | precluded [1] 91/22 | 31/1 34/15 45/19 |
| points [2] 103/7 | prefer [1] 106/16 | 48/17 50/1 78/19 |
| 103/10 | preference [1] | 80/20 82/14 99/5 |
| policy [2] 2/3 75/1 |  | 111/2 117/2 122/13 |
| poll [1] 23/6 | present [6] 6/17 <br> 7/16 8/15 9/12 10/8 | problem [1] 59/15 <br> proceed [1] 93/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pop [1] 79/9 } \\ & \text { pops [1] } 91 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 111/19 | proceedings [1] |
| populated [1] 70/3 | presented [2] 89/6 | 124/6 |
| Porter [4] 11/14 | 90/20 <br> presents [1] 105/23 | process [1] 83/22 <br> PROFESSOR [9] |
| 11/15 120/15 | presents [1] 105/23 | PROFESSOR [9] |
| 120/18 | President [2] 26/5 | 2/6 2/6 3/6 7/15 |
| portion [1] 89/10 | 115/6 | 9/14 17/8 18/21 |
| position [1] 98/9 | presumptive [1] | 20/23 107/19 |
| positive [2] 81/9 | 75/18 <br> pretty [3] 39/6 40/1 | Program [1] 2/14 <br> programmers [1] |
| 87/13 possibility [1] 60/8 possible [1] 89/23 | $65 / 22$ <br> previous [1] 83/5 | 101/18 <br> promulgated [2] |



## R

read [4] 72/6
113/13 114/3
121/17
reading [1] 117/15 ready [1] 46/14 real [2] 86/13
111/12
realize [1] 75/11
really [23] 6/8
17/12 29/7 36/14
44/17 45/11 45/18
47/6 61/4 62/14
66/11 80/12 80/14
84/16 97/8 98/2
99/12 101/19
110/19 111/12
111/13 113/1 117/4 reason [11] 19/2
24/14 26/19 40/11 40/15 42/8 61/21 68/5 70/8 101/13 112/17
reasonable [1] 45/19
receive [2] 13/14 88/15
received [1] 117/19 receiving [1]
113/17
recipient [2] 34/10 87/23
recognize [1] 63/21 relating [1] 46/21 recognizes [2] 24/1 Relations [1] 46/10 50/14
recognizing [1]
51/10
recommend [2]
44/3 80/2
recommendation
[4] 64/21 79/17 102/20 115/11
reconfirm [1] 76/14 remains [1] 83/16 record [2] 12/10 remember [6] 12/17
redo [1] 62/12 reduced [2] 116/16 116/16
Referee [1] 2/9
reference [1] 20/17
reflective [1] 18/20
reg [5] 38/22 50/12
50/13 51/8 51/18
regard [1] 18/21
regarding [1]
120/23
regardless [1] 95/9
register [1] 94/23
regs [1] 35/20
regular [1] 53/18
regulation [1] 35/4
regulations [1]
17/21
relates [1] 70/10
relationship [1]
50/16
relative [2] 124/17 124/19
release [2] 12/20 13/8
reluctant [1]
110/16

21/20 26/22 37/1
48/12 57/10 66/16
remind [1] 95/17
reminder [1]
118/19
removed [1] 26/4 rent [2] 38/2 38/4 repeating [1] 27/22 report [1] 26/20 reported [3] 21/8 21/20 124/6
Reporter [6] 1/17
3/12 5/10 124/4
125/2 125/10
REPORTER'S [1] 123/8
REPORTING [2] 3/13 125/1
reports [1] 13/14
representation [1]
$\mathbf{R}$
representation... [1] 5/17
requested [1] 17/8 require [1] 61/9 required [2] 28/11 49/11
requirement [1] 41/17
requirements [2] 17/13 49/15
requiring [1] 40/12 Rescue [3] 26/1

## 114/6 114/7

research [3] 2/3 48/13 111/18
reserve [79] 15/11
17/2 22/23 23/3
23/15 24/2 24/7
24/11 29/17 29/19
29/23 30/18 31/20
31/23 32/14 32/20
33/9 34/17 37/6
38/17 40/12 41/7
42/18 43/2 57/12
59/7 59/18 60/3
60/12 60/20 61/14 62/17 63/1 66/1
66/7 67/7 67/12 67/21 68/2 69/7 69/11 69/15 70/4
70/13 71/6 71/23

72/10 73/2 73/4
74/1 74/5 74/10
74/13 74/16 75/13
76/15 77/13 78/9
79/10 80/9 81/1
81/5 83/3 84/4 84/7
84/21 85/23 86/23
87/17 87/18 87/22
88/14 88/16 91/5
92/10 99/10 99/16
99/20 100/7
reside [1] 76/13
residential [1]
57/19
Resources [3] 2/15 2/17 3/2
respect [1] 98/3
respond [1] 46/19 response [41] $6 / 20$ 7/2 7/5 7/8 7/11
7/14 7/23 8/2 8/11
9/18 9/20 10/10
11/1 11/13 11/16
14/4 14/23 15/4
16/14 20/20 23/1
28/18 42/14 81/10
87/14 90/15 92/21
93/22 94/21 95/2
103/12 105/8
105/18 107/13
107/23 108/13
108/16 119/12

119/19 119/22 122/7
responsible [1]

## 85/12

rest [3] 59/4 63/20 74/2
restaurant [4]
40/22 41/2 41/21 42/2
result [1] 63/12 resulted [1] 18/12 results [2] 24/7 124/21
retail [1] 40/18
retroactive [6]
22/12 52/6 52/10
52/16 121/7 121/13
returns [1] 56/13
review [5] 13/11
28/11 70/2 71/2

## 75/8

reviewing [1] 28/5 revising [1] 15/11 revisit [2] 42/17 105/22
revisited [1] 23/7 revote [1] 103/20 reword [2] 88/8 88/11
right [54] 10/11
11/17 13/20 14/22
16/1 16/20 23/14


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 46/15 46/16 46/22 | 38/17 40/12 42/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| schedule [25] 15/23 | 47/3 51/23 58/12 | 43/2 57/12 59/7 |
| 17/5 19/23 20/9 | 59/16 61/5 61/8 | 59/18 60/3 60/12 |
| 20/11 23/16 24/2 | 63/11 66/9 66/23 | 60/19 61/14 62/16 |
| 24/5 29/10 29/11 | 69/17 70/9 70/18 | 63/1 66/1 66/7 67/7 |
| 30/12 30/14 30/18 | 72/1 72/2 73/10 | 67/12 67/21 68/2 |
| 32/16 33/1 34/19 | 73/14 74/3 74/9 | 69/6 69/11 69/15 |
| 59/16 59/17 63/17 | 75/3 77/19 78/2 | 70/4 70/13 70/13 |
| 81/12 81/13 82/1 | 83/1 83/20 85/10 | 71/6 71/22 72/10 |
| 89/23 92/9 92/12 | 85/15 93/6 96/20 | 73/2 73/4 73/23 |
| scheduled [1] 122/9 | 101/20 104/15 | 74/5 74/10 74/13 |
| School [1] 2/7 | 105/15 108/4 | 74/16 75/13 76/15 |
| Scott [1] 12/21 | 116/22 117/12 | 77/13 78/9 79/10 |
| screen [2] 5/18 | 118/16 119/11 | 80/9 80/23 81/4 |
| 118/17 | 119/14 120/14 | 83/2 84/3 84/5 84/7 |
| scroll [1] 84/14 | seeing [5] 20/21 | 84/21 85/23 86/23 |
| second [13] 14/10 | 22/5 47/6 112/5 | 87/17 87/18 87/22 |
| 14/11 19/20 33/11 | 116/18 | 88/14 88/16 91/5 |
| 34/5 37/23 64/4 | seem [5] 28/7 40/4 | 92/10 99/9 99/16 |
| 82/1 106/12 106/16 | 76/21 90/10 108/18 | 99/20 100/7 |
| 109/11 109/13 | seemed [2] 47/1 | self-support [78] |
| 110/11 | 109/18 | 15/11 17/2 22/22 |
| sections [1] 92/13 | seems [3] 39/9 | 23/3 23/15 24/2 |
| sector [2] 40/17 | 84/19 108/23 | 24/7 24/11 29/17 |
| 41/13 | seen [2] 86/6 95/7 | 29/19 29/23 30/18 |
| see [60] 5/11 8/4 | self [81] 15/11 17/2 | 31/19 31/23 32/14 |
| 13/4 15/6 16/4 | 22/22 23/3 23/15 | 32/20 33/9 34/17 |
| 22/21 26/11 31/18 | 24/2 24/7 24/11 | 37/6 38/17 40/12 |
| 32/1 32/9 34/8 | 29/17 29/17 29/19 | 42/18 43/2 57/12 |
| 38/21 39/10 42/12 | 29/23 30/18 31/19 | 59/7 59/18 60/3 |
| 42/23 43/12 43/23 | 31/23 32/14 32/20 | 60/12 60/19 61/14 |
| 44/21 45/11 45/16 | 33/9 34/17 37/6 | 62/16 63/1 66/1 |


| S | 37/13 70/8 | shorter [1] 16/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| self-support... [45] | setting [1] 71/3 | should [11] 6/5 |
| 66/7 67/7 67/12 | seven [2] 61/13 | 19/6 23/22 40/6 |
| 67/21 68/2 69/6 | 67/5 | 42/21 46/11 6 |
| 69/11 69/15 70/4 | several [2] 55/23 | 72/21 76/20 100 |
| 70/13 71/6 71/22 | 95/8 | 100/2 |
| 72/10 73/2 73/4 | shaded [1] 92/12 | show [13] 32/23 |
| 73/23 74/5 74/10 | share [4] 59/23 | 40/13 59/10 59/14 |
| 74/13 74/16 75/13 | 60/11 103/8 117/15 | 67/2 69/3 71/16 |
| 76/15 77/13 78/9 | shared [1] 21/2 | 73/18 75/18 77/13 |
| (10 80/9 80/2 | sharing [1] 25/13 | 82/11 83/7 85/4 |
| 81/4 83/2 84/3 84/7 | she [26] 8/8 9/2 | showed [3] 59/1 |
| 84/21 85/23 86/23 | 9/21 9/22 9/23 10/5 | 74/20 75/14 |
| 87/17 87/18 87/22 | 10/8 10/8 10/14 | showing [3] 8/7 |
| 88/14 88/16 91/5 | 36/22 37/9 49/19 | 45/22 68/5 |
| 99/9 99/16 | 50/2 50/23 51/2 | shown [2] 47/11 |
| 100/7 | 60/1 60/9 86/1 | 58/5 |
| semi [1] 47/7 | 96/10 96/12 96/1 | shows [11] 19/21 |
| send [1] 76/3 | 105/23 118/17 | 25/19 51/4 68/9 |
| sense [7] 35/3 48/19 | 119/21 120/15 | 68/11 69/18 72/14 |
| 49/12 80/10 86/4 | 121/3 | 72/22 73/20 73/22 |
| 11 101/10 | she's [6] 7/16 10/13 | 79/16 |
| sent [2] 12/18 12/20 | 11/11 46/7 46/9 | shy [1] 12/6 |
| separately [1] | 85/10 | sic [2] 86/21 86/21 |
| 102/15 | Shelby [1] 2/9 | side [4] 15/20 15/ |
| mber [2] | Sherman [1] 7/4 | 16/19 39/14 |
| 12/15 55/14 | shock [1] 20/12 | sides [1] 16/19 |
| ential [1] 67/4 | short [6] 16/16 | significant [3] |
| [1] 41/13 | 27/14 28/13 40/7 | 7/17 40/2 |
| service-sector [1] | 65/9 118/5 | silence [1] 100/17 |
| 41/13 ${ }^{\text {set }}$ [4] 30/16 35/2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shortchanging [1] } \\ & \mathbf{9 1 / 1 5} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{75 / 14}{\operatorname{similar}[2] 64 / 13}$ |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | slowly [1] 86/13 | 41/21 47/6 47/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| simple [14] 60/22 | small [3] 27/6 | 53/17 55/8 6 |
| 63/23 64/22 72/18 | 109/22 | 96/1 99/3 100/19 |
| 73/15 73/18 77/12 | smaller [1] 88/4 | 101/13 101/14 |
| 77/23 83/14 84/20 | SMITH [3] 4/2 | someone [1] 102/1 |
| 91/8 96/23 97/1 | 10/16 119/17 | something [14] |
| 104/18 | SNAP [1] 37/14 | 9/23 27/14 38/15 |
| simplicity [3] 96/20 | so [216] | 53/11 64/13 74/22 |
| 98/7 100/23 | sold [1] 111/3 | 79/21 86/18 91/21 |
| since [11] 21/5 24/1 | solely [1] 84/7 | 103/22 117/3 |
| 53/18 58/2 60/1 | some [55] 16/5 | 118/11 118/18 |
| 66/4 73/8 75/3 | 16/11 17/2 17/6 | 119/3 |
| 82/11 108/8 113/2 | 17/7 19/4 19/5 19/6 | sometime [1] 35/16 |
| single [8] 24/12 | 20/5 21/2 22/16 | sometimes [1] |
| 24/16 25/1 25/5 | 25/6 25/9 25/12 | 72/20 |
| 25/8 59/9 91/9 | 27/3 33/11 33/16 | somewhere [3] 53/2 |
| 100/1 | 34/7 36/14 37/6 | 64/20 65/16 |
| situation [4] 60/17 | 44/16 47/14 55/11 | sorry [13] 8/20 8/23 |
| 97/6 97/23 116/1 | 55/16 57/7 57/15 | 13/5 44/8 48/4 78/5 |
| six [17] 28/8 28/8 | 58/6 59/5 62/17 | 84/18 99/4 101/17 |
| 54/19 54/22 58/23 | 62/21 64/11 67/2 | 107/2 112/16 119/6 |
| 59/22 60/4 61/20 | 71/16 73/18 75/23 | 120/18 |
| 64/17 65/14 66/10 | 76/10 77/1 77/9 | sort [10] 20/4 25/12 |
| 84/2 113/10 115/4 | 78/2 79/7 91/2 | 33/21 42/23 49/21 |
| 117/1 118/8 119/2 | 98/13 103/7 103/18 | 56/15 76/1 79/12 |
| sixth [4] 64/23 | 103/21 105/21 | 93/5 103/1 |
| 65/17 65/18 65/23 | 108/23 111/6 | sound [1] 50/10 |
| skip [1] 58/19 | 111/17 112/14 | sounding [1] 49/4 |
| skipped [1] 84/1 | 115/15 115/17 | sounds [2] 98/1 |
| sliding [3] 101/4 | 118/22 119/9 | 110/13 |
| 101/12 102/14 <br> slightly [1] 91/4 | $\begin{aligned} & 122 / 13 \\ & \text { somebody [11] } \end{aligned}$ | spacing [1] 65/20 <br> speak [15] 5/18 |


| S | 82/18 | statistically [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| speak... [14] 5/21 | Starkey [1] 8/1 |  |
| 6/2 6/3 6/9 6/14 | start [6] 52/17 | statute [3] 54 |
| 10/19 11/5 12/17 | 77/12 93/7 101/15 | 68/13 68/21 |
| 56/5 82/19 82/21 | 113/8 122/11 | statutory [3] 53/ |
| 119/8 119/11 | starting [6] 26/3 | 54/10 54/13 |
| 11 | 106/2 106/14 | stay [1] 51/2 |
| speaker [2] 2/2 | 109/15 110/18 | STEINWIN |
| 47/16 | $113 / 3$ starts [1] 41/19 | [5] 2/21 8/16 8/22 8/23 14/8 |
| speaking [1] 46/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { starts [1] } \\ & \text { state }[20] \\ & \hline 1 / 3 \\ & 1 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | STEPHANIE [5] |
| specifically [1] 17/8 <br> spend [2] 59/4 | 2/17 26/8 28/6 | 3/14 10/7 12/3 |
| $101 / 8$ | 49/15 51/12 55/23 | 23/9 |
| spending [1] 33/5 | 58/11 66/19 69/8 | Stephen |
| spirit [1] 38/22 | 72/17 73/2 75/2 | STEPHEN |
| spoke [1] 10/8 | 86/6 86/8 96/6 | 1/12 46/8 118/ |
| sporadic [1] 41/14 | 124 | 120/6 |
| squeeze [1] 40/9 | State-Level [1] | Stephen |
| SSR [1] 86/18 | 2/17 | 118/10 |
| SSR-adjusted [1] | stated [1] 6/5 | stepped [1] 118/1 |
| 86/18 | statement [1] 52/9 | stick [2] 68/17 |
| Staff [3] 2/11 | statements [1] | 73/18 |
| 7 | 124/14 | sticker [1] 20/12 |
| staggered [6] | states [19] 20/5 | still [9] 12/14 35/22 |
| 103/15 105/10 | 20/7 20/13 20/15 | 58/2 76/19 82/10 |
| 106/4 1 | 21/4 22/14 22/1 | /3104/23 120/2 |
| staggering [1] | 26/8 28/10 28/10 | 121/3 |
|  | 44/17 55/6 58/16 | stimulus [1] 56/ |
| stamps [1] 37/15 | 66/22 67/2 68/8 | p [8] 22/20 42/11 |
| standing [2] 16/1 | 71/13 73/8 109/8 | 1/21 51/23 75/22 |
| 28/4 <br> standpoint [1] | statewide [1] 12/21 stating [1] 84/11 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 76 / 23 ~ 88 / 21 ~ 98 / 11 \\ \text { straw [2] 23/6 } \end{array}$ |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 1/15 2/14 2/17 3/2 | 99/20 100/2 100/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| straw... [1] 77/11 | 3/5 5/3 13/10 13/11 | 102/11 102/17 |
| studio [2] 38/8 | 15/11 17/2 22/16 | 116/15 117/8 121/7 |
| 38/10 | 22/17 22/22 23/3 | 121/13 124/9 |
| study [1] 51/12 | 23/15 24/2 24/7 | supposed [2] 75/17 |
| stuff [1] 80/16 | 24/11 24/14 25/1 | 94/17 |
| submit [1] 14/3 | 29/17 29/19 29/23 | Supreme [4] 3/15 |
| subsist [1] 37/16 | 30/18 31/19 31/23 | 5/2 12/11 13/3 |
| subtract [1] 32/10 | 32/14 32/20 33/9 | sure [13] 6/23 |
| subtraction [3] | 34/17 36/21 37/6 | 11/23 27/15 35/6 |
| 83/17 84/17 84/22 | 38/17 40/12 42/18 | 53/13 65/22 66/9 |
| such [3] 40/17 | 43/2 45/6 45/9 47/7 | 78/7 84/15 92/17 |
| 109/20 124/19 | 52/6 55/20 57/12 | 101/2 111/13 |
| sufficient [3] 31/22 | 59/7 59/18 60/3 | 119/17 |
| 32/13 57/20 | 60/12 60/19 61/14 | suspended [2] |
| suggest [1] 90/17 | $610 \times 716$ | switching [1] 63/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { suggested [2] 21/5 } \\ & 119 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 66/7 67/6 67/7 67/12 67/21 68/2 | system [3] 17/15 |
| esting [1] | 69/6 69/11 69/15 | 17/18 78/13 |
| 86/14 | 70/4 70/13 71/6 | T |
| suggestion [1] |  | table [3] 15/21 |
| 107/15 | 74/10 74/13 74/16 | 25/15 |
| suggestions [1] | 75/13 76/15 77/13 | take [12] 22/5 |
| 108/19 | 78/9 79/10 80/9 | 24/12 25/1 32/9 |
| suggests [2] 39/13 | 80/23 81/4 83/2 | 38/12 68/3 80/1 |
| $40 / 5$ | 84/3 84/7 84/21 | 93/20 94/3 99/13 |
| summarize [1] | $85 / 185 / 2386 / 1$ | 107/3 115/5 |
| 49/10 | 86/23 87/17 87/18 | taken [1] 99/10 |
| $\underset{\text { summer [2] 26/4 }}{ }$ | 87/22 88/14 88/16 | takes [1] 62/6 |
| 26/16 | 89/8 91/5 92/10 | taking [6] 5/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { super }[1] \quad 111 / 3 \\ & \text { support }[110] \quad 1 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | 89/8 91/5 92/10 94/5 99/16 | $25 / 5 \quad 29 / 15100 / 6$ |

talk [6] 33/11 37/5 48/18 75/10 77/2 99/3
talked [2] 32/21 89/21
talking [13] 46/3
56/18 57/4 62/14 62/18 63/4 80/11 81/22 98/6 99/14 99/21 99/21 110/19 tally [1] 105/6
TANF [1] 55/22 tasking [1] 43/20 $\operatorname{tax}[15]$ 24/4 32/7
56/13 95/21 96/4 112/1 112/2 114/8 114/13 114/22 115/14 115/18 117/8 117/23 118/13
taxable [3] 113/6 117/22 118/1 taxes [23] 24/15 24/19 24/20 25/3 25/10 29/12 32/5 32/19 37/7 37/10 95/19 96/5 97/9
97/11 98/4 98/16 99/7 106/6 113/2 113/5 113/19
114/22 120/23
taxpayer [1] 51/1 team [1] 17/16 teams [1] 81/16 tell [2] 26/12 58/6 telling [2] 46/1 110/4
tells [1] 37/17
$\operatorname{ten}[4]$ 21/22 51/15
66/23 67/18
tentatively [1]
42/19
term [2] 50/19 51/21
terms [2] 6/3 83/2
Terry [1] 2/11
test [2] 77/13 88/14
than [31] 15/18
19/10 21/4 21/8
26/9 31/3 32/13
47/13 55/5 60/12
71/6 72/8 72/9
73/17 73/23 74/4
75/1 83/17 83/23
85/22 87/10 88/4
90/9 98/14 105/14
105/15 108/10
108/19 109/17
113/4 116/7
thank [54] 7/19
8/18 9/8 9/10 9/13 10/3 10/18 10/22 11/6 11/7 11/19

12/7 12/16 13/13 13/20 14/9 14/13 14/18 14/19 15/7 15/13 17/13 31/12 31/16 36/8 49/1
50/4 54/11 66/14
77/7 78/21 87/5
90/13 91/18 92/18
92/19 94/9 94/18
104/14 105/13
107/21 108/1
110/21 112/15
120/1 120/2 120/4
120/5 120/10
120/19 121/10
122/21 122/23
123/2
Thanks [1] 120/11 that [545]
that's [84] 8/22
11/18 11/23 15/22
15/23 19/21 19/22
22/4 24/20 24/22
25/22 29/6 29/7
31/6 32/17 33/2
33/6 33/17 34/21
36/2 37/15 38/13
39/19 40/1 41/21
42/7 43/7 43/15
52/19 53/15 53/16
55/1 55/15 56/9
57/13 59/10 60/6

| T | 73/16 73/23 75/13 | 84/21 85/1 87/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| that's... [47] 62/11 | 75/15 85/21 97/22 | 88/5 90/17 92/7 |
| 63/2 63/2 63/6 | 99/15 112/18 113/8 | 93/8 93/9 93/18 |
| 63/17 66/15 66/22 | 114/17 114/20 | 93/20 96/7 97/15 |
| 67/18 68/22 69/18 | 116/6 119/15 | 97/19 98/21 103/17 |
| 72/11 72/12 76/14 | theirs [1] 75/17 | 103/19 103/20 |
| 78/16 79/10 80/8 | them [14] 6/13 | 103/20 105/19 |
| 82/5 83/18 86/5 | 11/22 22/7 65/6 | 105/22 107/4 |
| 86/10 88/9 88/18 | 66/5 70/15 102/16 | 108/10 109/15 |
| 88/19 91/9 93/14 | 103/20 112/10 | 109/16 109/17 |
| 93/16 93/17 97/10 | 115/22 116/7 | 114/10 115/22 |
| 97/16 98/18 99/12 | 117/11 117/11 | 118/22 122/19 |
| 101/15 103/3 | 121/17 | there [53] 5/14 |
| 104/21 110/21 | then [86] 6/12 14/5 | 12/19 14/2 14/10 |
| 111/13 112/12 | 18/13 19/13 23/20 | 15/15 18/8 19/6 |
| 113/21 114/2 115/5 | 25/2 25/4 28/8 | 19/17 20/6 22/20 |
| 115/6 116/3 116/14 | 29/10 29/12 30/17 | 22/21 25/11 25/12 |
| 117/14 117/23 | 32/5 34/1 34/12 | 26/19 29/12 33/10 |
| 118/23 120/12 | 37/9 37/20 38/2 | 40/22 42/11 43/19 |
| their [51] 17/16 | 40/23 41/15 42/3 | 44/16 44/18 44/21 |
| 21/10 22/10 22/17 | 44/11 44/11 44/13 | 48/17 49/8 51/5 |
| 25/3 25/7 27/9 28/2 | 50/1 54/14 54/16 | 51/23 59/6 60/7 |
| 28/12 34/16 34/18 | 55/22 56/16 60/10 | 60/15 60/16 62/3 |
| 37/23 41/10 41/11 | 60/20 63/14 64/23 | 64/16 75/22 76/23 |
| 42/1 42/4 45/20 | 68/9 69/6 69/20 | 78/1 79/5 79/7 |
| 47/10 47/12 52/21 | 70/21 71/4 71/8 | 79/19 79/21 82/23 |
| 66/4 67/8 67/15 | 72/6 72/7 72/12 | 85/4 85/21 98/6 |
| 67/20 68/13 68/17 | 73/10 73/14 73/20 | 98/11 100/17 103/2 |
| 68/19 69/6 69/9 | 74/2 74/3 74/6 | 109/19 110/12 |
| 69/21 69/22 70/11 | 74/14 74/17 74/20 | 111/18 111/20 |
| 70/12 70/13 70/16 | 74/21 74/23 75/8 | 111/21 115/14 |
| 70/17 71/12 72/4 | 76/4 80/6 80/7 81/3 | 118/22 |


| T | 32/11 33/2 33/4 | they're [1] 71/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| there's [37] 17/6 | 33/4 33/8 36/18 | They've [1] 56/13 |
| 18/13 19/15 25/5 | 37/20 37/21 38/23 | thing [12] 20/22 |
| 25/15 26/18 28/15 | 40/14 41/2 41/3 | 25/4 36/23 39/3 |
| 31/21 33/15 36/14 | 41/22 42/1 42/3 | 39/15 43/9 48/18 |
| 41/6 42/12 44/22 | 42/9 43/13 45/14 | 56/7 56/15 62/14 |
| 51/4 51/11 52/1 | 46/16 48/7 48/7 | 79/12 116/2 |
| 57/7 60/7 63/21 | 48/14 48/19 48/20 | things [11] 17/7 |
| 68/14 70/18 74/12 | 48/21 49/7 50/11 | 18/1 23/23 37/18 |
| 81/21 83/9 86/8 | 50/18 51/5 51/5 | 55/23 58/4 62/17 |
| 91/2 91/7 99/23 | 52/15 52/17 53/6 | 63/22 69/4 72/17 |
| 102/7 103/1 108/10 | 53/6 53/8 55/2 | 101/8 |
| 112/4 115/4 115/17 | 55/18 55/18 55/20 | think [90] 5/21 9/2 |
| 115/21 116/1 | 56/8 57/20 59/19 | 9/4 9/21 9/23 12/5 |
| 116/17 | 61/8 62/9 62/23 | 22/4 27/2 27/14 |
| thereof [1] 124/21 | 63/10 66/3 66/6 | 27/23 30/20 34/4 |
| these [19] 23/7 27/6 | 66/11 66/13 66/22 | 34/19 36/13 36/15 |
| 32/19 34/8 37/1 | 67/13 67/17 67/22 | 38/23 39/6 39/22 |
| 39/7 40/13 40/16 | 68/1 68/11 68/16 | 40/10 40/20 42/8 |
| 41/12 41/13 55/12 | 68/18 69/1 69/14 | 42/8 43/19 45/18 |
| 56/7 57/22 62/8 | 69/15 70/3 70/7 | 45/18 48/12 49/17 |
| 66/10 68/6 72/5 | 70/8 70/11 71/13 | 51/9 51/13 52/19 |
| 90/11 112/5 | 71/15 73/3 73/4 | 53/15 53/19 57/2 |
| these interest [1] | 73/7 73/10 73/11 | 57/16 65/6 65/18 |
| 55/12 | 73/15 75/15 83/1 | 66/15 71/17 72/11 |
| they [113] 5/11 | 83/1 85/11 85/13 | 72/15 72/16 75/2 |
| 6/13 13/6 15/17 | 85/19 85/20 85/20 | 77/1 77/3 77/5 77/8 |
| 16/4 17/14 17/17 | 87/9 91/14 99/18 | 77/10 79/13 80/12 |
| 20/11 21/11 21/21 | 101/20 102/17 | 81/20 82/16 82/17 |
| 22/11 22/13 22/18 | 103/4 112/9 113/14 | 82/22 83/5 83/9 |
| 25/2 26/13 26/16 | 114/3 116/5 119/8 | 88/10 88/11 89/21 |
| 27/7 27/8 28/12 | 119/11 119/16 | 90/6 91/2 91/12 |


| $\mathbf{T}$ | 46/18 50/7 52/2 | 20/15 21/9 21/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| think... [29] 91/23 | 56/17 57/22 59/14 | 21/20 33/8 35/7 |
| 92/23 92/23 94/16 | 61/6 61/7 61/7 | 37/10 38/21 39/5 |
| 97/14 97/14 100/4 | 62/16 63/11 63/20 | 40/18 43/6 49/5 |
| 101/10 101/16 | 64/4 64/16 66/9 | 49/7 49/10 51/11 |
| 102/2 102/7 106/3 | 68/6 69/4 69/15 | 55/5 55/18 58/22 |
| 108/20 109/5 | 69/23 70/15 71/17 | 59/1 62/1 63/9 |
| 111/16 112/4 | 72/14 72/15 72/19 | 64/18 65/5 65/10 |
| 112/13 112/17 | 72/21 72/21 72/21 | 78/12 94/3 94/10 |
| 114/11 115/1 | 73/1 74/3 74/6 | 94/22 95/14 96/9 |
| 115/14 117/3 | 74/11 75/10 75/11 | 99/15 103/10 104/1 |
| 117/21 118/2 119/9 | 77/4 78/7 79/9 | 104/9 105/9 105/14 |
| 119/21 120/15 | 80/18 80/20 82/4 | 105/23 107/21 |
| 121/3 121/14 | 83/4 83/22 84/4 | 115/4 121/15 |
| think we [1] 77/3 | 85/5 85/7 87/2 89/2 | though [8] 26/20 |
| thinking [8] 34/13 | 89/18 89/22 90/19 | 32/19 38/20 50/6 |
| 39/3 72/19 80/13 | 91/20 92/4 94/13 | 65/2 69/21 75/16 |
| 89/20 96/1 98/7 | 95/15 96/5 96/6 | 78/18 |
| 111/6 | 96/17 100/20 101/2 | thought [5] 66/10 |
| third [6] 21/15 | 101/22 104/12 | 66/21 103/10 107/1 |
| 69/19 78/13 88/23 | 106/15 107/9 110/9 | 121/10 |
| 90/19 108/4 | 111/1 111/10 112/3 | thoughtful [1] |
| this [106] 6/10 12/3 | 113/19 115/7 116/1 | 112/18 |
| 13/1 13/7 13/15 | 116/9 116/17 | thoughts [3] 95/13 |
| 13/22 14/3 14/22 | 116/17 116/22 | 103/11 111/18 |
| 15/8 15/15 18/4 | 117/1 117/17 118/5 | thousand [1] 55/19 |
| 18/19 22/9 23/5 | 125/4 | three [24] 6/4 6/5 |
| 23/6 26/15 26/18 | Thompson [2] 6/19 | 6/6 6/7 19/14 20/15 |
| 27/16 27/23 28/21 | 116/21 | 25/19 44/5 47/10 |
| 28/21 29/13 32/21 | those [48] 5/7 14/19 | 58/20 61/18 63/8 |
| 36/4 39/4 41/16 | 14/20 14/22 18/2 | 72/9 81/21 96/10 |
| 43/18 45/1 45/10 | 18/22 19/16 20/12 | 96/13 102/12 |

three... [7] 102/13
102/14 106/10
106/12 106/19
107/16 107/17
threshold [2] 61/1 67/23
thresholds [2] 62/2 62/8
through [6] 64/17 83/11 113/3 113/11 113/14 114/1 throw [3] 56/17 98/5 105/1
thumb [1] 39/19 thumbs [1] 15/3 Thursday [1] 13/5 thus [1] 77/10 tier [1] 71/22 tiered [1] 71/23 Tiffany [3] 10/22 10/23 119/20 tight [1] 38/17 time [37] 2/9 5/5 6/2 12/3 13/15 14/3 16/23 20/3 21/2 21/9 21/16 21/19 24/17 27/10 27/18 29/1 33/15 34/4 40/8 55/9 57/17 59/5 70/3 70/14 76/4 78/14 85/19

90/21 96/8 105/4 109/3 109/4 111/19 115/8 118/6 122/11 122/12
times [9] 22/2 22/6 30/6 30/7 39/17 39/18 47/22 52/14 80/21
tip [1] 100/18
Title [1] 121/14
today [8] 10/6
10/14 15/22 16/16
16/17 16/22 82/3
120/12
today's [2] 33/21 34/1
too [7] 37/5 45/16 49/19 50/2 50/8 88/1 98/1
took [2] 33/22 74/8 tool [1] 117/9
top [4] 19/20 63/14 75/9 99/11
totally [1] 70/19
toward [1] 20/3
towards [1] 113/19
tracks [1] 18/6
tradeoff [2] 50/9
91/7
train [1] 107/1
transcript [3] 13/23 14/6 124/14
treat [2] 80/6 115/12
treated [1] 83/2 trial [1] 9/23 tried [1] 9/2 trouble [1] 8/8 true [1] 124/13 truly [1] 110/12 try [2] 81/17 93/1 trying [4] 39/8 72/1 88/8 99/2
tucked [1] 69/19 turn [1] 15/9
turnip [1] 40/9
Tuscaloosa [2] 2/7 3/8
tweak [2] 98/10 115/13
twelve [1] 19/11
twice [1] 94/1
two [50] 15/15
19/14 19/20 21/14
22/2 22/6 22/15
23/23 25/15 39/17
39/18 42/2 43/12
43/16 44/5 44/12
47/22 50/15 52/13
53/6 54/4 54/4 54/5
54/8 54/18 55/3
55/6 57/5 58/3
59/14 59/22 60/6
61/18 63/4 63/10

| T | unemployment [1] | 98/20 98/22 103/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| two... [15] 64/14 | 112/ | 104/22 108/18 |
| 65/3 71/22 71/23 | uneven [1] 109/20 | 110/19 113/21 |
| 74/21 96/13 103/3 | Uniform [2] 53/20 | 118/12 119/7 |
| 106/8 106/9 106/11 | 121/8 | 121/22 122/3 |
| 106/18 107/17 | University [2] 2/7 | updated [5] 32/16 |
| 108/6 121/8 121/16 | 3/8 | 46/22 59/17 66/4 |
| two-tier [1] 71/22 | Unless [1] 122/18 | 73/9 |
| two-tiered [1] | unlikely [1] 97/15 | updates [1] 49/11 |
| 71/23 | unmute [14] 6/17 | updating [4] 15/10 |
| two-year [1] 121/16 | 8/5 8/6 11/11 14/21 | 23/18 30/14 30/17 |
| twofold [1] 33/21 | 15/2 94/11 94/12 | us [19] 5/10 11/21 |
| type [4] 5/23 21/23 | 94/23 104/10 | 46/12 49/5 49/19 |
| 64/11 98/13 | 105/17 107/7 | 49/20 90/1 90/21 |
| U | 107/22 108/14 | 95/17 99/3 103/18 |
| Uh [2] 81/9 87/13 | 104/15 104/22 | 108/22 109/7 |
| Uh-huh [2] 81/9 | unpaid [2] 51/11 | 120/12 120/16 |
| 87/13 | 56/9 | 121/20 122/2 |
| under [5] 13/10 | until [4] 12/14 | USDA [3] 37/11 |
| 13/11 64/12 113/10 | 26/17 46/14 56/19 | 37/12 37/17 |
| 118/3 | up [43] 8/8 17/6 | use [23] 24/10 |
| underground [1] | 24/6 26/17 27/16 | 30/23 31/2 37/21 |
| 50/23 | 36/21 37/11 44/18 | 43/14 44/8 44/9 |
| underlying [1] | 45/6 45/20 47/4 | 44/12 57/6 60/23 |
| 90/22 | 49/20 53/5 56/16 | 62/10 62/16 65/10 |
| understand [3] | 57/1 59/10 61/13 | 67/19 74/1 74/21 |
| 45/10 86/13 100/23 | 71/18 74/11 75/18 | 74/22 76/15 78/9 |
| understanding [1] | 77/14 79/9 82/11 | 81/16 97/18 97/20 |
| 23/8 | 83/18 84/22 88/3 | 102/6 |
| understood [2] | 89/1 91/21 91/23 | used [15] 18/15 |
| 57/13 92/18 | 93/11 97/13 98/19 | 18/17 22/3 23/23 |


| $\mathbf{U}$ | Venohr's [1] 121/2 | 84/9 94/10 104/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| used... [11] 27/19 | version [1] 97/2 | visual [2] 5/17 |
| 27/19 37/13 39/19 | versions [1] 15/15 | 88/ |
| 61/14 65/18 75/16 | versus [4] 47/18 | voice [1] 9/16 |
| 75/20 102/1 117/9 | 48/1 113/18 114/23 | vote [20] 23/5 77/12 |
| 117/10 | very [31] 12/8 15/7 | 93/19 93/20 94/3 |
| user [2] 60/23 65/3 | 16/10 16/10 17/11 | 94/11 94/12 94/14 |
| using [16] 20/16 | 17/16 18/23 18/23 | 94/17 94/20 103/17 |
| 24/20 25/20 30/23 | 19/3 19/6 25/16 | 103/18 104/10 |
| 31/10 38/7 57/8 | 31/6 32/23 43/17 | 104/16 104/18 |
| 60/11 63/5 64/13 | 43/23 52/20 58/13 | 105/17 107/3 107/8 |
| 67/23 70/5 96/11 | 69/16 72/15 72/16 | 107/22 122/17 |
| 105/10 105/21 | 73/3 73/15 82/5 | voted [4] 20/16 |
| 110/7 | 82/6 91/16 100/13 | 94/16 105/16 |
| usual [1] 124/21 | 102/6 103/7 112/17 | 110/11 |
| usually [7] 26/13 | 114/12 114/12 | votes [4] 77/11 |
| 27/19 27/19 28/12 | via [2] 1/18 124/15 | 105/5 105/6 108/2 |
| 48/20 76/13 81/15 | Vicki [4] 11/14 | W |
| V | 120/17 | wage [29] 24/17 |
| value [2] 82/22 83/ | video [2] 3/13 12/12 | 25/23 26/2 26/7 |
| variable [3] 40/20 | videoconference [1] | 26/9 26/12 $26 / 21$ |
| 65/11 97/4 | 1/19 | 27/6 27/11 27/18 |
| varied [1] 95/21 | view [1] 116/13 | 28/2 29/1 36/ |
| vast [1] 41/7 | violence [1] 50/17 | 36/19 42/1 45/20 |
| VENOHR [15] 2/3 | Virginia [10] 61/7 | 70/11 70/12 70/14 |
| 10/12 10/12 15/9 | 61/16 64/14 65/5 | 70/16 71/8 78/14 |
| 15/12 89/21 90/17 | 65/14 65/21 66/21 | 78/17 85/14 96/4 |
| 95/17 100/20 | 68/1 68/13 73/12 | 97/13 97/22 98/9 |
| 105/20 106/22 | Virginia's [1] 64/8 | 98/22 |
| 107/15 108/22 | Virtual [1] 1/19 | wait [1] 116/7 |
| 111/19 122/5 | visible [4] 14/20 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { want [47] } 6 / 13 \\ 20 / 12 ~ 24 / 12 ~ 24 / 14 ~ \end{array}$ |


| W | 26/19 26/22 27/2 | 8/13 8/14 100/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| want... [43] 25/1 | 27/11 33/23 33/23 | way [19] 6/8 35/11 |
| 40/6 42/17 43/9 | 34/18 35/19 36/19 | 39/10 46/17 50/13 |
| 45/5 49/21 50/12 | 41/3 42/20 45/11 | 53/8 61/12 69/19 |
| 55/14 63/8 67/14 | 45/16 47/21 48/2 | 77/21 77/23 79/7 |
| 71/16 72/17 76/2 | 48/6 48/15 49/19 | 83/14 85/16 86/5 |
| 76/5 76/8 76/9 | 54/6 55/7 56/12 | 88/19 88/20 92/9 |
| 76/10 76/15 76/16 | 57/17 59/6 60/14 | 103/22 110/18 |
| 77/13 77/16 77/22 | 62/3 62/4 62/6 | we [223] |
| 82/17 82/18 83/11 | 65/17 65/19 65/22 | we'll [2] 73/18 |
| 90/2 90/16 93/2 | 67/11 67/15 67/20 | 93/18 |
| 94/19 98/5 101/9 | 67/23 68/20 70/3 | we've [2] 20/4 |
| 101/17 105/1 106/1 | 70/21 75/5 75/7 | 32/21 |
| 106/5 106/6 107/1 | 79/16 80/1 83/5 | wealth [1] 121/20 |
| 108/4 109/21 112/8 | 83/6 83/7 87/23 | website [2] 13/10 |
| 119/11 119/18 | 92/10 92/11 92/14 | 15/16 |
| 120/3 | 92/17 94/16 95/19 | Wednesday [2] |
| wanted [17] 26/11 | 96/1 96/2 96/12 | 13/5 13/7 |
| 44/7 44/9 44/12 | 96/14 99/8 100/16 | week [11] 32/4 |
| 46/7 53/12 56/6 | 102/2 104/19 106/2 | 40/19 40/20 40/20 |
| 59/4 66/8 67/19 | 106/10 107/15 | 40/23 41/15 41/15 |
| 74/9 74/18 97/3 | 107/16 109/10 | 41/23 42/2 118/20 |
| 98/12 98/23 115/11 | 109/12 109/13 | 118/21 |
| 119/8 | 109/15 109/16 | weekend [1] 123/1 |
| wants [1] 115/6 | 113/18 114/5 114/7 | welcome [2] 5/2 |
| was [95] 1/16 12/19 | 114/16 114/19 | 111/14 |
| 12/20 14/1 17/1 | 115/14 121/11 | well [31] 12/8 14/21 |
| 17/11 17/20 18/6 | Washington [1] | 39/4 39/11 39/11 |
| 18/10 18/17 20/2 | 73/2 | 45/13 46/12 47/5 |
| 20/3 21/11 21/18 | wasn't [1] 48/17 | 51/10 56/1 56/11 |
| 21/19 22/1 24/8 | wave [2] 5/11 10/12 | 59/7 60/2 60/14 |
| 24/17 26/4 26/15 | waving [4] 5/13 | 68/23 69/1 72/21 |


| W | 37/16 38/16 39/8 | 28/1 28/14 32/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| well... [14] 73/21 | 40/3 41/15 41/2 | 34/16 37/2 37/4 |
| 76/18 77/19 78/23 | 42/20 44/6 47/16 | 37/5 39/6 39/7 |
| 90/23 92/22 93/2 | 49/10 50/14 55/2 | 43/13 48/19 50/6 |
| 102/9 104/17 | 55/7 56/2 56/5 | 54/6 58/21 59/15 |
| 105/19 108/17 | 56/18 57/13 59/4 | 59/19 60/4 66/9 |
| 111/10 112/23 | 63/17 64/6 67/19 | 71/5 71/18 72/5 |
| 118/18 | 67/22 69/4 69/14 | 72/18 74/4 83/13 |
| well-being [1] | 70/18 70/23 71/1 | 91/3 91/16 92/1 |
| 51/10 | 71/5 71/14 72/14 | 92/5 92/11 102/2 |
| Weller [1] 10/4 | 74/7 74/11 75/14 | 104/22 105/2 115/9 |
| went [2] 22/14 | 76/1 76/19 78/6 | where [44] 15/23 |
| 98/22 | 78/8 79/13 79/15 | 16/4 16/23 19/21 |
| were [22] 15/16 | 80/1 81/20 84/5 | 20/2 23/3 23/13 |
| 17/1 17/7 17/9 | 86/10 86/14 86/16 | 25/16 27/16 28/23 |
| 17/23 18/7 18/15 | 87/12 91/9 91/13 | 30/15 42/7 42/20 |
| 18/23 19/2 19/2 | 92/8 93/10 95/6 | 43/4 49/22 52/23 |
| 20/13 21/11 41/3 | 95/17 97/5 97/21 | 53/20 57/18 60/9 |
| 42/20 48/7 48/7 | 98/1 100/18 102/6 | 60/16 60/17 61/1 |
| 52/8 57/4 57/5 96/9 | 102/18 103/14 | 62/22 64/14 64/17 |
| 98/22 100/14 | 107/15 109/7 | 66/23 68/11 68/23 |
| weren't [1] 48/14 | 109/10 110/4 114/7 | 69/6 69/8 69/17 |
| West [11] 61/7 | 114/18 115/6 | 74/9 76/12 79/2 |
| 61/16 64/8 64/13 | 117/14 120/9 | 79/11 79/17 80/2 |
| 65/5 65/14 65/21 | what's [4] 37/17 | 80/8 81/7 81/8 |
| 66/21 68/1 68/12 | 63/11 68/12 89/13 | 81/23 82/2 85/13 |
| 73/12 | whatever [8] 33/23 | 99/20 |
| what [81] 16/22 | 36/3 44/2 45/15 | Wherein [1] 68/18 |
| 18/2 18/17 21/8 | 68/3 74/18 89/10 | wherever [1] 80/7 |
| 23/22 25/14 26/11 | 103/17 | whether [11] 42/20 |
| 29/5 31/9 31/18 | when [37] 5/20 | 53/5 57/6 62/20 |
| 33/22 36/4 37/11 | 12/1 26/13 27/17 | 76/4 76/9 76/16 |



| W | \|48/9 56/7 57/21 | 50/3 51/15 52/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| working... [5] 20/5 | 11 | 53/7 54/4 54/5 54/5 |
| 41/21 110/14 | wrench [1] 56/17 | 54/8 54/18 54/22 |
| 110/18 112/8 | write [1] 71/18 | 55/3 113/10 113/2 |
| works [1] 61/11 | written [4] 13/3 | 121/8 |
| worksheet [50] | 13/14 35/11 77/21 | yes [13] 6/15 9/7 |
| 23/17 24/3 24/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wrong [2] 23/10 } \\ & 96 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | 12/13 12/19 31/16 <br> 46/6 54/2 77/6 83/4 |
| 31/14 44/15 58/5 |  | 88/6 93/14 106/20 |
| 58/7 58/10 58/15 | Y | 88/6 93/14 106/20 120/18 |
| 58/17 59/8 61/8 | yea [1] 14/21 | yet [3] 114/1 11 |
| 63/16 63/19 66/20 | yeah [31] 31/8 31/8 | yet [3] 114/1 114/2 115/5 |
| 67/8 68/10 68/13 | 34/22 36/9 36/12 |  |
| 68/17 68/19 69/5 | 40/10 43/5 45/17 | York's [1] 71/21 |
| 69/16 70/7 71/21 | 49/13 55/11 56/2 | you [483] |
| 74/7 74/9 75/12 $75 / 1675 / 1976 / 6$ | 63/21 84/15 85/5 | you're [3] 55/4 |
| $75 / 16 ~ 75 / 19 ~ 76 / 6 ~$ $76 / 1676 / 187 / 14$ | 86/16 87/5 88/12 | 56/22 84/3 |
| 76/16 76/18 77/14 79/1 79/2 79/18 | 91/11 98/17 98/19 | you've [1] 84/1 |
| $79 / 179 / 279 / 18$ $80 / 281 / 3$ 81/8 82/2 | 98/20 99/4 99/13 | you-all [7] 15/7 |
| 80/2 81/3 81/8 82/2 82/8 82/9 82/12 | 100/16 109/9 110/6 | 17/9 82/4 86/8 |
| $82 / 882 / 982 / 12$ 82/23 83/7 90/5 | 112/2 114/6 118/7 | 100/12 117/16 |
| 82/23 83/7 90/5 90/8 90/8 91/12 | 119/4 120/17 | $122 / 22$ |
| 90/8 90/8 91/12 102/21 | year [22] 18/7 18/9 | young [1] 114/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102/21 } \\ & \text { worksheets [3] } \end{aligned}$ | 18/11 22/9 28/11 | your [41] 5/12 5/22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { worksheets [3] } \\ & \mathbf{6 3 / 1 1 ~ 6 5 / 4 ~ 7 1 / 1 9} \end{aligned}$ | 33/23 51/17 66/18 | 6/16 8/19 14/14 |
| workshop [1] 84/9 | 70/16 70/16 72/7 | 15/22 16/3 28/22 |
| world's [1] 5/15 | 73/8 73/10 113/6 | 45/4 55/6 55/22 |
| worried [4] 36/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 113 / 7115 / 71 \\ & 116 / 9117 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 56/4 56/9 56/10 |
| 47/17 113/12 118/8 | 117/12 121/16 | 74/8 75/2 75/8 76/2 |
| worst [1] 5/15 | 125/4 | 76/5 78/10 80/1 |
| would [174] | years [18] 21/22 | 86/9 |
| wouldn't [5] 25/2 | $22 / 15 \text { 27/13 28/13 }$ | 95/1 97/23 103/8 |
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