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PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. Good morning, folks. We appreciate everyone coming. Obviously we miss Bob because Stephanie --

MS. BLACKBURN: Obviously.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- is wearing multiple hats today. So, and as luck would have it, a little snafu at the beginning, but that's okay. We are now able to get up and function. So, we are happy to have Dr. Jane Venohr join us from the Worldwide Web.

Let me remind everybody -- I think y'all know our Court Reporter, Jeana Boggs. And as always, don't do I do, do as I say, which is to ask you to identify yourself and not to speak over would be helpful to her.

And anything else I need to remind them?

THE COURT REPORTER: No.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank
you. She does a great job listening to us
and typing and do all the things that good court reporters do.

We are going to start by having everyone to introduce themself. First, we will start with the Committee and then we will go with the public. If anybody from the public has not signed up, there is a list to sign for the public, and there is an agenda over there. But we will start.

Judge, would you like to start by introducing yourself?

HON. WILLIAMS: Yes. Good morning. I'm Judge Calvin Williams, Circuit Judge, Montgomery County Family Court.

PROFESSOR GRAY: I'm Brian Gray. I'm Professor of Emeritus of Statistics at the University of Alabama.

HON. SHERMAN: I am Michael
Sherman. I'm a Circuit Judge down in Mobile handling domestic relations cases.

MS. SULLIVAN: Joan-Marie
Sullivan. I'm a practicing attorney in

Huntsville, Alabama.
HON. PALMER: Julie Palmer, Child
Support Referee, Shelby County.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: And I'm Penny
Davis. I'm the Chair of the Committee.
MS. BLACKBURN: Stephanie
Blackburn. I work with the Supreme Court
Clerk's office. I'm the liaison.
MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries. I'm an attorney in Mobile.

MS. BUSH: Jennifer Bush with DHR
Legal.
MS. MCCLENNEY: Lathesia
McClenney, Child Support Director, DHR.
MR. WHITMIRE: Drew Whitmire,
Attorney in Birmingham.
MS. BALDWIN: Melody Baldwin, Assistant DA, Fifth Circuit.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: And we will start over here with the public.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I'm Scott
Johnson. I'm an attorney, and just visiting to learn.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: We're happy to have you. Thank you, Scott.

MR. SMITH: I am Cliff Smith, DHR Policy Manager for Child Support.

MS. CLARK: Lisa Clark, Policy Program Specialist.

MS. HOWELL: Vernecia Howell, DHR Policy.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Thank you all for coming. I will ask now and also ask at the end does anybody from the public want to speak at this point?

MR. SMITH: No.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All right. Well, thank you.

Stephanie, do before we have a quorum?

MS. BLACKBURN: I am so happy to say that we do have a quorum.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. Yay.
MS. BLACKBURN: It's wonderful.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: And I would like
to say thank all of you for making a
special effort to come, many of you from Mobile, Tuscaloosa, and then going back via Huntsville to teach a class and then going back to Tuscaloosa. So, may get the mileage award, which means nothing other than gratitude for that. And we especially appreciate everyone making an effort to have a quorum today. We do hope to be able to tend to business today.

Stephanie, will you talk about our notice to the media?

MS. BLACKBURN: Yes. On October 12th, a notice when out to the media outlets that we were having a meeting with the Child Support Committee here today and the public was invited.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Did the public respond with any documents they would like to share with the Committee?

MS. BLACKBURN: No. I have not received any.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank you very much.

All right. Everyone has a packet in front of you that's got the information we're looking at. The first thing is the transcript. And so, does anyone have any changes or recommendations with regard to the transcript?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. If not, do I hear a motion to approve the transcript?

HON. SHERMAN: So moved.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Thank you,
Judge. Do I have a second?
MS. SULLIVAN: Second.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Second. Okay. So, we have moved and a second. All in favor say "aye."
(Committee members saying
"aye").
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank
you.
All right. We are immediately
going to jump into business that's on the
agenda unless someone has something first that we need to bring to the attention of the Committee.
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. The first
item of business is the report from the Shared Physical Custody Reimbursement, Child Support Committee, and that is -there is a memorandum that you will see relating to that.

Now, we have listed on the agenda Melody as the Chair, but she's having throat issues. And Judge Sherman had already been involved in doing some of the drafting. And so, he has graciously agreed to present that also.

HON. SHERMAN: Yes. So, you have the memo dated November 4th that our Subcommittee drafted, and you see we are proposing to present to the Supreme Court an amendment to Rule 32 that would create what we have called a Shared Physical Custody Adjustment for child support where
there's 50/50 custody.
This is -- The language in this proposed Rule that's in this memorandum is identical in substance to the language that was presented at last month's Child Support Committee meeting. We made some revisions to them primarily to correct some typographical mistakes, one I think, but also some stylistic changes for clarity that did not change the substance of the proposal. The only thing substantive that we've changed since the last meeting is in paragraph -subparagraph (c) where we had originally talked about in this -- let me back up for a second for those who weren't here.

There was some concern of this joint or Shared Custody Adjustment being applied in certain cases, and one of the parents negotiating to get that with no real intent to actually exercise their shared custody but rather to get a reduction in child support.

And so, to address that, we wanted to present -- have some mechanism in the Rule to allow judges to remove the adjustment or recalculate child support as if there was no shared custody in those cases. So, this is what subparagraph (c) is about.

And the proposal is, as it's written right now -- and this is a slight change from last month -- is that if that parent -- let's just say it's the father for ease of reference. If the father is not exercising his shared custody 50/50 as set out in the agreement but he got the benefit of it, and the mother petitions the court to have the court remove that adjustment or recalculate child support as if that wasn't in place, the test that we had in there now is, if the father has not exercised 14 of his overnight -- 14 days of his visitation within the preceding 12 months. It did say within the past calendar year -- 14 days in the past
calendar year, and we changed that preceding 12 months with the idea of, you know, if on February 1st a petition is filed the look-back would only be 30 days; whereas, if you do 12 months, you have got a better representation of what he is actually exercising in that instance.

So, that's really the only
substantive changes, changing it from 14
days within the preceding calendar years and 14 days within the 12 months preceding the filing of the petition. It does require a petition. And I think it's important to note that what we are talking about there is that it would give the court the ability to find that to be a reason to change child support without respect to whether custody is being modified. I think in most of those cases, that mother in the example I gave would be also asking to modify custody potentially. But whether they did or they didn't, it would be grounds to modify the child
support and remove this Shared Custody Adjustment.

So, I won't go through the entire Rule because we covered it at the last meeting, but I did want to point out that was the subjective change.

The other thing we've done since the last meeting is come up with a draft of some Committee Comments, which you see is the last two pages of that memorandum.

And that is the report of our Subcommittee, and I am happy to answer any questions. And I'm sure Melody, to the extent she can, is happy to do also.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, I will open up the floor for any questions from the Committee members.

Judge?
HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.
I want to thank the Subcommittee.
I think they have done a great work on putting this together. I just have one thought or a question, and it may be
immaterial to moving forward on the adoption of these changes.

But is there a need to say at "for more than 14 days into 12 months immediately preceding" as opposed to just leaving it more than 14 days in the 12 months preceding? So, we narrow it to the 12 months immediately preceding --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: You're suggesting the word "immediately"?

HON. WILLIAMS: -- so no one can suggest that it's an open period of 12 months prior to the filing. I don't want attorneys coming in and saying, well, you know, we only counted 12 months but not immediately preceding.

HON. SHERMAN: I think certainly the intent that it's the immediately preceding. It may add some clarity if we have that in there. It's a good suggestion I think.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes. Anybody have any other thoughts?

So, it would be added on subsection (c) --

HON. WILLIAMS: And (d).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- and (d).
HON. PALMER: And on that topic --
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Let me see. Is there another spot on the Comments?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. The last paragraph, Penny. Well, the last two paragraphs actually.

HON. SHERMAN: Yes.
MS. BALDWIN: Judge Sherman, this is Melody Baldwin.

And the only thing I think I would add as we are considering whether or not we are going to recommend, as with whatever changes we make today, is that subparagraph (b) of paragraph (d).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: (d) as in "dog."
MS. BALDWIN: (b) as in "boy."
PROFESSOR DAVIS: (b) as in "boy." Okay.

MS. BALDWIN: Relying on which
form the Committee actually ultimately votes on which we haven't done. There was a straw vote when we didn't have a quorum that we liked the form that was the shorter version, the Vermont form without the cross-credits as Professor Gray presented before us today. Everybody has a copy of it. Because that language would have to be changed probably. I don't remember what the line numbers were on the other form. So, that's just something I thought we need.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Are the line
numbers -- Well, we have in front of us the form. So, we can double-check the line numbers now. And so, did you -Professor Gray, did you use the same line numbers that were in here?

PROFESSOR GRAY: It should match.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: It should match
up. That's what I assumed. Let's double-check. So...

HON. SHERMAN: The reference --
this is Judge Sherman.
The reference to Line 10 it says each parent child-support obligation, which is what is on that form, reference to Line 13 is correct as it is. But I think Melody's point is that we haven't yet adopted the Worksheet. So, if we adopted a different Worksheet, we need to rephrase that paragraph.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: That's an excellent point. I was thinking we might want to look at them together once we looked at especially this and then also look at the form. But that's a good point. So, if we for some reason -- I don't think we will change it, but if we do change, you are right, we will need to do that.

HON. PALMER: Julie Palmer. The only thing that I see now that Judge made that comment about "immediate" and maybe this is the exact same thing, but 12 consecutive months preceding a filing
versus just 12 months.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, you want it to read -- Tell me exactly how you want it to read.

HON. PALMER: Twelve consecutive months preceding the filing of the petition to modify, versus just 12 months.

HON. SHERMAN: So, we take out "the" before that?

HON. PALMER: Possibly.
HON. SHERMAN: The 12 --
HON. PALMER: Uh-huh (positive response) .

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Filing of the petition to modify.

HON. PALMER: Fourteen days in twelve months preceding the filing.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, immediately preceding? You want to leave in "immediately."

HON. PALMER: Oh, yeah, definitely.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay.

HON. PALMER: Just take the word "the" out. Yes.

HON. SHERMAN: And add
"consecutive" after "12"?
HON. WILLIAMS: I think we could use either/or when you use the
"consecutive," or we can use
"immediately," whichever one I guess is a better flow, better word.

MS. BALDWIN: Well, to make it absolutely clear, you can leave in both.

HON. SHERMAN: A room full of judges and lawyers.

MS. BALDWIN: Leave it in.
HON. WILLIAMS: Okay. Fourteen days and --

HON. SHERMAN: So, it would read -- what we are saying is the proposal would read "fails to exercise his or her physical custody of a child for more than 14 days" -- would it say -- "in 12 consecutive months immediately preceding"?

HON. WILLIAMS: Yes. 14 days and

12 consecutive months immediately preceding.

HON. SHERMAN: We would make that change in subparagraph (c) and (d) and in the last two paragraphs of the Committee Comments.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, leave in the word "12" -- "in the 12"?

HON. WILLIAMS: No. Take out the --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Take out "the 12 months."

PROFESSOR GRAY: I would keep the
"the" because there are a lot of 12 consecutive months immediately preceding.

HON. WILLIAMS: Twelve consecutive months. It makes sense.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, it would be, "Fails to exercise his or her physical custody for 14 days in the 12 consecutive months immediately preceding"?

HON. SHERMAN: Yes.
HON. WILLIAMS: There would be no
confusion there.
HON. PALMER: Well, we think.
MS. BLACKBURN: We will find a way I'm sure.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Other thoughts? Any more belts and suspenders we need to do?

MR. JEFFRIES: Penny, Jim Jeffries.

I had a concern about the language generally describing 14 days in (c) "fails to exercise 14 days" and then just because --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: And that would be changed if we decide that to "in 12 consecutive months immediately preceding."

MR. JEFFRIES: Right. What I'm -This is kind of a comment and a suggestion. But I like the language in (d) where it specifically says the parent willfully failed to exercise his or her physical custody. I think that's a good clarification for parents who change their
schedule voluntarily which is, of course, encouraged.

HON. SHERMAN: Like, by agreement of the parents you mean?

MR. JEFFRIES: By agreement or work schedule or something that's not necessarily willful.

HON. PALMER: An illness. An illness.

MR. JEFFRIES: An illness. I think the word "willfully" is a good term to use in (d), and I wonder if maybe for clarity it needs to be in (c) as well. That would be my comment.

HON. WILLIAMS: Well, I think the distinction between (c) and (d), if I am not mistaken, is that it gives the court a discretion to find if the petition alleges that the parent failed to do this exercise visitation in this period, that the Court find that he or she willfully did so and posed the appropriate, I guess, remedy to it.

MR. JEFFRIES: I don't disagree, Judge. And I noted as well in (c) that it says "may consider" --

HON. WILLIAMS: Yes.
MR. JEFFRIES: -- not necessarily
"shall." I mean, there is a lot of discretion there.

HON. SHERMAN: The idea -- So, originally before this current -- this is Judge Sherman. Sorry. I forgot about that.

Before this original draft that we landed on, there was discussion that there be almost -- I forget the language we were using, but basically that in my example, I said "father." So, in that case, that the father might have to pay back the mother all of the benefit he had received in the lower child support all the way back to whenever the order was done. And we saw a lot of problems with that. I saw a lot of problems with that in terms of trial courts trying to determine when did they
stop doing it and counting days, and there would be so much litigation --

MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.
HON. SHERMAN: -- and factual
dispute. And so, we are tried to narrow the focus. And in only -- We tied it, first of all, to the petition. So, it can't just be, you know, the mother -- in my example, the mother -- is just allowing the father not to exercise it without doing anything and that rolls on for years, and then maybe dad files a petition to modify child support, and she says, okay, fine, I am countersuing you for all the money you owe me for the last four years.

So, we tried to narrow the focus, but we were still making a distinction. We still wanted there to be potentially some financial disincentive to a party to do what we are trying to avoid they are doing, which is why we included (d) to allow them to be on the hook, so to speak,
for that petitioning party's attorney's fees and costs for having to do that. And in that instance, because there was going to be a financial penalty, so to speak, we felt like we had to raise the burden a little bit is what you are pointing out to the willfulness.

And so, it was an intentional
decision to have it in (d) and not in (c), but we did discuss it or at least I thought about whether it should be or shouldn't be, and I am certainly open to that discussion. You know, as a trial judge, we did -- I felt comfortable with it as it is because it is so discretionary in the trial court. I mean, if somebody is trying a case with me in the example you gave or Judge Palmer where the person has been hospitalized, I mean, that's not -- I don't think that is what the Rule is intending. But we could consider adding that language to see, and it would certainly raise the bar to that
modification of child support, I think, if that's what we want to do.

MR. JEFFRIES: Or it could be something in the Comments that's more instructional about that?

HON. SHERMAN: I also thought about the Committee Comments talking about the distinction, willful not. I didn't do that in these Committee Comments and maybe some language about why we included it in (d) if that's what we ended up doing and not in (c) and some examples when it would be willful, you know, it could be instructive to trial courts.

MS. SULLIVAN: Joan-Marie Sullivan.

I serve on this Committee as the Past-President of the Family Law Section. And obviously when this initial draft came out, I polled my Committee members and many of them have problems with that 14 days just because it's such a defined number. I mean, obviously I didn't
prevail in my argument with this Committee.

But I know that Penny presented it at our recent CLE, and I think there were about 70 attorneys there. And some of them had talked about, like, could we put a provision here that said if it's done by agreement so that maybe something that's in the Committee Comments that, when you presented that, I remember that was one of the comments that you received at the time. But, yeah, I --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. And I think based on a prior conversation, the thought was that by having judicial discretion, that what would happen in front of the judges the party would say: We agree to it. So --

MS. SULLIVAN: Sure.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- you know, you could choose a word less than willful but more than just the failure. You could have "unexcused" or something like that
which might --
HON. SHERMAN: If Jim, with his experience, and Joan-Marie with hers and these other lawyers that they have talked to think that's a red flag, we probably need to address it somehow however we decide to address it.

MS. SULLIVAN: As I explained previously, and I'm in a land of engineers, and I think they are going to go, oh, 14 days, we are done.

HON. SHERMAN: Yeah.
MS. SULLIVAN: And so, you know, I want there to be some more disincentive for people to take something back when it's done by agreement, and certainly don't want to quell the ability for parties to coparent.

HON. SHERMAN: You want them to agree, as you said. And if it does come before a trial court, that's a difficult issue for a judge, you know, to exercise that discretion in. It often comes down
to just he said/she said in trying to evaluate their credibility. There may not be any documentary evidence, text, or anything else that said that they did agree to it when, in fact, they may have. And I don't think we are trying to punish the father, in my example, in that instance if the parties agree and they had a legitimate reason to agree, his work schedule changed or something.

So, I mean, I think it's a valid concern.

HON. WILLIAMS: I think -- I think it gives the parent the right to say, in my view based on my perception, is a petition worth filing because he or she has missed these days or these periods, and then it's up to the court to determine if that was a willful act. Because the court's determination on finding may be well different than the petitioner's belief. Right?

So, I think that's why it's left
to the court's discretion to find that it was willful in spite of what the pleadings say.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Is there a word other than "willful"?

HON. SHERMAN: You could say something like "without just cause" or -MR. JEFFRIES: "Excessive" is something that I thought about. An excessive number of days in the 12 months.

HON. SHERMAN: That could become very subjective.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. I think the -- Well, the Committee could certainly revisit the issue of settling on a set time. You could have -- I thought your objection was not the 14 days per sè but the fact that it was not without excuse or willful or something like that.

MR. JEFFRIES: That was.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay.
MR. JEFFRIES: And I just -- I see kind of -- To Joan-Marie's point, I see
this 14-day window being something that is overly suggestive. I don't know any other way to say it.

MS. SULLIVAN: And what I had voiced prior is, you know, I am concerned that you are going to have a parent who really needs the other parent to take the child, and they are going to go, oh, crap, if I go beyond that 14 days, I am going to get a hit on my child support and then just keep them in a room with a tablet, you know, with a babysitter that doesn't need to be there just so that they can make sure that they don't fall within that 14-day frame. And I has expressed concern about that 14-day number, as well, instead of, you know, a substantial amount of visitation. But I understand that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, your primary objective is if it's without agreement of the parties?

MS. SULLIVAN: I just think the 14 days is such a tight number that, you
know, it will just sort of -- I mean, people are going to adding up and go, oh, we are on day 14, let's go, instead of trying to coparent.

MR. JEFFRIES: And to that point, as well, we are missing sort of a category I think of non-agreed missing of days where the other party, the father in our example, has some legitimate reason. He wants to go to a wedding -- I am just, you know -- I mean, 14 days over the period of 12 months can be accumulatively met fairly easily I would think. Just under different circumstances. You know, if you had somebody that gets COVID and can't exercise for seven days or five days, however, seven, I guess it would be, because you have to include the weekends if it was a week-to-week thing. And then all of a sudden you are into -- once that one week occurs, you are into only seven more days cushion: If it is not by agreement, you know, I am going to the

Bahamas with my girlfriend and I am not about going to be able to pick up the kids. Oh, no, you're not, you better -you know.

That's what -- I mean, that's
more --
HON. SHERMAN: The point contrary, though, to -- So, I hear the concern that having a bright line would suggest filing more frequently maybe than we might want. However, I think you can make the exact same point if it's a subjective test. If we said, for example, if the -- if one of the parents misses a significant -- fails to exercise a significant amount of their time, well, you are going to have people in your office saying that the four days he didn't exercise was significant.

MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
HON. SHERMAN: And it is not the 14 -- it's not close to 14. So, I mean, I think you can -- you're going to have that issue to the extent that people are even
educated on what the rule says. I mean, most of them are going to be hearing lawyers telling them what the Rule says. But to the extent that they are educated on what the Rule says, I think you are going to have the same issue and ultimately it's going to come down to getting sound, legal advice from lawyers and judges applying the Rule fairly and consistently however we define it. So, I would -- I mean, I am not set in stone on any of this. I am willing to listen to all of the benefit from the wisdom of this group. But I prefer -- I mean, I like having a bright-line test but making it discretionary.

And then, if we wanted to say
something like, where I thought you were going, Jim, was something more like it is not just 14 days. There has to be some other element to it whether it's willful or it's without just cause or absent an agreement or some other language; that
there's still a brighter line for judges and trial courts and lawyers and everything, but also that it excepts from it some of these instances, valid instances, that y'all are raising. MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries. It does say clearly more than 14 days, and it says "may."

HON. SHERMAN: Yes. Right.
MR. JEFFRIES: So, to your point, I hear what you are saying too.

MS. SULLIVAN: But as a practitioner, I think I am going to have an easier job convincing my client that it doesn't fall into this if it says something more nebulous, you know, and say that's not significant, instead of, oh, it's 14 days, here we go.

So, you know, I understand. I think, if nothing else, we have to have something in it that says "without undue cause" or something that gives us a little bit more ability to convince ours clients
that this is not what the intent of this is.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. Penny Davis. I actually remembered.

I think we settled on more than 14 days because that's a month that they didn't exercise their visitation rights. Because if you have 50/50, then that's more than a month that they didn't, which is a significant amount --

MR. JEFFRIES: Totally.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- from our perspective. But we could add -- Getting back to the willful versus agreements, we could add something after where it says, "a parent fails to exercise his or her physical custody of a child," and then we say something like "without agreement of the other party for more than -- other parent for more than," that way you at least have the argument that parties agree to it which if that -- if that's your concern, primary concern, is that you want
people to be able to trade out their time and to agree to it. Then I think that would --

HON. SHERMAN: I would --
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- resolve that and still give the judge discretion in other instances.

HON. SHERMAN: I would respectfully disagree.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay.
HON. SHERMAN: And the reason is that I think, to Joan-Marie's point, we want them to coparent and agree. And if we tie the language to agreement, they are just not going to agree in the first place. Right?

MR. JEFFRIES: Right. Yeah.
HON. SHERMAN: So, if we make it something like without undue cause or just cause --

MS. SULLIVAN: Without just cause.
HON. WILLIAMS: Sufficient cause --

HON. SHERMAN: -- without sufficient cause.

HON. WILLIAMS: -- failed to exercise.

HON. SHERMAN: And we could include in the Committee Comments that one of the things that doesn't meet that, if we wanted to specifically mention agreements -- we can do it in the Comments -- to help lawyers and judges understand what we intended.

I would be a little hesitant to put that in the actual Rule itself, just personally. I think that might undermine our desire that parents try to work those things out and agree. And if the language says, oh, if I agree to this, that goes away, then they are less likely I think.

HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.
So, I am thinking this is kind of tantamount to a show-cause petition, which, you know, we use in contempt proceedings where we get the other party
to come in to show cause why they shouldn't be held in contempt, though this is more of a modification.

But if we add in, Jim, after -- in
subparagraph (c) "in a parent without sufficient cause fails to exercise his or her physical custody of a child for that period of time," would that encompass the court's discretion to find, you know, willfulness based on some agreement or other arrangement to maybe get around?

MR. JEFFRIES: I think that's -that's kind of what I am thinking.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Did you say without just cause --

HON. WILLIAMS: Sufficient -without sufficient cause.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Without sufficient cause. Okay.

MR. JEFFRIES: You know, and if it -- just another kind of thought in this processes is, if it's more than -- missing time for more than sufficient cause, then
that could get us into a mod -- you know, if it's significant enough to get us to a modification of the physical -- the joint physical custody order, that could be kind of part of whatever parties do.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Of course, we are not talking about the order of custody. This is only relating to the support.

MR. JEFFRIES: I know. But, I mean, am I wrong that this -- if we are talking about when there is 50/50 custody, though, right?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right.
HON. PALMER: Would it not be filed as a rule nisi if you are trying to collect your money?

MS. SULLIVAN: It's a petition to modify.

HON. SHERMAN: It's a petition to modify child support.

HON. PALMER: Okay.
HON. SHERMAN: And it says that
the Rule. The Rule says that.
MS. SULLIVAN: And I think, you
know, Judge and I were talking before the meeting. I think we all kind of anticipated that it may go hand-in-hand with a custody modification, as well.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right.
MR. JEFFRIES: Right. That's an element --

MS. SULLIVAN: I guess this could be a standalone.

MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. That's an element, though, I think, that if it's more than too much, then we are possibly modifying custody.

MS. SULLIVAN: Correct.
HON. SHERMAN: In my own view, I think you are more likely to see them modifying child support and not custody under this provision where they are pro sè people I think. I think a lot of times you are going to have -- if there is a private attorney like you guys that do
this all the time, and somebody has -- I mean, they are basically seeing the kid every other weekend, y'all are probably going to plead both --

MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
HON. SHERMAN: -- alternatively.
MR. JEFFRIES: Right. That's exactly what I -- you are right. I mean, I agree. That's exactly my point that if it's --

MS. SULLIVAN: Right.
MR. JEFFRIES: You know, if we are talking about 18 days --

HON. SHERMAN: Yeah.
MR. JEFFRIES: -- over the course of a year, you know, we are not necessarily getting into a modification of custody, and you still have the sufficient cause as Judge mentioned.

HON. SHERMAN: I really like that language --

HON. WILLIAMS: Yeah.
HON. SHERMAN: -- that he is at.

MR. JEFFRIES: I think that really helps.

HON. WILLIAMS: That way we are not telling them to just, you know, model everything for an agreement to be breached and then you, you know, run to the court. Sufficient cause is based on what the judge finds it to be.

MR. JEFFRIES: Right. And there is also -- Jim Jeffries again. The cost benefit sort of -HON. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. JEFFRIES: -- underlying issue as well that, you know, if it's 18 days, are they really going to file a motion to modify child support to get back \$150, you know, which is more than the filing fee.

HON. SHERMAN: Not if they've got -- for the record, I better not say that.

MR. JEFFRIES: So, I am with you, Judge. I agree with Judge Williams' language. I think that would be a helpful, suggestive practice point for
engineers and just people that are going to be difficult.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: In theory and initially when the judge ordered joint custody, he or she was thinking that the parties could get along. And so --

HON. PALMER: No. No.
MS. SULLIVAN: No.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: You're in
Huntsville. That's worse.
MS. SULLIVAN: Madison County, our standing pendente lite order says joint from the get-go, week-on/week-off. So, they don't even know the parties when they enter that order.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right. I'll rephrase that. Then the majority of the jurisdictions, after there has been a hearing, that's a thought at least the judges entertain.

Okay. So, right now there's two different issues on the table as far as potential amendments. Do we want to
address those first before we go into other suggestions?

MR. JOHNSON: Scott Johnson.
HON. PALMER: I don't think you can speak yet.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. This is the Committee. Yeah. So, let's -Anybody have any others before we deal with these two?

MR. JEFFRIES: I don't.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. The -well, still in the order that they were presented. The first one dealt with the consecutive and the immediacy of it. And so, I think the language that was settled on is for more than 14 days in the 12 consecutive months immediately preceding. So, all -- and that would be placed in every instance where the reference to the 14 days in both the language to the Rule itself as well as to the Committee Comments.

So, any other discussion before we
have a vote on that?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All in
favor of the change throughout the Rule relating to the time frame, if you would, just raise your right hand. (Committee members raising hands.)

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. Any opposed? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, it's unanimous. Thank you.

The next language that I guess technically was Judge Williams' suggestion would be that "afterwards a parent fails" we add "without sufficient cause."

HON. WILLIAMS: Before it could
be --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Pardon?
HON. WILLIAMS: I was thinking it was before "fails."

HON. SHERMAN: "Parent without
sufficient cause fails."
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Before the word. Thank you. "A parent without sufficient cause fails."

HON. SHERMAN: And that's in
subparagraph (c) only, correct? We leave "willfully" as it was?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes. So, that's subsection (c). And is there a reference in the Comments? Let's see.

HON. SHERMAN: Yes, there is. Next to the last paragraph, it tracks that language. Next to the last paragraph.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes.
HON. SHERMAN: We are leaving "willful".

PROFESSOR DAVIS: It would be on page two.

MS. SULLIVAN: I see.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, it would be
"a parent," and then add the words
"without sufficient cause fails," second
to the last paragraph on the Comments.
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Okay. Any further discussion on that?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. Do we have -- We didn't do a motion the last time. I guess we technically should. Do we have a motion for that?

HON. SHERMAN: I so move.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank you for your motion.

MR. JEFFRIES: I'll second.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Second. All in favor, "aye"?
(Committee members raising hands).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Nay? Like sign?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Do we have to go back since I didn't do the motion? We'll go backwards and have a motion, I guess, technically on the first one.

HON. SHERMAN: I think Judge

Williams made that.
HON. WILLIAMS: I so moved.
HON. SHERMAN: And I'll second his motion.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: We have a second. All right. So, if the record reflects we have a post-motion and second, and everybody approved. Thank you.

If Bob wasn't here and Stephanie is too nice to call me on it, so thank you.

All right. Any other suggested language changes?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. At this point, we will do the whole -- we will have a vote on the entire act -- I mean, Rule.

HON. SHERMAN: Is that including --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Pardon?
HON. SHERMAN: Are you including the Committee Comments, because I just want to ask a question about that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. Before we do that, let's look at the -- also at the Schedule. But go ahead and add anything on Comments.

HON. SHERMAN: Just before we have a final vote on the Committee Comments for this particular issue, I didn't know if we want to -- I mean, I don't want to -- We have had to delay a vote on this a couple of times because we didn't have a quorum. We have a quorum today.

But I don't know if we want to consider amending and adding to the Committee Comments any language that might flesh out more of the addition we just made about "without sufficient cause" and give any examples talking about agreements or not. I am not saying we need to do that. I am asking the question whether we want to consider that or not.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: With the
additional language changes that we just
voted on, is there a need to give examples in the Comments?

HON. SHERMAN: That's the question I am raising. I certainly did not do that before because we weren't making that distinction.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Historically, I don't think there is a lot of that in the Rule Comments, but it doesn't mean we certainly can't do so.

MR. JEFFRIES: Or maybe just to -Jim Jeffries.

Maybe just an emphasis on the -that the 14 days is not meant to be some sort of bright-line rule and emphasize the discretion of judges, something like that?

HON. SHERMAN: I mean, that's in there, I think, in the Committee Comments as well as the Rule itself.

MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. Then it might be fine.

MS. SULLIVAN: I don't see any need for it.
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HON. SHERMAN: You think the Committee Comments are okay?

MS. SULLIVAN: I do.
HON. SHERMAN: Okay.
PROFESSOR GRAY: There is one little problem in that next to the last paragraph in the Comments.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay.
PROFESSOR GRAY: In the middle of the paragraph, it says, "at least 14 days." And I think we are saying more than 14.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes.
MS. STEINWINDER: The same for the last paragraph.

HON. SHERMAN: Yes.
PROFESSOR GRAY: And the last one paragraph.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: So, we delete "at least" and add instead "more than." Okay.

MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries.
Do we need to add -- Do we need to
add the language from (c) in the Rule where we say "the 12 consecutive months immediately preceding"? Do we need to do that?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah.
Everywhere that's mentioned in the Comments.

MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. Okay.
HON. SHERMAN: We already did that.

MS. SULLIVAN: Just from a grammatical standpoint because I am kind of a nerd, it says in the subparagraphs
"where a parent fails to exercise" --
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Which paragraph are you referencing?

MS. SULLIVAN: Subparagraph. It's
the second to the last paragraph.
HON. SHERMAN: On the Committee Comments.

MS. SULLIVAN: In the Committee
Comments.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay.

MS. SULLIVAN: It says, "in cases where a parent fails to exercise the time sharing they were granted," it really should be "he or she was granted." And the parent is the noun --

HON. SHERMAN: Yes. Thank you.
MS. SULLIVAN: -- and then we go to a pronoun, and that may be --

HON. SHERMAN: To "he or she was."
MS. SULLIVAN: To "he or she was."
HON. SHERMAN: I've seen it somewhere else.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes. I saw it before. I didn't see it.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Anybody else see a place in Comments?

MS. SULLIVAN: That's all it was.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Did you find another place?

MS. SULLIVAN: No, ma'am. That was it.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. I think that the -- Who is it that gets this after
we do?
HON. SHERMAN: Reporter of Decisions.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Reporter of Decisions? Yeah, they would probably catch that, but we like to send it as clean as we can just in case.

All right. Anything else?
Anybody noticed anything else?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. We will -- Would that change be in the form of a motion, Joan-Marie?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, I so move.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Do we have a second?

HON. PALMER: I'll second.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Second. Thank you.

All in favor, right hand.
(Committee members saying
"aye").
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right or left
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hand. Okay.
(Committee members raising hands) .

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All opposed?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All
right. Anything else related to the Rule itself and the Comments?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Let's turn our attention to the Form, the Form that's designated CS-42-S. And we did get an answer back that Stephanie had indicated that we could do basically what we wanted to. But they were comfortable with the "S".

MS. BLACKBURN: The dash "S" or I guess the parenthesis "S" whichever we wanted to do.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right. And so, what you see in front of you is a dash "S". The main thing, we didn't want it to
look like a five. Little prints gets littler as time passes.

Okay. Brian, you mind going over the Form one more time?

PROFESSOR GRAY: One more time?
PROFESSOR DAVIS: One more time.
PROFESSOR GRAY: Okay. So, this is the Form that we came up with for the shared parenting situation, Shared 50\% Physical Custody situation. And, again, the top lines basically map out very similar to what we have on the Form CS-42. When you get down to Line 5, that's where the one-and-a-half multiplier comes in which is different, obviously, than the previous Form.

The work-related childcare costs, the healthcare coverage costs are in here just as they were before. The new section down below, Lines 11 through 13, is where we take care of the shared physical custody calculations. And then, finally, the support order -- the child-support
order at the end in Line 14.
We had another version that we had created that basically computes things the same way pretty much, but it takes about three more lines to do it. And we did have a Committee straw poll that suggested that this Form was preferred over that Form -- that approach.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Does anybody have any questions for Professor Gray relating to the Form 42 -- CS-42-S?

PROFESSOR GRAY: We should mention this is the version that Vermont follows that Dr. Venohr found for us.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right. Okay. Any questions or comments? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: At this time, is the Committee ready to vote on accepting both the Rule, the Comment, and the Form and sending that with the amendments that have been approved by the Committee to the Supreme Court?

HON. SHERMAN: Is Dr. Venohr on the call still?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: She is.
HON. SHERMAN: Can I ask her a question before we do that?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Absolutely. Dr. Venohr?

HON. SHERMAN: Good morning, Dr. Venohr. Can you hear me okay? This is Judge Sherman.

My question -- Recently, I had a trial where I was considering joint physical custody, and under our current Guidelines, of course, we don't really have any guidance other than we can deviate from Rule 32 for that. And as an experiment, I used this Guideline that we are talking about as I was considering my ruling just to see what it would provide. And I was anticipating that it would be a child support obligation for the father that was less than our current Guidelines, because he makes more money -- quite a bit
more money than the wife did, or the mother did in that case.

But when I ran the Guidelines, it turned out that he would be paying more child support with joint custody using the 150\% multiplier than he would have paid under the other Guidelines. So, with joint custody, he would be paying more child support than if he had just had weekend visitation -- every other weekend visitation.

I am curious if that -- That surprised me, but I am wondering is the reason for that and is that an -- I guess it's a two-part question. Is that an outlier? And, secondly, is the reason for that because there was such an income disparity in that case that taken with the income disparity and the 150\% multiplier that's why that was the result?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And most
States handle that by adding a clause that if the sole custody order is less than the
shared parenting order, then use the sole custody amount.

But you are right. If there is a large disparity of income, then by design it's purposeful that that multiplier, that $150 \%$ is going to result in a higher amount.

HON. SHERMAN: Okay.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Does that happen very often, Dr. Venohr?

DR. VENOHR: You know, I don't know -- I don't have enough statistics from Southern States to really know if there is a regional trend. But what we see in other States -- which would be New Hampshire, Arizona, so I don't know how comparable that is -- that to have that big income disparity, it's maybe -- I would guesstimate like $10 \%$ of the shared parenting cases. You know, what we see more typical just with female earnings increasing over time, but these are, you know, Arizona and New Hampshire is that we
are seeing closer incomes, particularly in shared custody, equal custody cases, that the incomes are usually the $40 \%$ to $60 \%$-the parent -- the paired parents' income is usually about $40 \%$ to $60 \%$ of the combined income.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.

DR. VENOHR: I did have a question. I was looking over the Adjustments. So, you are not -- It looks like you are not weighing it by time. It is an offset. You are not taking the difference in multiplying it by 50\%. Does that makes sense? Professor Gray might know what I am asking.

HON. SHERMAN: I asked Professor
Gray that question I think this morning. I thought it was supposed to be the difference at the bottom of the form.

PROFESSOR GRAY: I think she's talking about the work-related child-care costs and healthcare coverage costs?

DR. VENOHR: Oh, no. When you do the cross-credits, you do the proration of the $150 \%$, and then you multiply it by the percentage of time which would be 50\%, and then you take the difference. I didn't see that step in there, but that might be purposeful. I might have just missed it. I haven't been hearing quite right on the last few calls.

PROFESSOR GRAY: Yeah. I think that may have shown up more in the 17-line form where we did the -- where maybe it was explicit. I can't recall right offhand. I think the fact that --

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. The only reason I bring it up now is based on Judge Sherman's comment that, if you intended to have that in there, it would lessen the impact that Judge Sherman would -- just described.

PROFESSOR GRAY: Okay. And that's to adjust the other costs, the child-care costs and the healthcare-coverage costs by
the time or --
DR. VENOHR: No. It's applied to the basic obligation. It has nothing to do with the add-ons.

HON. SHERMAN: I think he does that in Line 12, doesn't he? Isn't that what that is?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. That's the shared 50\% calculation.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Was that attached to what Bob sent? I didn't see it, the latest Worksheet.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: No.
PROFESSOR GRAY: No. This was not in that set. This was a last minute and realized we needed to have this Form for the meeting. But this Form is unchanged except for a few text corrections from the last two versions from the last two meetings.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Let me pull it, then, Professor Gray, and just look. The only -- I just want to double-check
because it does tie into Judge Sherman's question. Even though -- even if you are not doing what I described, it still could occur. But if you are doing what I describe, it's going to occur less often if that makes sense.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. And I think Line 12 --

PROFESSOR GRAY: I think Line 12 does that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- does that.
PROFESSOR GRAY: Why we do it here.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right.
Stephanie is forwarding you the email right now so we can look at that.

So, while she is capturing that, does anybody have any other questions relating to the -- a Committee member have any other questions relating to the Form? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: See, they get applause over there. We don't get an
applause. We're just nose to the grindstone for our group.

MR. JEFFRIES: A thankless job.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: It is very
thankless.
Did the email come in, Dr. Venohr?
DR. VENOHR: (Indicating thumbs up) .

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Good. I think Line 12 is where you give the credit for shared 50\% custody, it's referencing. Which I think it's helpful that it's on the Form so that the public, particularly the pro sès, can see that it does occur. Right?

Any other thoughts? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. So, we have before us the Rule, the Comments and the Form to present while we have a quorum, which there should be applause for a quorum.

HON. SHERMAN: So, do we want --

In light of Dr. Venohr's response to my question, do we want to consider whether to add the language that she mentioned that some States have that in the event the -- this Form results in a higher child support amount, that we would use the other or not?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: It is seems to me that it would have been past -- the additional costs occur anyway. So, doesn't that just shift a greater burden to the parent that actually has less resources?

HON. SHERMAN: I think it does -I think it would. I think the policy question is that -- do we want to do that or do we want to -- I mean, I think we have got some statutes that say that the public policy of our state is that we should encourage joint custody. It is not going to encouraged joint custody to have Child-Support Obligations to pay more child support with joint custody than
without, although I hear Dr. Venohr saying that's going to be in the minority of cases; 10\% is not insignificant. I'm asking the question.

You are right, though, Penny. I
think the tradeoff is, somebody is going to have those costs. If the data is correct, which it is, that it's at least 50\% more to raise a child in two homes than one, then it would effectively mean the parent with less resources are going to incur more of that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right. And the policy --

MR. JEFFRIES: I think -- sorry.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: -- internally in there historically has been that the child not suffer. And so, you put the entire pot of money in there, and they pay proportionally to what their resources are. So, I think it would counter that policy. But that's certainly something that can be presented. Ultimately the

Supreme Court would make that decision. MS. SULLIVAN: Could we have something in there that at least suggested to judges that they could do that, not make it mandatory but just say --

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Not make what mandatory?

MS. SULLIVAN: That they go with the lower amount to, you know, say in there that --

HON. SHERMAN: I think by definition, then, you are deviating from Rule 32, because we are creating Rule 32 now in joint custody. Right now they can do whatever they wanted to. But after the -- If this Rule is adopted, they would have to find some reason to deviate -- I think find some reason to deviate from this new method of calculating Rule 32 support, which I think you are going to have a hard time doing in that instance to shift it. But I mean, theoretically it could, but it's going to be a deviation
from it.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right.
HON. SHERMAN: If you say you can do that instead of this, we are really not making this the rule.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Right. And I think isn't uniformity one of the things the Feds really like?

MS. BUSH: Yes. You would want uniformity.

HON. SHERMAN: What do you mean? I know what uniformity is. In what context? What are you talking about?

MS. BUSH: The regulations that govern child support stress the uniformity being applied across the State in different courts in a uniform manner. So, you certainly can have discretion and have reasons to deviate, but you do want uniformity.

HON. WILLIAMS: So -- Judge Williams.

So, are we saying that there would
be no discretion for the court as we do in other calculations to deviate upward or downward, I mean, transportation, other expenses that the other parties have taken on?

HON. SHERMAN: You still have that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: You still have that, yeah.

HON. WILLIAMS: We still would have that?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes.
HON. SHERMAN: My point was simply that if we said -- When you have joint shared physical custody, and this is how you calculate child support when you have that, but if this amount is more than the amount they would have paid under -without the shared custody adjustment, they can use that as a reason to deviate. To me, that undermines the point of having that rule in the first place.

MR. JEFFRIES: Even though
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technically -- Jim Jeffries.
Even though technically the discretion --

HON. SHERMAN: The discretion is still there.

MR. JEFFRIES: -- is still there.
HON. SHERMAN: Correct.
MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
HON. SHERMAN: But we wouldn't be building it in the Rule. To me, it's contradicting the Rule by putting it in the Rule.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Penny Davis.
I guess my focus has always been on the child.

HON. SHERMAN: Yes.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: And it seems to me that if you have somebody that really has that much money, then if they wind up paying a few hundred dollars more a month, I would rather that happen than the child that's living two weeks out of the year have to worry about being able to -- the
parent having to provide milk or bread or whatever they need. If there is that -If you have got somebody that's on minimum wage, $\$ 10$ or $\$ 11, ~ I ~ d o n ' t ~ k n o w ~ w h a t ~ y o u r ~$ situation was, but substantially different than this other person, the child is going to be in that household for two weeks.

And so, if they are still having to pay a disproportionate amount, then my concern is how that would impact on the child. That's just my personal thought.

Okay. So, does anybody have any specific language they want to change, or do we want to go ahead and vote on this? Entertain any suggestions. (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Hearing none, do I hear a motion that we approve the Rule, the Comments, and the Form as suggestions to present to the Supreme Court and have a final say-so on what actually happens?

HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.

I move that we adopt and accept the full changes to Rule 32 Alabama Rules of Judicial Administration along with the CS-42-S form.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Is there a second?

HON. WILLIAMS: Along with the Comments.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Comments. Thank you. Is there a second?

MR. JEFFRIES: I'll second.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Jim Jeffries second. All of favor show by right hand or left hand.
(Committee members raising hands).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Any opposed?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. Good job, gentlemen and ladies. We have dealt with that for several weeks, and I think that's a major accomplishment.

Do we want to give ourselves a
round of applause?
(Applause) .
PROFESSOR DAVIS: They will wonder next door about us.

Okay. Our second agenda item is the report for the Child Support For Multiple Children's Subcommittee, and Judge Sherman was the Chair of this Committee.

HON. SHERMAN: So, you have before you another memo dated November 4th that takes up -- you may recall that Judge Terry Moore of the Court of Civil Appeals had presented to us a couple of years ago a concern he had and some suggested changes to address those concerns. His concerns primarily dealt with cases where you have multiple children, and you are establishing child support. And it's apparent that within some short time frame of one or more of those children will become emancipated. And we have all read the case opinions where those cases have
been tried and gone up on appeal. And, you know, either the parent has been overpaying child support, the noncustodial parent, because child support was calculated, let's say, on three children, one aged out six months after the divorce, and it was never modified. So, they have been overpaying support. Or in the cases we read in the appellate courts, it's usually they cut the child support, say, by a third in that instance thinking that it's a per capita calculation which we all know it is not. And so, they end up on the hook for a large child support arrearage. And there's really nothing the appellate court can do about that, nothing the trial court can do about that under our current law.

So, that was one -- That was the major concern he had. The other one was he wanted to simplify the procedure to allow those modifications and also, I think, you know, the parental issue that
appellate courts have with trial judges not making sure that there's a CS-42 Form in the record. That was another concern he had voiced.

So, a Subcommittee was formed. We addressed the issues. We had previously presented a memo with a couple of different options. Then the discussions on this issue got tabled as we made the major revisions to Rule 32 that recently were passed by the Supreme Court with the new schedule of Child-Support Obligations. And now that all that is behind us, we wanted to take that issue back up.

So, that Subcommittee met again since our last meeting, and we are presenting this now. We have narrowed the proposal to one which was based on the straw poll of the Committee-at-large that we had taken before all this was tabled.

So, to simplify the matter, we just are presenting one proposal that is before you today that essentially allows a
court at the time -- and it is
discretionary. The language says "may" order child support using separate Worksheets in those cases where there are multiple children, and it's apparent that one or more will age out within the time frame we put was within two years of that order.

Then, when the trial court is establishing a child support, they can calculate child support today saying, based on three children, this is the obligation; however, in 18 months when the oldest child ages out, the obligation will automatically become this. And both spreadsheets are filed with the court, made part of the court record. The modification then becomes automatic. There is no requirement that that party -or the parties come back to court for subsequent modification. It happens automatically.

What doesn't happen
automatically -- I think it's important to say -- is an income withholding order is not amended. So, if there is not an income withholding order and the Rule -and the proposal that is before you makes this clear, I think, or it's intended to make it clear, that the burden is going to be on the parent, the obligor parent, because they are paying it -- it's coming out of their check -- to go do the administrative procedure necessary to amend their wage order, which at least in my clerk's office and I think it's this way throughout the State, is a form and a very tiny filing fee to amend that wage order.

The other thing -- let me see.
The other thing it does -- So, paragraph one is the issue that I just mentioned, and all of that is discretionary.

The paragraph two is intended to be mandatory language telling trial courts
to include this language that we have set
out in the indented paragraph, which is simply meant to educate the parties so that they understand. Unless we have done what it says in paragraph number one, then your obligation doesn't automatically modify. And so, it's just meant to help them understand that they would need to do something else to modify their child support if we haven't -- if the trial court hasn't exercised their jurisdiction or discretion, rather, in paragraph number one to do it ahead of time.

The other thing that I think is important to know is that, although we are providing a mechanism for an automatic recalculation of child support, that doesn't prohibit either party from filing a petition to modify child support. So, we are saying that today child support for these three children is X , and 18 months from now it's going to be Y. Well, between now and 18 months from now, somebody may have lost a job; they may
have gotten a significant raise; daycare might have been in there before, and it is not now.

So, there's a lot of different variables that could affect that so that the $Y$ child support might not be appropriate 18 months from now. So, they still have the ability to file a petition like they always would, and that's in the Rule to make that clear.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Does anybody have any questions? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Let's look first regarding the language of the Rule itself, and then we will look separately at the Comments.

HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.
So, I would be interested -- I mean, for a non-partisan and not involving attorneys that come under IV-D, that have multiple children, how do you think this would affect those cases whether DHR
cases, and there's multiple children, which frequently there are? I mean, would that apply to these type cases, as well?

HON. SHERMAN: Yes, it would.
MS. BUSH: Well, in the Committee Comments -- Jennifer Bush.

In the Committee Comments, there is a -- if you look at the second paragraph towards the bottom, it does state that, if there is an income withholding order in place, that needs to be amended as those older children become ineligible. And in those cases, it specifically -- the language designation of the obligor parent was specifically chosen, should follow the procedures requiring that income withholding order to be amended. And the thought process being, it's the person who is paying has the most motivation if it's going to be decrease to go in there and make sure their employer, who they know have the contact information for, gets that amended
income withholding order and takes on that responsibility.

So, that is one way it would be dealt with.

HON. WILLIAMS: So, my other question is: If that -- which it often happens, that obligor doesn't file the request and usually cases now to modify, because the child has emancipated, always late. But in this instance, if we adopt this Rule, if they are late in filing or requesting that the income withholding order to be changed, do they get the benefit of getting some of that overpayment back or are they just out of money? Does this speak to that?

HON. SHERMAN: It is not dealt with -- that question is not answered directly. I can tell you just my instinctual response to that would be that the reduction was made automatic by court order. So, if I was paying \$800 a month and now I should be paying $\$ 600$ a month
but I'm still having $\$ 800$ a month taken out of my paycheck, I think I have got a \$200 overpayment in child support.

HON. WILLIAMS: But they were late filing.

HON. SHERMAN: I understand. I think -- I think as it's written, that's my interpretation of it. Now, whether we want to address it somehow beyond what we have to specifically take on that issue, I don't see --

HON. WILLIAMS: That's going to automatically going to create a credit pursuant to the previous order, but they have an obligation to the previous order to file timely. And now the custodial parent is going to be out of a couple of \$100 to pay back because they slept on getting their --

HON. SHERMAN: Well, it's probably not going to be a couple of $\$ 100$. It's probably going to be about \$3,000 by the time he gets to you or me.

MS. BUSH: Jennifer Bush.
Judge Williams, I have confirmed that the DHR child support computer has the ability to put a post-dated change. So, it would be able to put the current amount of child support; and at a future date, 18 months from now, in the example, if we have that date, we can put that date in the computer and it will automatically lower the child support to the new amount on that date.

And that practical impact of that would be, when that changes if excess money kept coming in, what's going to happen on our computer system is -- and we are going to go with the new lower amount that's occurred after the 18 months is past. If more money comes in because that income withholding order has not changed, it would apply first to the lower current child support amount. And then, of course, we all know about allocation. MR. JEFFRIES: Yes.

MS. BUSH: But it would then -- If there was no allocation involved and there was only one case, it would then apply to your principal custodial parent arrears. So --

HON. SHERMAN: And then if there are no arrears --

MS. BUSH: It would apply to interest. And if there's none of that, it would go into a prepaid account.

HON. WILLIAMS: Okay. Back to the automatic --

HON. SHERMAN: Prepaid just means it's --

MS. BUSH: It's my understanding --

HON. WILLIAMS: Oh, prepaid?
MS. BUSH: Yeah. Generally most of the prepaids just sits there on the off-chance that -- you know, it can be -I am not saying it can't be removed, but it would sit there on the off-chance that current is not paid in the next month, and
then it would pop up. You lose your job, and we pull from that prepaid.

MS. MCCLENNEY: That's a good explanation.

MS. BUSH: Okay.
HON. PALMER: But what if you are not DHR? What if you are a private case?

HON. SHERMAN: Well, if it is not DHR -- Do y'all have accounts in the clerk's office that tracks?

HON. PALMER: Uh-uh (negative response) .

MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries.
Judge Williams, can I ask you a question?

Are you suggesting that we specify that, for example, if the obligor does not follow through with his obligation that he does not -- he or she does not get credit like to clarify that or --

HON. WILLIAMS: I think that we would have need, in my opinion, some clarifying language because we could get
into one of these situations that we address under the shared custody arrangement where somebody files something, and then as retaliation other parties file something and say, well, you know, I would have paid you child support, you know, when I shouldn't have been paying it because I didn't file my, you know, IWO change or amendment, and I'm going to do it, and I am going to require that you -- in retaliation for you filing something against me, pay me $\$ 3,000$ that you owe me for not having filed.

So, they have -- they have no
limitations on that, it seems, under this current Rule change.

I mean, there is some precedent under Alabama law to say that they are not entitled to have that money back in the example of alimony. That's what the case --

MR. JEFFRIES: That's what I was going to say. It's child support too.

It's considered a gift.
HON. PALMER: Julie Palmer.
Can we put a date of filing, that you can go back as far as the date of filing versus the date when it should have been changed? Because, again, if you sleep on your rights, you lose your rights. And if you don't pay the -- I think in Jefferson it's a \$40 filing fee they get the income withholding order amended, and then you lose that money when you don't file. It's on you, which I believe this clearly says in here.

But I think we do, again, a bright line as to when you have to pay the money back versus the day after the child turned 19 or the date that you filed.

HON. WILLIAMS: Especially in cases of a custodial parent making significantly less. Now she's stuck with a \$3,000 credit that, you know, some judges will say, well, it's going to come out of your future child support or you
are going to have to pay it back somehow to the obligor parent because you should not have received it even though he slept on his time to file.

MS. BUSH: This is Jennifer Bush.
My understanding is right now there is not a repayment provision in here.

HON. SHERMAN: That is correct. It's silent.

MS. BUSH: And so, if you don't amend your income withholding order, you are the obligor, then it's silent. There is no -- there's no requirement here that you get paid back.

So, you are motivated -- and it is only a two-year time frame. So, hopefully, if you are the obligor, you would be aware.

HON. SHERMAN: Well, that's true. It is limited to two years.

MS. BUSH: It's two years.
HON. SHERMAN: The reason we put
the obligation on the obligor is obvious. I mean, it's what you said earlier. If I have -- if I'm paying $\$ 800$ a month and I know my order says now I am supposed to be paying $\$ 600$ because my daughter just turned 19, but $\$ 800$ is coming out of my income every -- I assume most people are going to go down there and amend it. But we also know there are going to be a lot of cases where they are not.

And so, then the question becomes what happens in those cases? I think that as the Rule reads right now, it would be just what you said awhile ago the way DHR would do it. Theoretically, that's the way it should be done. That is considered overpayment of child support because the court order says you should be paying \$600 a month.

So, the point Judge Williams brings up is a legitimate point: Do we want to address it, and how do we want to address it.

But in those instances, I think that money would be considered a credit towards child support or arrears or interest. Or if none of that's there, then it's an overpayment.

HON. WILLIAMS: Yeah. And I appreciate, you know, DHR having the triggers in place to stop it. But even when you are putting that money into an account that's just accruing is not going back to that obligor, and I have seen numerous cases where they are coming in and saying DHR is not doing this or they are allocating my child support for this child to other cases that I don't think it should be going to, but that's DHR's rules.

And so, I can foresee instances where they are going to say, well, one, they shouldn't have allocated the money from this child to another case that I am on to why are they holding my money and not giving it back to me when I shouldn't
have been paying it. And they are going to ask the court to order DHR to give it to them.

MS. BUSH: Yes, sir. And this is Jennifer Bush with DHR Legal.

I want to point out that this scenario happens pretty much every time a child support order ends and your youngest child emancipates and you have an income withholding order. I mean, this is the exact same scenario occurs where the income -- the termination of the IWO takes a little while to kick in.

And in that scenario, we do -- at the end -- I don't know that we can do it with a computer on this. But when the last child emancipates and there's no current support owed, then that current account is closed and that money is just held and then it's returned to the person.

So, assuming there's no other children, allocation totally separate issue, and it's federal requirement that
we allocate. So, I am not getting into a scenario of an allocation. But assuming there's one child, we do deal with this all the time.

And the prepaid account I
mentioned, let's say your child support is lowered and there is no arrears, no interest, nothing, and it goes into that prepaid account. DHR does have the capability of manually going in there and refunding that money, so it can happen. A lot of times it is held, especially if no one brings it to our attention and no one asks for it to be returned. And then in the event, there is a loss of a job -which that frequently happens with us; there is going to be a disruption of employment and current is not paid -- it's going to immediately be pulled from that prepaid account and then apply.

So, I don't know if that addresses your question. But what $I$ am trying to say is we deal with this scenario already
when child support ends and there's a lag with that IWO.

MS. SULLIVAN: And in a private case, what if there is a court delay? It doesn't really address. It just says follow the proper procedure. But what if that income withholding order doesn't immediately get signed and money comes out. I just think there needs to be a little bit more consideration of that issue that the judge brought up.

HON. PALMER: And Julie Palmer.
Or if the company doesn't get it or there is a delay there, then what are you going to do? I mean, I think we need to address that issue, as well. Maybe allow them 30 days -- up to 30 days before that child emancipates to file the petition so that the IWO can get to the company in time, and the company can change their income withholding that they are doing on the employee's check, or they just needs to be some sort of repayment I
think.
MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries.
Can you put an effective date?
Judges might know this more than me. But put an effective date on a new IWO?

HON. SHERMAN: Well, we talked about that. The question would be whose responsibility is it going to be to put that prospective wage order in effect. I mean, there still has to be a processing of an order.

And so, I can sign and date an order ahead of time, but somebody has, then, got to know to take that order and now issue it out, and is that going to be on all the clerks around the State? Is that going to be, you know, the judges? Whose responsibility is that going to be?

We discussed that and landed on we wanted to avoid putting that on the clerks to have to do that in all their cases, and that's why we put it on the obligor of that responsibility.

MR. JEFFRIES: I was meaning, like, let's say somebody comes to me and they question me about in a private setting, hey, how do I -- my child support is supposed to reduce on X day, how do I get my income withholding order changed? And I would say to the point some people made about the timing of it, actually the timing that it takes because it's different all the time. Sometimes it's quick, and sometimes it is not.

But if you said -- if I was able to say, look, if it was me, you know, I would file it 60 days before and just let the court know that, as of a certain day, this IWO is supposed to be in effect. So, it's basically giving instructions to the employer that they can do this as of a certain date. I don't know if that makes sense or what.

HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.
I get them all the time usually
from the receiving custodial parent to
update an IWO because of a change in employment or whatever. And it comes in as a notice of change of address or whatever, and then we update the IWO. So, I will issue it based on the notice to the court that something has changed on the IWO as far as the withholding and which it would be directly to. So, I would assume, if we are going to require that, the obligor sends it to the employer, which I think they would have to go through the court first.

HON. SHERMAN: They would.
HON. WILLIAMS: So, they would need to file something through the court for the court to order that change to the employer before it can change.

HON. SHERMAN: Yeah, Judge. They will have to go to the clerk's office, file the amended -- it's a form that you've all used, amended wage order, pay the $\$ 25$ or $\$ 40$, whatever it is. And then that goes to the judge. The judge signs
it. That goes back to the clerk. The clerk issues it to the employer.

So, there's some time, and then the employer has to put it into effect. So, there is time that it takes.

And in the example that Judge Williams gave for change of employment, that the effective event has already taken place. The court order is not changing. They are just in a different place.

In the example you are giving, you are suggesting that we would be entering an order that the wage order is going to change at some point in the future within, say, 60 days. I don't know that -- I think there could be some problems with that. I think that when the amended wage order goes out, you are ordering that employer to withhold money now because this is what's owed now.

So, you know, the alternative would be to have, you know, a new subparagraph that specifically -- rather
than deal with the IWO and the responsibility of it in the Committee Comments, you could have a new subparagraph that essentially addresses this specific issue and sets out some Guidelines about who -- you know, whose responsibility it is and specifically what does happen if it's -- if there is an overpayment, the amended order is not affected prior to the obligation being reduced and additional monies paid out. What happens to it when we could take that issue on. I don't know what the -- that's a very vexing problem because there is a lot of competing interest in that.

MR. JEFFRIES: Jim Jeffries again.
I guess the big difference here in the gift scenario that I mentioned before is that, like y'all mentioned a second ago, there is already an order that the child support be X at a future date.

So, it takes away somewhat the issue of an obligee having to be upset
about having to give money back because it wasn't theirs in the first place pursuant to the court's order.

HON. SHERMAN: You could say -- I probably should give this a lot more thought before I voice this.

But you could say, in the provision, it could state that the reduced child support amount would become effective, you know, pursuant to the court order when that child ages out. But in the event that there's an income withholding order in place, it would become effective when the obligor parent files the amended order with the court, and that eliminates any overpayment. Now, I don't know if that's what you want to do. But you would essentially -- that is really putting the burden now on the obligor parent. And if they sit on their rights and they don't file the amended wage order, then they are not due any money back.

MR. JEFFRIES: My only point to that would be that that still doesn't address the -- after the obligor files --

HON. SHERMAN: That's correct.
MR. JEFFRIES: -- what if it takes
60 days for the employer to change --
HON. SHERMAN: That happens now, right?

MR. JEFFRIES: It does.
HON. SHERMAN: You see it in termination cases where a kid ages out or you stop child support or a modification of child support and we are amending a previous wage order, that happens now and we don't --

MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
HON. SHERMAN: We don't address
that. It just sort of sorts itself out however it sorts itself out.

MS. BUSH: Jennifer Bush.
I just want to point out, our DHR computer needs a date. We have got to have a date. So, if it's some contingent,
you know, it becomes effective if and when you file this document, there's so much disconnect, we would never know when that person filed that document.

HON. SHERMAN: That's why I should have thought about it before I said it out loud. Sorry.

HON. WILLIAMS: Judge Williams.
Just to add another layer onto this that, I mean, if the obligor at some proceeding that he filed where he is not satisfied that he has been, you know, made whole pursuant to a court order, then maybe he shifts the burden to the obligee to say, well, you knew pursuant to the court order that the child support changed to this and you were taking the money anyway. But as it's been stated by Jim, it could be perceived as a gift that you didn't stop.

So, that's arguments on both sides I think.

HON. SHERMAN: I thought this was
the simpler of the two proposals apparently.

MR. JEFFRIES: We were pretty quiet for a little while.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Other issues than what's been raised?
(No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: It seems to me that maybe the -- rather than try to vote on this that we probably need to think through some of these issues.

Judge Sherman is the Chair of the Committee. Do you remember offhand -- I know if you're like me, you don't remember who.

HON. SHERMAN: I can't keep them straight who else is on it.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Who else remembers they are on that Committee? Okay. So, we have a couple here.

Would anybody else like to serve? Now that you have raised some issues, we would like input from somebody else.

Anybody else may want to serve?
MS. BALDWIN: Jennifer, you are not. You need to be.

MS. BUSH: I will be on the
Subcommittee.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. So, Jennifer is. And Joan-Marie is volunteering. Anybody else want to volunteer?

HON. WILLIAMS: Katie was on it two years ago.

MS. STEINWINDER: (Nodding in the affirmative).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes, Katie was on it and Judge Williams is on it. And Bob can go back to the minutes and figure out if there were anybody else. So, your silence doesn't mean you're off of it. It just means like, if you are like me, you can't remember what you were on.

MS. STEINWINDER: I think Amanda was on it.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: I kind of think
she was.
HON. SHERMAN: She was the Chair.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Melody, were you on it?

MS. BALDWIN: Well, I didn't remember that I was, but Bob did pull it up. But honestly Jennifer is so familiar with the interworkings of how the system works, that I don't think I am as effective on that as she is.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All right. So, we will leave it --

MS. BALDWIN: I would rather substitute Jennifer.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Well, we welcome as many as to be the whole Committee on the Subcommittee if they wanted to. But that will give you kind of an idea. I think that's a good working group. But that does not mean that someone who is not on the Subcommittee cannot send suggestions to the Subcommittee, because it's certainly
easier to draft the exact language in the Subcommittee setting than here.

So, if everyone is okay, then we will table this issue now until the next time we meet in the future depending on how much the Subcommittee feels like they need. And I appreciate the thought process that's gone into this discussion. I think that is very helpful. It's the balance of who has the burden of doing that.

The next issue on our agenda is going to have an update on research issues, other issues. Jennifer, you are on the agenda. I think you had talked and sent material out, and Jane had also sent some material out.

MS. BUSH: So, at the end of the last Committee meeting, the question was asked if there were any new topics for the Committee to consider. And I mentioned that, while participating in training across the State for the May 1st changes
to Rule 32, several people had requested guidance on how to treat a non-parent's income when calculating child support, a situation where -- and typically I am just going to say grandmother. It would not have to be a relative. It could be a nonrelative.

But the question is: How do we treat grandparent who has custody; how do we treat their income when we are running the Guidelines? And the different scenarios are you can use the grandparent's income in lieu -- I would say -- of the missing parent, but this is assuming you have got a case with one parent, a grandparent, and the other parent is not a party in the case before the court. Wherever they may be, they are not a party.

So, one option would be to use that non-parent custodian's income in lieu of the missing parent's income and just run your Guidelines the way you normally
would.
Another thought would be, if you knew or had any information about the missing parent's income, you could calculate child support on both parents, the one present where you have their income, and then impute income to the missing parent and run Guidelines that way.

And then a third scenario would be you run Guidelines solely on the income of the parent that's present, and they pay 100\%. There is no split of percentage as there would be.

So, those are the possible scenarios. And as far as research, I don't have any research on that. I brought it up because it was mentioned to me as a potential topic for the Committee in the future.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. And, Jane, are you still on? Jane?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah, I am. Sorry.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Were you able to hear Jennifer's comments?

DR. VENOHR: I heard the word
"research."
PROFESSOR DAVIS: That's the key.
MS. BUSH: I'll do a short summary.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah, a real short summary of the issue.

MS. BUSH: Just as a potential topic for future Committee meetings how to treat a non-parent's income when calculating child support. The typical scenario might be a grandparent. But do you use that person's income in lieu of the missing parent? Do you try to impute income to the missing parent who is not a party to the case? Or do you just use the income of the parent who is a party to the case and make that person 100\% responsible for child support to the nonrelative who actually has custody, or the non-parent I should say?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I mean, I
think the practices vary from State to State. And I haven't seen them ever use the grandparent's income. And there's something I will tell you about in a minute that might change that if I misunderstood.

But in cases where there's two parents and the child is living with a grandparent, you know, and the truth is is that, what I hear in the field is that they usually can only get one parent in at a time. And so, they usually use that parent's income alone. So, it would be a $100 \%$.

And then sometimes they will -and this is where the practice varies that I have seen that they might impute and assume there's another parent out there that has minimum wage. And what that has the effect of is the parent that is at the court, it brings that order down, you know.

But, you know, that is an area of research that we haven't -- I haven't ever investigated the different practices. I know it came up in Tennessee, and I talked to a couple of States with it. But I just want to make sure that that's what you are talking about, not talking about grandparent liability when there is a -when the child to the grandparent has children and that child is a minor and is on TANF. You are not talking about that scenario, right?

MS. BUSH: No, we are not talking about the minor child scenario.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. Is where -MS. BUSH: We are talking about -DR. VENOHR: The first one. Yeah, because we are doing some research right now on the latter where there is a minor child that is receiving TANF. And the issue is whether the grandparents have to pay for the grandchildren, but that's a minor thing.

So, yeah. So, ignore my second answer part of it. Did that make sense when I said with the first part?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes. There is -- What you are saying there is some data out there where other States have dealt with the initial scenarios that Jennifer had mentioned when a grandparent --

DR. VENOHR: Right. And I
think -- I mean, I didn't hear -- and, Jennifer, are you finding that you are having information from both parents at the time that the order is established?

MS. BUSH: I would think that would be more unusual to have information about the other missing -- the missing parent's income. But that is a scenario that comes across the State, and people are requesting guidance on: Do they use the grandparents' income, or do they just use the income of the party that is in front of them.

DR. VENOHR: No. I have never seen them use the income of the grandparents, you know. It's just -yeah. I mean, they treat it more like third-party care.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Judge Williams has a question.

HON. WILLIAMS: Yeah, Judge Williams.

So, these questions initially came up in a juvenile dependency context where a child is deemed dependent, and it could be a grandparent or it could be some other third party. It could be --

DR. VENOHR: Right.
HON. WILLIAMS: -- an aunt or an uncle. It would be a non-relative. And the child is dependent and placed in their custody based on the dependency and the lack of ability of the parents to provide or care for them. Oftentimes, it's one parent that appears in court, usually the mother, because a lot of times the father
is not known or it's an alleged father and he is not there.

And so, the question has become, well, how do we calculate child support? Do we do it using that third party whether it's a grandparent or some other third party that has custody and that parent that's before the court use their income to calculate child support or do we just strictly use that parent, that's present, child support.

Now, in Alabama, if we don't have a father who has been adjudicated as the father and he is only alleged or presumed to be the father, technically, we don't have jurisdiction over him based on recent law by our appellate courts. So, we can't really even, in that case, impute any income to that alleged father if he has not been determined to be the father.

DR. VENOHR: That makes sense. Is this a permanent plan? I mean, is the child just -- is the permanent plan to
keep the grandparent, who has custody, been transferred, or is it a child protective service case where the permanency plan might be family reunification with the mother?

HON. WILLIAMS: So, in most instances, it's a dependency determination where the court has granted either DHR in the case of CPS, Child Protective Services, we granted them custody; or in a case with third party, we granted them temporary custody. And usually that is the final order, and that's where we have to consider the issue of child support based on statute.

DR. VENOHR: So, there's no chance that the child is going to go back with the mother, you know, that --

HON. WILLIAMS: Unless the court --

DR. VENOHR: -- because that's --
HON. WILLIAMS: Unless the court modifies it on a separate and subsequent
petition.
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I mean, I am thinking about -- you know, I would have to -- I am going to have to review my notes. Because I was thinking of more when it's just -- when the -- When the permanency plan is still with the child that it is not -- where there has not been a change in custody, you know, that the child is still a Child Protective Service case. And that's where I am hesitant.

And the decision has been finalized, you know, where the -- Am I making sense?

HON. WILLIAMS: Yes.
DR. VENOHR: And that, I am going to have to, like, dig a little bit to see if there is a difference. Because you are really talking about when there's been a decision that the child is going to stay with grandma, that custody is really -- I mean, it's permanent.

HON. WILLIAMS: For the most part.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes.

HON. WILLIAMS: No, we don't call it permanent until we TPR. But, yeah, it's temporary.

DR. VENOHR: Oh, okay. Yeah. That's right. That's a really -- I am glad you brought TPR in, because that would be the turning point.

Yeah. But, you know, I could see where you would want to include grandparents just to help reduce it because of the ability to pay, you know, 90\% of those that are removed from the home is because of economic issues, not -you know, the mother did not have enough income to support the kid, you know, eviction. You know, you know the cases. You know what you are seeing more than what I do.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Well, do you think you would be able to come up with a memo that might give us some direction?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.
I will come up with a memo and, yeah, and
just do a little bit of a scan to see some of the options. Because it sounds like that should be Alabama's consistency across the State that you are concerned about; is that right?

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yes.
DR. VENOHR: In fairness, of course.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Sure. I think that would give us an opportunity to at least respond to the inquiries that we have had even if we don't come up with the change in the Rules. I would like to make sure our Committee does respond to the inquiries that we have.

Okay. Anybody else have any questions or any comments that might help direct Dr. Venohr's research in any way? (No response).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Jennifer, can you think of anything else that you would like for her to look at typically?

MS. BUSH: No.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All
right. Thank you, Dr. Venohr.
Jennifer, anything else? I know the other issue that comes to my mind was that related to -- and we don't have a lot of time before we offer the public the opportunity -- was the opportunity to --

MS. BLACKBURN: I don't know what to do.
(At which time, the Internet connection with Dr. Venohr was disconnected).

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. All right. We will not require Dr. Venohr at this point for anything else.

Okay. The question that I think we have talked about before is the -- I think Dr. Venohr did perhaps have some information.

The people that pay for childcare are paying substantially less, and they are getting credit for substantially less than what they are paying. And I think we
had talked a little bit about that the last time. And so, I guess in light of the fact we have lost Dr. Venohr, maybe we will just delay that unless you have anything, Jennifer, to say about that.

MS. BUSH: The only thing I would like to add is this is on DHR's public website. You can get it in a link -- Bob sent the link with his email to everybody, and it is the 2021 Alabama Child Care Market Rate Survey Final Report.

So, the question sometimes is:
How do we come up with those daycare rates? And this is the full report if you ever want to read it.

I do think that the issue people bring up, people will say, well, I pay more than what that daycare rate sets out. But whether it's high, low, this is the market rate survey. It's redone every two years, and this is the 2021 version.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: I think it
comes -- the issue basically is the cap
that we apply.
MS. BUSH: Yes, ma'am.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. So, it light of time and the IT issue we are having, we will come back to that issue maybe at maybe the next meeting.

So, if anybody has any thoughts on -- or suggestions relating to the child custody the way it was handled in the Rule, if we want to continue to leave it as it is or if you want to think about having the Child Support Rule to reflect more what the actual payments are by the parties, then we will take that up, I guess, at the next meeting or hear from Jane.

So, would you reach out to Jane
and see if she has any additional
information she can share. I think that would be helpful. And we will let Jennifer be sort of contact person in our Committee if anybody has any thoughts about dealing with that particular issue.

All right. Any other comments or questions from the Committee members about future topics that we want to take up? We obviously have several things that are still pending we will look at at the next meeting.
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: All right. At this time, we turn our attention to the comments from the public. I think I have asked three of you before. Do you have any comments at this point?

MR. SMITH: No.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Scott, I think you had a comment earlier that you would like to make.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you for letting me sit in. I've learned a lot.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Would you identify.

MR. JOHNSON: Scott Johnson.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: And we usually
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put where you are from.
MR. JOHNSON: From Montgomery,
Alabama.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: And during the discussion of the 14 days, the thought occurred to me that a willfully
non-exercising shared-custody parent could possibly have proof of 15 or 16 partial days of custody. And could he come in in -- If we create grounds for filing under this part of the Rule, could he come in and defeat a petition to modify under this Rule by attaching that proof of 15 or 16 partial days because that -- grounds for filing is not discretionary, is it?

HON. SHERMAN: The grounds for
filing -- I mean, anybody can file
anything at any time whether they have reason to or not. So, nothing in the Rule is going to change that.

However, the Rule as proposed and
passed today puts discretion in the trial court whether to grant that modification of child support based on the failure to exercise.

So, if the parent that is alleged to have not exercised that time, if I am understanding your question or comment, is contesting whether they did or they didn't, that's what that trial is about, and the court is going to have to make that determination whether or not they did or they didn't. So, whether I want to try the case when I'm counting days or not, I may put in the position of doing that at some point under this Rule, if I'm understanding your question.

MR. JOHNSON: That's pretty close.
But I am thinking of the initial
responsive pleading where he is moving to dismiss, and he has got his documentation attached. Does he defeat the petition?

HON. SHERMAN: Well, I mean, I
think that is a question of fact for the
court to determine.
HON. WILLIAMS: Yeah. I think that would fall under the category if there is sufficient cause. And if he is say, well, I can point to half days during his 14-or-more-day period that I did, you know, that could be -- I mean, the court can consider and weigh that.

MR. JOHNSON: And that's why your comment about show cause made sense because it could be more like a show cause.

But my other question if -- Whose duty is it to give notice to the parties? Is this going to have to be in every final judgment if it's uncontested? Is the duty on the lawyers to put in the language that warrants that shared-custody parents what they face if they don't exercise their visitation, or is there no notice?

HON. SHERMAN: I think the notice --

MR. JOHNSON: Are they required
to --
HON. SHERMAN: I think the notice is the law. I mean, I think that, you know, we are imputed with knowledge with what the law is. So, I think the Rule itself is their notice.

Now, if I am representing -- If I am a private practicing attorney representing a party, then obviously I am going to be giving them some advice about that and educating my clients about it. But there is no requirement that a court or even the parties in their own agreements put it.

Also, I don't think there's any prohibition against attorneys in private practice negotiating to include some language in their agreements that specify -- you know, that mention the Rule to educate their clients. But I don't think there's any additional burden on the court as it's proposed right now that would require them to do that.

PROFESSOR DAVIS: Yeah. I think one thing perhaps it's a little more helpful in this area is AOC does have on its website the Rule. And so, the pro sè people, once they are directed to that website, then it would include that information. And if they read the Rule and the Comments, then they will see that. So, it would be available to them.

So, you know, they don't really have to go and try to search out through the Code of Alabama or to the administrative rules to find it. It is separated for them. So, I think it does help the pro sè people. And I suspect the judges -- y'all deal with the pro sè people all the time and so Judge Palmer has too, that the clerks are fairly helpful in directing them to these sites that are informational for them.

Anybody have any other comments? Any other comments?

MR. JOHNSON: No. I am certainly
glad I was here. Thank you.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Thank you. We appreciate your coming.

And all of the transcripts are put on the website. So, anybody that -- if you can't come next time, and we welcome you to all the meetings, then you can go on the website and see the transcript than listen to us.

Any other issues to be presented at this time?
(No response).
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Does anybody
object to us leaving early?
HON. WILLIAMS: No.
PROFESSOR DAVIS: Well, then we are adjourned. Thank you so much.
(Conclusion of the Advisory Committee on Child Support Guidelines and Enforcement meeting at 12:07 P.M.)
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| applied [3] 11/19 | 4/16 10/12 12/4 | 108/20 124/11 |
| 65/2 71/16 apply [6] 83/3 | 12/8 12/13 12/17 | asking [4] 13/21 |
| apply [6] 83/3 $86 / 2087 / 387 / 8$ | 15/5 16/15 16/16 | 51/20 63/16 69/4 |
| 86/20 87/3 87/8 $\mathbf{9 5 / 2 0} 123 / 1$ | 16/19 16/20 16/21 | asks [1] 95/14 |
| applying [1] 35/9 | 17/6 18/5 23/13 | Assistant [2] 2/11 |
| appreciate [5] 4/2 | 24/2 26/13 26/15 | 6/18 |
| 8/7 93/7 108/7 | 27/17 29/8 29/20 | assume [3] 92/7 |
| 130/3 | 32/16 33/6 36/12 | 99/9 112/19 |
| approach [1] 59/8 | 41/16 42/6 43/19 | assumed [1] 17/21 |
| appropriate [2] | 44/14 45/22 45/22 | assuming [3] 94/21 |
| 23/22 82/7 | 46/21 46/21 48/7 | 95/2 109/15 |
| $\text { approve [2] } 9 / 9$ 74/18 | $\begin{aligned} & 52 / 1952 / 1956 / 6 \\ & 56 / 758 / 258 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attached [2] 65/11 } \\ & 126 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |


| A | 49/13 56/22 | because [50] 4/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| attaching [1] | B | 14/4 17/8 |
| 125/15 | babysitter [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 22 / 1326 / 326 / 15 \\ & 27 / 2230 / 1630 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| ATTENDING [1] | 32/12 | 33/18 37/6 37/8 |
| 3/12 | back [29] 8/2 8/4 | 50/23 51/11 52/5 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { attenti } \\ 57 / 12 \end{array}$ | 11/15 13/4 24/17 | 54/12 60/23 61/17 |
| 57/12 95 <br> attorney | 24/19 29/15 37/14 | 66/1 70/13 77/4 |
| $2 / 172 / 223 / 43 / 6$ | 44/16 49/19 57/14 | 80/9 84/9 85/18 |
| 3/10 3/13 5/23 6/10 | $78 / 14 ~ 79 / 20 ~ 84 / 15$ $85 / 1887 / 1189 / 19$ | 86/18 88/23 89/8 |
| 6/16 6/22 42/23 | 85/4 80/4 90/16 91/1 | 90/6 91/2 92/5 |
| 128/8 131/17 | 91/15 93/11 93/23 | 92/17 98/9 99/1 |
| attorney's [2] 2/9 | 100/1 102/1 102/23 | 100/19 101/14 |
| 26/1 | 106/16 117/17 | 110/18 113/18 |
| attorneys [4] 15/14 28/5 82/21 128/16 | 123/5 | 115/23 117/21 |
| 28/5 82/21 128/16 | backwards [1] | 118/5 118/17 119/6 |
| automatic [4] 79/18 | Bahamas [1] 34/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119/11 119/13 } \\ & 120 / 2.125 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 81/15 84/21 87/12 | balance [1] 108/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120/2 125/16 } \\ & 127 / 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| automatically [6] | BALDWIN [3] 2/8 | become [7] 31/11 |
| 79/15 79/22 80/1 81/5 85/13 86/9 | 6/17 16/13 | 76/22 79/15 83/12 |
| 81/5 85/13 86/9 <br> available [1] 129/9 | bar [1] 26/23 | 102/9 102/14 116/3 |
| available [1] 129/9 Avenue [1] 1/19 | based [12] 28/14 | becomes [3] 79/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avenue [1] 1/19 } \\ & \text { avoid [2] 25/21 } \end{aligned}$ | 30/15 40/10 44/7 <br> 64/16 78/18 79/12 | 92/11 104/1 |
| 97/20 |  | been [24] 10/14 |
| award [1] 8/5 |  | 26/19 45/18 59/22 |
| aware [1] 91/19 | basic [1] 65/3 | 64/8 68/9 69/17 |
| away [2] 39/18 | basically [7] 24/15 | 73/14 77/1 77/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 101 / 22 \\ & \text { awhile [1] } 92 / 14 \\ & \text { aye [4] } 9 / 179 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43/2 57/15 58/11 } \\ & 59 / 398 / 17122 / 23 \\ & \text { be [146] } \end{aligned}$ | 77/8 82/2 89/7 90/6 94/1 104/12 104/18 105/6 116/13 |


| B | 20/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| been... [5] 116/20 | between [2] 23/16 | 2/15 90/1 |
| 17/2 118/8 118/12 |  | bright-line [2] |
| 8/18 | beyond [2] 32/9 | 52/15 |
| before [38] 1/16 |  | ighter [1] |
| 7/16 17/7 19/9 24/9 | big [2] 62/18 | bring [3] 10/2 |
| 2 29/21 42/3 | 101/17 | 64/16 122/17 |
| 23 | Birmingham | brings [3] 92/21 |
| 18 47/22 48/2 | 3/11 6/16 | 95/13 112/22 |
| 51/2 51/6 52/5 | bit [7] 26/6 36/23 | brought [3] 96/11 |
| /14 58/19 60/5 | 60/23 96/10 118/1 | 110/18 119/6 |
| 67/19 76/10 78/20 | 120/1 122/1 | building [1] 73/10 |
| 78/23 80/5 82/2 | BLACKBURN [2] | burden [7] 26/5 |
| (17 98/14 99/17 | 3/13 6/7 | 68/11 80/7 102/1 |
| /18 102/6 104/6 | Board [1] 132/1 | 104/14 108/10 |
| 109/17 116/8 121/6 | Bob [6] 4/3 50/9 | 128/21 |
| 121/17 124/11 | 65/11 106/16 107/6 | BUSH [7] 2/11 6/11 |
| 131/8 | 122/8 | 83/6 86/1 91/5 94/5 |
| beginning [1] 4/9 | Boggs [6] | 103/20 |
| behind [1] 78/13 | 16 4/1 | business [3] 8/9 |
| being [7] 11/18 | 132/9 | 9/23 10/6 |
| 13/18 32/1 71/16 | both [8] 20 | C |
| 73/23 83/19 101/10 | 46/20 59/20 79/15 |  |
| belief [1] 30/22 | $1110 / 5$ |  |
| believe [1] 90/13 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { below [2] 58/20 } \\ & 132 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bottom [2] } \\ & \text { 83/9 } \end{aligned}$ | culated [1] |
| [1] 22/6 | boy [2] 16/20 16/21 |  |
| benefit [5] 12/15 | breached [1] 44/5 | calculation [2] 65/9 |
| 24/18 35/13 44/11 | bread [1] 74/1 | $7 / 12$ |
| 14 | BRIAN [3] 2/14 | calculations [2] |


| C | 116/17 130/6 | 35/22 36/22 38/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| calendar [3] 12/23 | cannot [1] 107/22 | 38/20 38/21 38/23 |
| 13/1 13/10 | cap [1] 122/23 | 39/2 39/21 40/1 |
| call [3] 50/10 60/2 | capability [1] 95/10 | 40/6 40/15 40/17 |
| 119/1 | capita [1] 77/12 | 40/19 40/23 43/19 |
| called [1] 10/22 | capturing [1] 66/17 | 44/7 47/17 48/1 |
| calls [1] 64/9 | care [6] 58/21 | 48/4 48/22 51/17 |
| CALVIN [2] 3/7 | 63/22 64/22 115/5 | 127/4 127/10 |
| 5/13 | 115/21 122/10 | 127/12 |
| came [4] 27/19 58/8 | case [21] 24/16 | CCR [1] 132/9 |
| 113/4 115/10 | 26/17 56/7 61/2 | Center [1] 2/3 |
| can [50] 14/14 | 61/18 76/23 87/3 | Central [1] 3/13 |
| 15/11 17/15 20/7 | 88/7 89/21 93/21 | certain [3] 11/19 |
| 20/11 32/13 33/12 | 96/4 109/15 109/17 | 98/15 98/19 |
| 34/11 34/22 39/9 | 111/18 111/20 | certainly [11] 15/17 |
| 46/5 56/7 60/4 60/9 | 116/18 117/3 117/9 | 26/12 26/23 29/16 |
| 60/15 66/16 67/14 | 117/11 118/11 | 31/14 52/4 52/10 |
| 69/23 70/14 71/3 | 126/13 | 69/22 71/18 107/23 |
| 71/18 72/20 77/16 | cases [26] 5/21 | 129/23 |
| 77/17 79/10 84/19 | 11/19 12/6 13/19 | CERTIFICATE [1] |
| 86/8 87/20 88/14 | 55/1 62/20 63/2 | 131/1 |
| 90/3 90/4 93/18 | 69/3 76/17 76/23 | Certified [4] 1/17 |
| 94/15 95/11 96/19 | 77/8 79/4 82/23 | 131/4 132/2 132/1 |
| 96/20 97/3 97/12 | 83/1 83/3 83/13 | certify [3] 131/6 |
| 98/18 99/17 106/16 | 84/8 90/19 92/10 | 131/16 131/23 |
| 109/12 112/12 | 92/12 93/12 93/15 | Chair [6] 2/6 6/5 |
| 120/20 122/8 | 97/21 103/11 112/8 | 10/12 76/8 105/12 |
| 123/19 125/19 | 119/1 | 107/2 |
| 127/5 127/8 130/7 | catch [1] 56/6 | chance [3] 87/20 |
| can't [9] 25/8 33/15 | category [2] 33/6 | 87/22 117/16 |
| 52/10 64/13 87/21 | $127 / 3$ | $\text { change [26] } 11 / 10$ |
| 105/16 106/20 | cause [25] 31/7 | 12/10 13/17 14/6 |


| C | 25/13 27/1 32/8 | 118/10 118/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| change... [22] 18/16 | 32/10 37/17 40/7 | 118/19 122/10 |
| 18/17 21/4 22/23 | 41/21 42/19 44/16 | 123/8 123/12 126/3 |
| 47/4 56/12 74/13 | 58/23 60/21 61/5 | 130/20 131/9 |
| 86/4 89/9 89/16 | 61/9 63/22 64/22 | child-care [2] 63/22 |
| 96/21 99/1 99/3 | 68/5 68/22 68/23 | 64/22 |
| 99/16 99/17 100/7 | 69/9 69/17 71/15 | child-support [4] |
| 100/14 103/6 112/6 | 72/16 73/15 73/21 | 18/3 58/23 68/22 |
| 118/9 120/13 | 74/6 74/11 76/6 | 78/12 |
| 125/22 | 76/19 77/3 77/4 | childcare [2] 58/17 |
| changed [11] 11/12 | 77/10 77/14 78/12 | 121/20 |
| 13/1 17/9 22/15 | 79/3 79/10 79/11 | children [11] 76/18 |
| 30/10 84/13 86/19 | 79/14 81/8 81/16 | 76/21 77/5 79/5 |
| 90/6 98/6 99/7 | 81/18 81/19 82/6 | 79/12 81/20 82/22 |
| 104/16 | 84/9 85/3 86/3 86/6 | 83/1 83/12 94/22 |
| changes [11] 9/5 | 86/10 86/21 89/6 | 113/10 |
| 11/9 13/9 15/2 | 89/23 90/16 90/23 | Children's [1] 76/7 |
| 16/17 50/13 51/23 | 92/17 93/3 93/14 | choose [1] 28/21 |
| 75/2 76/16 86/13 | 93/15 93/21 94/8 | chosen [1] 83/16 |
| 108/23 | 94/9 94/17 95/3 | Circuit [7] 3/1 3/2 |
| changing [2] 13/9 | 95/6 96/1 96/18 | 3/8 3/8 5/14 5/20 |
| 100/9 | 98/4 101/21 102/9 | 6/18 |
| charged [1] 131/21 | 102/11 103/12 | circumstances [1] |
| check [5] 17/15 | 103/13 104/16 | 33/14 |
| 17/22 65/23 80/10 | 109/3 110/5 111/13 | Civil [1] 76/13 |
| 96/22 | 111/21 112/9 113/9 | clarification [1] |
| child [119] $1 / 2$ 1/15 | 113/10 113/14 | 22/23 |
| 2/9 2/20 6/2 6/14 | 113/20 115/12 | clarify [1] 88/20 |
| 7/4 8/15 10/8 10/23 | 115/18 116/4 116/9 | clarifying [1] 88/23 |
| 11/5 11/23 12/4 | 116/11 116/23 | clarity [3] 11/10 |
| 12/17 13/17 13/23 | 117/2 117/9 117/14 | 15/19 23/13 |
| 18/3 20/20 24/19 | 117/17 118/7 | CLARK [2] 3/19 |


| C | 29/20 35/7 40/1 | 67/19 74/19 75/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLARK... [1] 7/5 | 67/6 79/20 82/21 | 75/9 82/17 83/6 |
| $\text { class [1] } 8 / 3$ | 90/22 119/20 | 83/7 101/3 111/2 |
| clause [1] 61/22 | 119/23 120/12 | 120/17 124/1 |
| CLE [1] 28/4 | 122/13 123/5 | 124/10 124/12 |
| clean [1] 56/7 | 125/11 125/13 | 129/8 129/21 |
| clear [4] 20/11 80/6 | 130/6 | 29/22 |
| 80/7 82/10 | comes [9] 29/23 | Commerce [1] 2/15 |
| clearly [2] 36/7 | 58/14 86/18 96/8 | Commission [1] |
| 90/13 | 98/2 99/2 114/19 | 132/11 |
| clerk [2] 100/1 | 121/4 122/23 | Commissioner [2] |
| 100/2 | comfortable [2] | 1/18 131/5 |
| clerk's [4] 6/8 | 26/14 57/16 <br> coming [8] 4/3 7/10 | COMMITTEE [61] <br> 1/1 1/15 2/5 5/5 6/5 |
| 80/13 88/10 99/19 clerks [3] 97/16 | 15/14 80/9 86/14 | $8 / 15 \text { 8/19 9/18 10/3 }$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { clerks [3] 97/16 } \\ & 97 / 20 \text { 129/18 } \end{aligned}$ | 92/6 93/12 130/3 | 10/8 11/6 14/9 |
| client [1] 36/14 | commencing [1] | 14/17 17/1 21/5 |
| clients [3] 36/23 | 1/20 | 27/7 27/9 27/17 |
| 128/11 128/20 | comment [8] 18/21 | 27/20 28/2 28/9 |
| Cliff [1] 7/3 | 22/18 23/14 59/20 | 31/14 39/6 46/7 |
| CLIFFORD [1] | 64/17 124/15 126/7 | 46/21 47/7 49/14 |
| 3/19 | 127/10 | 50/23 51/7 51/15 |
| close [2] 34/21 | comments [44] | 52/18 53/2 54/19 |
| 126/17 | 14/9 16/7 21/6 27/4 | 54/21 56/21 57/2 |
| closed [1] 94/19 | 27/7 27/9 28/9 | 59/6 59/19 59/22 |
| closer [1] 63/1 | 28/11 39/6 39/10 | 66/19 75/15 76/9 |
| Code [1] 129/12 | 46/22 48/10 48/23 | 78/19 83/5 83/7 |
| collect [1] 41/17 | 50/23 51/5 51/7 | 101/2 105/13 |
| College [1] 2/15 | 51/15 52/2 52/9 | 105/19 107/17 |
| Colorado [1] 2/3 | 52/18 53/2 53/7 | 108/19 108/21 |
| combined [1] 63/6 | 54/7 54/20 54/22 | 110/19 111/11 |
| come [17] 8/1 14/8 | 55/16 57/9 59/16 | 120/14 123/22 |



| C | 78/11 79/1 79/9 | credit [6] 67/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| could... [16] 101/12 | 79/16 79/17 79/20 | 85/13 88/19 90/21 |
| 102/4 102/7 102/8 | 81/10 84/21 92/18 | 93/2 121/22 |
| 104/19 109/6 110/4 | 94/2 96/4 98/15 | credits [2] 17/6 |
| 115/12 115/13 | 99/6 99/12 99/15 | 64/2 |
| 115/14 119/8 125/9 | 99/16 100/9 102/10 | cross [2] 17/6 64/2 |
| 125/11 125/13 | 102/15 104/13 | cross-credits [2] |
| 127/7 127/11 | 104/16 109/18 | 17/6 64/2 |
| counsel [1] 131/17 | 112/22 115/22 | CS [5] 57/13 58/12 |
| counted [1] 15/15 | 116/8 117/8 117/20 | 59/11 75/4 78/2 |
| counter [1] 69/21 | 117/22 126/2 | CS-42 [2] 58/12 |
| countersuing [1] | 126/10 127/1 127/7 | 78/2 |
| 25/14 | 128/12 128/22 | CS-42-S [3] 57/13 |
| counting [2] 25/1 | 131/4 132/1 132/2 | 59/11 75/4 |
| 126/13 | 132/10 | Culverhouse [1] |
| County [5] 2/23 | court's [4] 30/20 | 2/1 |
| 5/14 6/3 45/11 | 31/1 40/9 102/3 | curious [1] 61/12 |
| 131/3 | courts [8] 24/23 | curious if [1] 61/12 |
| couple [7] 51/10 | 27/14 36/2 71/17 | current [11] 24/9 |
| 76/14 78/7 85/17 | 77/9 78/1 80/22 | 60/13 60/22 77/18 |
| 85/21 105/20 113/5 | 116/17 | 86/5 86/20 87/23 |
| course [6] 23/1 41/6 | coverage [3] 58/18 | 89/16 94/18 94/18 |
| 43/15 60/14 86/22 | 63/23 64/23 | 95/18 |
| 120/8 | covered [1] 14/4 | cushion [1] 33/22 |
| court [62] 1/17 3/14 | COVID [1] 33/15 | custodial [4] 85/16 |
| 3/15 4/14 5/2 5/15 | CPS [1] 117/9 | 87/4 90/19 98/23 |
| 6/7 10/20 12/16 | crap [1] 32/8 | custodian's [1] |
| 12/16 13/16 23/17 | create [3] 10/21 | 109/21 |
| 23/20 26/16 29/21 | 85/13 125/12 | custody [53] 10/7 |
| 30/18 44/6 59/23 | created [1] 59/3 | 10/23 11/1 11/18 |
| 70/1 72/1 74/21 | creating [1] 70/13 | 11/22 12/5 12/13 |
| 76/13 77/16 77/17 | credibility [1] 30/2 | 13/18 13/21 14/1 |


| C | 97/3 97/5 97/12 | deal [5] 46/8 95/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| custody... [43] | 98/19 101/21 | 95/23 101/1 129/16 |
| 20/20 21/20 22/22 | 103/22 103/23 | dealing [1] 123/23 |
| 37/17 40/7 41/4 | dated [3] 10/18 | dealt [6] 46/13 |
| 41/8 41/12 42/6 | 76/11 86/4 | 75/20 76/17 84/4 |
| 42/15 42/19 43/18 | daughter [1] 92/5 | 84/17 114/7 |
| 45/5 58/10 58/22 | DAVIS [4] 2/6 6/5 | December [1] |
| 60/13 61/5 61/8 | 37/4 73/13 | 132/4 |
| 61/23 62/2 63/2 | day [9] 32/1 32/15 | decide [2] 22/15 |
| 63/2 67/11 68/20 | 32/16 33/3 90/16 | 29/7 |
| 68/21 68/23 70/14 | 98/5 98/15 127/6 | decision [4] 26/9 |
| 72/15 72/19 89/2 | 132/4 | 70/1 118/12 118/19 |
| 109/9 111/22 | daycare [3] 82/1 | Decisions [2] 56/3 |
| 115/19 116/7 117/1 | 122/13 122/18 | 56/5 |
| 117/10 117/12 | days [48] 12/20 | decrease [1] 83/21 |
| 118/9 118/20 123/9 | 12/23 13/4 13/10 | deemed [1] 115/12 |
| 125/9 125/11 | 13/11 15/4 15/6 | defeat [2] 125/14 |
| 127/18 | 19/16 20/16 20/21 | 126/21 |
| customary [1] | 20/23 21/20 22/11 | define [1] 35/10 |
| 131/22 | 22/12 25/1 27/22 | defined [1] 27/22 |
| cut [1] 77/10 | 29/11 30/17 31/10 | definitely [1] 19/22 |
| D | 31/17 32/9 32/23 | definition [1] 70/12 |
| DA [1] 6/18 | 33/16 33/22 34/17 | 96/14 122/4 |
| dad [1] 25/12 | 35/20 36/8 36/18 | delete [1] 53/19 |
| Dadeville [1] 2/10 | 37/6 43/13 44/14 | Denver [1] 2/3 |
| dash [2] 57/18 | 46/16 46/20 52/14 | Department [2] |
| 57/22 | 53/11 96/17 96/17 | 2/12 2/20 |
| data [2] 69/7 114/6 | 98/14 100/15 103/6 | dependency [3] |
| date [15] 86/7 86/8 | 125/7 125/11 | 115/11 115/19 |
| 86/8 86/11 90/3 | 125/16 126/13 | 117/7 |
| 90/4 90/5 90/17 | 127/5 | dependent [2] |
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doesn't [15] 32/12
36/15 39/7 52/9
65/6 68/11 79/23
81/5 81/17 84/7
96/5 96/7 96/13
103/2 106/18
dog [1] 16/19
doing [13] 10/14
25/1 25/11 25/22
27/11 66/3 66/4
70/21 93/13 96/22
108/10 113/18
126/14
dollars [1] 73/20
domestic [1] 5/21

| D | 58/20 92/8 112/22 | 119/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| don't [50] 4/15 | downward [1] 72/3 | educate [2] 81/2 |
| 15/13 17/9 18/16 | DR [16] 2/2 4/11 | 128/20 |
| 24/1 26/20 29/17 | 59/14 60/1 60/6 | educated [2] 35/1 |
| 30/6 32/2 32/14 | 60/8 62/10 67/6 | 35/5 |
| 45/14 46/4 46/10 | 68/1 69/1 120/18 | educating [1] |
| 51/9 51/13 52/8 | 121/2 121/11 | 128/11 |
| 52/22 60/14 62/11 | 121/14 121/18 | effect [4] 97 |
| 62/12 62/16 66/23 | 122/3 | 98/16 100/4 112/21 |
| 74/4 85/11 90/8 | draft [4] 14/8 24/12 | effective [7] 97/3 |
| 90/12 91/11 93/15 | 27/19 108/1 | 97/5 100/8 102/10 |
| 94/15 95/21 98/19 | drafted [1] 10/19 | 102/14 104/1 |
| 100/15 101/13 | drafting [1] 10/15 | 107/10 |
| 102/17 102/21 | DREW [2] 3/10 | effectively [1] |
| 103/15 103/17 | 6/15 | 69/10 |
| 105/14 107/9 | due [1] 102/22 | effort [2] 8/1 8/8 |
| 110/17 116/12 | duly [1] 131/23 | either [4] 20/6 77/2 |
| 116/15 119/1 | during [2] 125/6 | 81/17 117/8 |
| 120/12 121/5 121/8 | 127/5 | either/or [1] 20/6 |
| 127/19 128/15 | duty [2] 127/14 | element [3] 35/21 |
| 128/20 129/10 | 127/16 | 42/9 42/13 |
| done [9] 14/7 14/21 | E | eliminates [1] |
| 17/2 24/20 28/7 | each [1] 18/3 | else [20] 4/19 30/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29/11 29/16 81/3 } \\ & 92 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { earlier [2] } 92 / 2$ | 36/20 55/12 55/16 |
|  | 24/15 | 56/8 56/9 57/8 81/8 |
| double [3] 17/15 | $\mathbf{e a}$ | 105/17 105/18 |
| $17 / 22 \text { 65/23 }$ | ea | 105/21 105/23 |
| double-check [3] |  | 106/1 106/8 106/17 |
| 17/15 17/22 65/23 | $108 / 1$ | 120/16 120/21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { down [7] 5/20 } \\ & 29 / 2335 / 758 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | easily [1] 33/13 economic [1] | email [3] 66/15 |


| E | 130/21 131/10 | ever [3] 112/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| email... [2] 67/6 | engineers [2] 29/10 | 113/2 122/15 |
| 122/9 | 45/1 | every [7] 43/3 |
| emancipated [2] | enough [3] 41/2 | 46/19 61/10 92/7 |
| $76 / 2284 / 9$ | 62/12 119/14 | 94/7 122/20 127/15 |
| emancipates [3] | enter [1] 45/15 | everybody [4] 4/13 |
| 94/9 94/17 96/18 | entering [1] 100/12 | 17/7 50/8 122/9 |
| Emeritus [2] 2/14 | entertain [2] 45/20 | everyone [5] 4/2 |
| 5/17 | 74/15 | 5/4 8/7 9/1 108/3 |
| emphasis [1] 52/13 | entire [3] 14/3 | everything [2] 36/3 |
| emphasize [1] | 50/ | 44/5 |
| 52/15 | entitled [1] 89/19 | Everywhere [1] |
| employee [2] | equal [1] 63/2 |  |
| 131/17 131/19 | especially [4] 8/7 | eviction [1] 119/16 |
| employee's [1] | 18/13 90/18 95/12 | evidence [1] 30/3 |
| 96/22 | Esquire [8] 2/8 <br> 2/11 2/17 3/3 3/5 | evidenced [1] 132/2 |
| employer [8] 83/22 | 2/11 2/17 3/3 3/5 | exact [4] 18/22 <br> 34/11 94/11 108/1 |
| 98/18 99/11 99/17 | 3/10 3/13 3/20 |  |
| 100/2 100/4 100/19 | essentially [3] $78 / 23$ 101/4 102/18 | exactly [3] 19/3 $43 / 843 / 9$ |
| 103/6 | 78/23 101/4 102/18 <br> established [1] | 43/8 43/9 <br> example [12] 13/20 |
| employment [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { established [1] } \\ & 114 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { example [12] 13/20 } \\ & 24 / 1525 / 926 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 95/18 99/2 100/7 | establishing [2] | 30/7 33/9 34/13 |
| encompass [1] 40/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { establishing [2] } \\ & \mathbf{7 6 / 1 9} 79 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 / 7 \text { 33/9 34/13 } \\ & 86 / 788 / 1789 / 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| encourage [1] 68/20 | evaluate [1] 30/2 | 100/6 100/11 |
| raged | even [11] 34/23 | examples [3] 27/1 |
| $23 / 268 / 21$ | 45/14 66/2 66/2 | 51/18 52/1 |
| end [5] 7/11 59/1 | 72/23 73/2 91/3 | excellent [1] 18/11 |
| 77/13 94/15 108/18 | 93/8 116/18 120/12 | except [1] 65/18 |
| ended [1] 27/11 | 128/13 | excepts [1] 36/3 |
| ends [2] 94/8 96/1 | event [4] 68/4 95/15 | excess [1] 86/13 |
| ENFORCEMENT <br> [5] 1/2 1/16 2/20 | 100/8 102/12 | excessive [2] 31/8 |


| $\mathbf{E}$ | 64/14 122/3 126/23 | February 1st [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| excessive... [1] | fact that [1] 64/14 | 13/3 |
| 31/10 | factual [1] 25/4 | federal [1] 94/23 |
| excuse [1] 31/18 | failed [3] 22/21 | Feds [1] 71/8 |
| exercise [19] 11/21 | 23/19 39/3 | fee [3] 44/17 80/15 |
| 20/19 21/19 22/12 | fails [13] 20/19 | 90/9 |
| 22/21 23/19 25/10 | 21/19 22/11 34/14 | feels [1] 108/6 |
| 29/22 33/16 34/15 | 37/16 40/6 47/16 | fees [1] 26/2 |
| 34/18 37/7 37/16 | 47/22 48/1 48/4 | felt [2] 26/5 26/14 |
| 39/4 40/6 54/14 | 48/22 54/14 55/2 | female [1] 62/21 |
| 55/2 126/4 127/19 | failure [2] 28/22 | few [3] 64/9 65/18 |
| exercised [3] 12/20 | 126/3 | 73/20 |
| 81/10 126/6 | fairly [3] 33/12 | field [1] 112/11 |
| exercising [3] 12/13 | 35/9 129/18 | Fifth [1] 6/18 |
| 13/7 125/9 | fairness [1] 120/7 | figure [1] 106/16 |
| $\operatorname{Exp}$ [1] 132/10 | fall [3] 32/14 36/15 | file [15] 44/15 82/8 |
| expenses [1] 72/4 | 127/3 | 84/7 85/16 89/5 |
| experience [1] 29/3 | familiar [1] 107/7 | 89/8 90/12 91/4 |
| experiment [1] | family [3] 5/14 | 96/18 98/14 99/15 |
| 60/17 | 27/18 117/4 | 99/20 102/21 104/2 |
| expires [1] 132/11 | far [4] 45/22 90/4 | 125/19 |
| explained [1] 29/8 | 99/7 110/16 | filed [7] 13/4 41/16 |
| explanation [1] | father [16] 12/11 | 79/16 89/13 90/17 |
| 88/4 | 12/12 12/19 24/16 | 104/4 104/11 |
| explicit [1] 64/13 | 24/17 25/10 30/7 | files [4] 25/12 89/3 |
| expressed [1] 32/15 | 33/8 60/21 115/23 | 102/15 103/3 |
| $\text { extent [3] } 14 / 14$ | 116/1 116/13 | filing [20] 13/12 |
| 34/23 35/4 | 116/14 116/15 | 15/13 18/23 19/6 |
|  | 116/19 116/20 | 19/14 19/17 30/16 |
| F | favor [5] 9/17 47/4 | 34/9 44/17 80/15 |
| face [1] 127/19 | 49/13 56/20 75/13 | 81/17 84/11 85/5 |
| fact [5] 30/5 31/18 | February [1] 13/3 | 89/11 90/3 90/5 |

$\qquad$
filing... [4] 90/9
125/12 125/17
125/19
final [5] 51/7 74/21
117/13 122/11
127/15
finalized [1] 118/12 finally [1] 58/22 financial [2] 25/20 26/4
financially [1]

## 131/20

find [10] 13/16 22/3 23/18 23/21 31/1 40/9 55/18 70/17 70/18 129/13
finding [2] 30/20 114/12
finds [1] 44/8
fine [2] 25/14 52/21 first [16] 5/4 9/3 10/1 10/5 25/7
38/15 46/1 46/13 49/21 72/22 82/14 86/20 99/12 102/2 113/17 114/3
five [2] 33/16 58/1
flag [1] 29/5
flesh [1] 51/16
floor [1] 14/16
flow [1] 20/9
focus [3] 25/6 25/17 20/15
73/14
folks [1] 4/2
follow [3] 83/16
88/18 96/6
following [1] 132/3
follows [1] 59/13
foregoing [1]
131/12
foresee [1] 93/18
forget [1] 24/14
forgot [1] 24/10
form [31] 17/1 17/4 function [1] 4/10
17/5 17/11 17/15 further [3] 49/1
18/4 18/14 56/12
57/12 57/12 58/4
58/8 58/12 58/16
59/7 59/8 59/11
59/20 63/20 64/12
65/16 65/17 66/20
67/13 67/20 68/5
74/19 75/4 78/2
80/14 99/20
formed [1] 78/5
forward [1] 15/1
forwarding [1]
66/15
found [2] 59/14
132/3
four [2] 25/15
34/17
Fourteen [2] 19/16
frame [5] 32/15
47/5 76/20 79/7 91/17
frequently [3] 34/10 83/2 95/16 FRIDAY [3] 1/4 1/21 131/12
front [5] 9/2 17/14 28/17 57/22 114/23
full [3] 20/12 75/2 122/14

131/16 131/23
future [8] 86/6
90/23 100/14
101/21 108/5
110/20 111/11
124/3

## G

gave [3] 13/20 26/18 100/7
General [1] 2/11 generally [2] 22/11 87/18
gentlemen [1]
75/20
get [28] 4/10 8/4
11/20 11/22 32/10 39/23 40/11 41/1 41/2 44/16 45/6

| G | 33/2 33/3 33/10 | 99/9 100/13 108/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| get... [17] 45/13 | 36/18 42/5 45/13 | 109/5 117/17 118/4 |
| 57/13 58/13 66/22 | 46/1 49/19 49/20 | 118/15 118/19 |
| 66/23 84/13 88/19 | 51/4 55/7 70/8 | 125/22 126/10 |
| 88/23 90/10 91/15 | 74/14 80/10 83/21 | 127/15 128/10 |
| 96/8 96/13 96/19 | 86/16 87/10 90/4 | gone [2] 77/1 108/8 |
| 98/6 98/22 112/12 | 92/8 99/12 99/19 | $\operatorname{good}[12] ~ 4 / 15 / 1$ |
| 122/8 | 106/16 117/17 | 5/12 15/20 18/14 |
| get-go [1] 45/13 | 129/11 130/7 | 22/22 23/11 60/8 |
| gets [5] 33/15 55/23 | goes [5] 39/17 95/8 | 67/9 75/19 88/3 |
| 58/1 83/23 85/23 | 99/23 100/1 100/18 | 107/19 |
| getting [7] 35/8 | going [76] 5/3 8/2 | got [12] 9/2 12/14 |
| 37/13 43/17 84/14 | 8/4 9/23 16/16 26/3 | 13/5 44/18 68/18 |
| 85/19 95/1 121/22 | 29/10 32/6 32/8 | 74/3 78/9 85/2 |
| gift [3] 90/1 101/18 | 32/9 33/2 33/23 | 97/14 103/22 |
| 104/19 | 34/2 34/16 34/22 | 109/15 126/20 |
| girlfriend [1] 34/1 | 35/2 35/6 35/7 | gotten [1] 82/1 |
| give [13] 13/15 38/6 | 35/19 36/13 38/15 | govern [1] 71/15 |
| 51/18 52/1 67/10 | 42/22 43/4 44/15 | graciously [1] |
| 75/23 94/2 102/1 | 45/1 58/3 62/6 66/5 | 10/15 |
| 102/5 107/18 | 68/21 69/2 69/6 | grammatical [1] |
| 119/21 120/10 | 69/11 70/20 70/23 | 54/12 |
| 127/14 | 74/6 80/7 81/21 | grandchildren [1] |
| gives [3] 23/17 | 83/20 85/12 85/13 | 113/22 |
| 30/14 36/22 | 85/17 85/21 85/22 | grandma [1] |
| giving [4] 93/23 | 86/14 86/16 89/10 | 118/20 |
| 98/17 100/11 | 89/10 89/23 90/22 | grandmother [1] |
| 128/10 | 91/1 92/8 92/9 | 109/5 |
| glad [2] 119/6 | 93/10 93/16 93/19 | grandparent [10] |
| 130/1 | 94/1 95/10 95/17 | 109/9 109/16 |
| go [30] 5/6 14/3 | 95/19 96/15 97/8 | 111/14 112/10 |
| 29/11 32/8 32/9 | 97/15 97/17 97/18 | 113/8 113/9 114/9 |


| G | 123/15 | 47/6 56/20 57/1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| grandparent... [3] | guesstimate [1] | 75/13 75/14 |
| 115/13 116/6 117/1 | 62/19 | handle [1] 61/22 |
| grandparent's [2] | GUEST [1] 2/2 | handled [1] 123/9 |
| 109/13 112/4 | guidance [3] 60/15 | handling [1] 5/21 |
| grandparents [3] | 109/2 114/20 | hands [4] 47/8 |
| 113/21 115/3 | Guideline [1] 60/17 | 49/15 57/3 75/16 |
| 119/10 | GUIDELINES [13] | happen [7] 28/16 |
| grandparents' [1] | 1/2 1/16 60/14 | 62/9 73/21 79/23 |
| 114/21 | 60/22 61/3 61/7 | 86/15 95/11 101/8 |
| grant [1] 126/2 | 101/6 109/11 | happens [9] 74/22 |
| granted [5] 55/3 | 109/23 110/8 | 79/21 84/7 92/12 |
| 55/4 117/8 117/10 | 110/11 130/21 | 94/7 95/16 101/12 |
| 117/11 | 131/10 | 103/7 103/14 |
| gratitude [1] 8/6 | guys [1] 42/23 | happy [5] 4/11 7/1 |
| GRAY [8] 2/14 | H | 7/18 14/12 14/14 |
| 5/16 17/6 17/17 | had [31] 10/13 | hard [1] 70/21 |
| 59/11 63/15 63/18 | 11/14 12/19 22/10 | has [49] 5/7 9/1 |
| 65/22 | 14/14 26/5 28/6 | 10/1 10/15 12/19 |
| great [2] 4/23 14/21 | 30/8 32/4 33/15 | 17/7 26/19 30/17 |
| greater [1] 68/11 | 51/10 57/14 59/2 | 32/15 33/9 35/20 |
| grindstone [1] 67/2 | 59/2 60/11 61/9 | 43/1 45/18 65/3 |
| grounds [4] 13/23 | 61/9 76/14 76/15 | 68/12 69/17 73/14 |
| 125/12 125/16 | 77/20 78/4 78/6 | 73/19 77/2 83/19 |
| 125/18 | 78/20 108/15 | 84/9 86/3 86/19 |
| group [3] 35/14 | 108/16 109/1 110/3 | 97/10 97/13 99/6 |
| 67/2 107/20 | 114/8 120/12 122/1 | 100/4 100/8 104/12 |
| guess [13] 20/8 | 124/15 | 108/10 109/9 |
| 23/22 33/17 42/10 | half [2] 58/14 127/5 | 111/22 112/20 |
| 47/14 49/6 49/21 | Hampshire [2] | 112/20 113/9 115/7 |
| 57/19 61/14 73/14 | H2/16 62/23 | 116/3 116/7 116/13 |
| 101/17 122/2 | hand [7] 42/5 42/5 | 116/19 117/1 117/8 |


| H | 116/14 116/19 | 91/14 101/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| has... [7] 118/8 | 125/11 125/13 | 105/20 108/2 130/1 |
| 118/12 123/7 | 126/19 126/20 | hers [1] 29/3 |
| 123/18 123/22 | 126/21 127/4 | hesitant [2] 39/12 |
| 126/20 129/18 | healthcare [3] | 118/11 |
| hasn't [1] 81/10 | 58/18 63/23 64/23 | hey [1] 98/4 |
| hats [1] 4/7 | healthcare-coverag | high [1] 122/19 |
| have [180] | e [1] 64/23 | higher [2] 62/6 68/5 |
| have to [1] 118/4 | hear [10] 9/9 34/8 | him [1] 116/16 |
| haven't [7] 17/2 | 36/11 60/9 69/1 | his [17] 12/13 12/20 |
| 18/6 64/8 81/9 | 74/18 111/2 112/11 | 12/21 20/19 21/19 |
| 112/3 113/2 113/2 | 114/11 123/15 | 22/21 29/2 30/9 |
| having [18] 5/3 | heard [1] 111/3 | 37/16 40/6 50/3 |
| 8/14 10/12 26/2 | hearing [4] 35/2 | 76/16 88/18 91/4 |
| 28/15 34/9 35/15 | 45/19 64/8 74/17 | 122/9 126/20 127/6 |
| 72/21 74/1 74/8 | held [4] 1/16 40/2 | historically [2] 52/7 |
| 85/1 89/13 93/7 | 94/20 95/12 | 69/17 |
| 101/23 102/1 | help [5] 39/10 81/6 | hit [1] 32/10 |
| 114/13 123/5 | 119/10 120/17 | holding [1] 93/22 |
| 123/12 | 129/15 | home [1] 119/13 |
| he [42] 10/15 12/14 | helpful [7] 4/18 | homes [1] 69/9 |
| 13/6 23/21 24/18 | 44/23 67/12 108/9 | honestly [1] 107/7 |
| 30/1 30/16 33/9 | 123/20 129/3 | HONORABLE [3] |
| 34/18 43/23 45/5 | 129/19 | $2 / 223 / 13 / 7$ |
| 55/4 55/9 55/10 | helps [1] 44/2 <br> her [8] 4/18 20/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hook [2] 25/23 } \\ & 77 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 60/23 61/4 61/6 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { her [8] } & 4 / 18 & 20 / 19 \\ 21 / 19 & 22 / 21 & 37 / 16 \end{array}$ | Hoover [1] 2/23 |
| 61/8 61/9 65/5 65/6 | 21/19 22/21 37/16 | Hoover [1] 2/23 |
| 76/15 77/20 77/21 | 40/7 60/4 120/22 | hope [1] 8/8 |
| 78/4 85/23 88/18 | here [16] 6/20 8/15 | hopefully [1] 91/18 |
| 88/19 91/3 104/11 | 11/16 17/18 28/7 | hospitalized [1] |
| 104/11 104/12 | 36/18 50/9 58/18 | 26/19 |
| 104/14 116/2 | 66/13 90/13 91/8 | household [1] 74/7 |


| H | 126/13 126/15 | 39/6 80/23 119/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| how [16] 19/3 | I've [2] 55/11 | 128/17 129/6 |
| 62/16 72/15 74/10 | 124/18 | included [2] 25/22 |
| 82/22 92/22 98/4 | idea [3] 13/2 24/8 | 27/10 |
| 98/5 107/8 108/6 | 107/19 | including [2] 50/20 |
| 109/2 109/8 109/9 | identical [1] 11/4 | 50/22 |
| 111/11 116/4 | identify [2] 4/16 | income [44] 61/17 |
| 122/13 | 124/21 | 61/19 62/4 62/18 |
| HOWELL [2] 3/18 | ignore [1] 114/1 | 63/4 63/6 80/2 80/4 |
| 7/7 | illness [3] 23/8 23/9 | 83/10 83/17 84/1 |
| however [7] 29/6 | 23/10 | 84/12 86/19 90/10 |
| 33/17 34/11 35/10 | immaterial [1] 15/1 | 91/12 92/7 94/9 |
| 79/13 103/19 | immediacy [1] | 94/12 96/7 96/21 |
| 125/23 | 46/14 | 98/6 102/12 109/3 |
| huh [1] 19/12 | immediate [1] | 109/10 109/13 |
| Human [2] 2/12 | 18/21 | 109/21 109/22 |
| 2/20 | immediately [18] | 110/4 110/7 110/7 |
| hundred [1] 73/20 | 9/22 15/5 15/8 | 110/11 111/12 |
| Huntsville [4] 3/6 | 15/10 15/16 15/18 | 111/15 111/17 |
| 6/1 8/3 45/10 | 19/18 19/20 20/8 | 111/19 112/4 |
| I | 20/22 21/1 21/15 | 112/14 114/18 |
|  | 21/21 22/16 46/17 | 114/21 114/22 |
| I mean [1] 43/8 | 54/3 95/19 96/8 | 115/2 116/8 116/19 |
| I'll [6] 45/16 49/11 | impact [3] 64/19 | 119/15 |
| 50/3 56/17 75/11 | 74/10 86/12 | incomes [2] 63/1 |
| 111/6 | important [3] | 63/3 |
| I'm [21] 5/13 5/16 | 13/14 80/1 81/14 | increasing [1] |
| 5/17 5/20 5/23 6/4 | impute [4] 110/7 | 62/22 |
| 6/5 6/8 6/9 6/21 | 111/16 112/18 | incur [1] 69/12 |
| 6/22 14/13 22/4 | 116/18 | indented [1] 81/1 |
| 22/17 29/9 69/3 | imputed [1] 128/4 | indicated [1] 57/14 |
| 85/1 89/9 92/3 | include [6] 33/18 | Indicating [1] 67/7 |


ineligible [1] 83/13 information [8] 9/2 83/23 110/3 114/13 114/16 121/19
123/19 129/7 informational [1] 129/20
initial [3] 27/19
114/7 126/18 initially [2] 45/4 115/10
input [1] 105/23
inquiries [2] 120/11 120/15
insignificant [1] 69/3
instance [7] 13/7 26/3 30/8 46/19 70/21 77/11 84/10 instances [6] 36/4 36/5 38/7 93/1 93/18 117/7 instead [5] 32/16 33/3 36/17 53/20 71/4
instinctual [1] 84/20
instructional [1] 27/5
instructions [1] 98/17
instructive [1] 27/14
intended [4] 39/11 64/17 80/6 80/21 intending [1] 26/21 intent [3] 11/21
15/18 37/1
intentional [1] 26/8 interest [4] 87/9 93/4 95/8 101/15 interested [2] 82/19 131/20
internally [1] 69/16 Internet [1] 121/10 interpretation [1] 85/8
interworkings [1] 107/8
introduce [1] 5/4 introducing [1] 5/11
investigated [1]
113/3
invited [1] 8/16
involved [2] 10/14 87/2
involving [1] 82/20 is [306]
isn't [2] 65/6 71/7 issue [30] 29/22
31/15 34/23 35/6 44/13 51/8 77/23

78/9 78/14 80/19
85/10 94/23 96/11 96/16 97/15 99/5 101/5 101/13
101/23 108/4 108/12 111/9
113/21 117/14
121/4 122/16
122/23 123/4 123/5 123/23
issues [11] 10/13
45/22 78/6 100/2 105/5 105/11
105/22 108/14
108/14 119/13
130/10
it [289]
it's [92] 7/21 12/8
12/11 13/13 15/12
15/18 15/20 27/22
28/7 29/16 30/11
30/18 30/23 32/20
34/12 34/21 35/7
35/21 35/22 36/18 40/22 41/2 41/18
41/20 42/13 43/10
44/14 47/12 54/17
61/15 62/5 62/18
65/2 66/5 67/11
67/12 67/12 69/8
70/23 73/10 76/19
77/9 77/12 79/5

| I | J | 3/5 5/22 27/15 29/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| it's... [48] 80/1 80/6 | JANE [7] 2/2 4/11 | 56/13 106/7 |
| 80/9 80/13 81/6 | 108/16 110/22 | Joan-Marie' |
| 81/21 83/19 83/20 | 110/22 123/16 | 31/23 38/12 |
| 85/7 85/20 85/21 | 123/17 | job [7] 4/23 36/14 |
| 87/14 87/15 89/23 | Jeana [5] 1/17 3/15 | 67/3 75/20 81/23 |
| 90/1 90/9 90/12 | 4/14 131/4 132/9 | 88/1 95/15 |
| 90/22 91/10 91/13 | Jefferson [1] 90/9 | JOHNSON [4] |
| 91/22 92/2 93/5 | JEFFRIES [12] | 2 46/3 |
| 94/20 94/23 95/18 | 2/17 6/9 22/9 36/6 |  |
| 98/9 98/10 98/17 | 44/10 52/12 53/22 | join [1] 4/11 |
| 99/20 101/8 103/23 | 73/1 75/12 88/13 | joint [12] 11/18 |
| 104/18 107/23 | 97/2 101/16 | 41/3 45/4 45/12 |
| 108/9 115/3 115/21 | JENNIFER [18] | 60/12 61/5 61/8 |
| 116/1 116/6 117/7 | 2/11 6/11 83/6 86/1 | 8/20 68/21 68/23 |
| 118/6 118/21 119/3 | 91/5 94/5 103/20 | 70/14 72/14 |
| 122/19 122/20 | 106/2 106/7 107/7 | judge [52] 3/1 3/8 |
| 127/16 128/22 | 107/14 108/14 | 5/10 5/13 5/14 5/20 |
| 129/2 | 114/8 114/12 | 9/13 10/13 14/18 |
| item [2] 10/6 76/5 | 120/20 121/3 122/5 | 14/19 16/12 18/1 |
| its [1] 129/4 | 123/21 | 18/20 24/2 24/10 |
| itself [8] 39/13 | Jennifer's [1] 111/2 | 26/14 26/18 29/22 |
| 46/21 52/19 57/9 | JIM [16] 2/17 6/9 | 38/6 39/19 42/3 |
| 82/15 103/18 | 22/8 29/2 35/19 | 43/19 44/8 44/21 |
| 103/19 128/6 | 36/6 40/4 44/10 | 44/21 45/4 47/15 |
| IV [1] 82/21 | 52/12 53/22 73/1 | 49/23 60/10 64/16 |
| IV-D [1] 82/21 | 75/12 88/13 97/2 | 64/19 66/1 71/21 |
| IWO [10] 89/9 | 101/16 104/18 | 74/23 76/8 76/12 |
| 94/12 96/2 96/19 | JOAN [8] 3/5 5/22 | 82/18 86/2 88/14 |
| 97/5 98/16 99/1 | 27/15 29/3 31/23 | 92/20 96/11 98/21 |
| 99/4 99/7 101/1 | 38/12 56/13 106/7 <br> JOAN-MARIE [6] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99/18 99/23 99/23 } \\ & 100 / 6104 / 8 ~ 105 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |


| J | 51/16 51/23 52/11 | 31/23 39/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| judge... [4] 106/15 | 52/13 54/11 56/7 | 40/21 41/4 42 |
| 115/6 115/8 129/17 | 58/19 60/19 61/9 | 54/12 106/23 |
| judges [14] 12/3 | 62/21 64/7 64/19 | 107/18 |
| 20/13 28/17 35/9 | 65/22 65/23 67/1 | knew [2] 104/15 |
| 36/1 39/10 45/20 | 68/11 70/5 74/11 | 110/3 |
| 52/16 70/4 78/1 | 78/22 80/19 81/6 | know [101] |
| 97 | 84/15 84/19 87/13 | 13/3 15/15 25/8 |
| 129/16 | 87/19 92/5 92/14 | 26/13 27/13 28 |
| judgment | 93/10 94/19 96/5 | 28/20 29/13 29 |
| 127/16 | 96/9 96/23 98/14 | 32/2 32/5 32/12 |
| judicial [4] 3/2 3/8 | 100/10 103/18 | 32/17 33/1 33/1 |
| 28/15 75/3 | 103/21 1 | 3/14 33/2 |
| JULIE [5] 2/22 6/2 | 106/19 109/4 | 36/16 36/19 39/2 |
| 8/19 90/2 96/12 | 109/22 111/10 | 40/9 40/20 41/1 |
| jump [1] 9/23 | 111/18 113/5 | 41/10 42/3 43/12 |
| jurisdiction [2] | 114/21 115/3 116/9 | 43/16 44/4 44/6 |
| 81/10 116/16 | 116/23 118/6 | 44/14 44/17 45/14 |
| isdictio | 119/10 120/1 122/4 | 51/8 51/13 62/11 |
|  | juvenile [1] 115/11 | 62/12 62/13 62/16 |
| just [86] 6/22 12/11 | K | 16 |
| 14/22 15/5 17/11 | KATIE [3] 3/3 | 70 |
| 19/1 19/7 20/1 | 106/10 106/14 | 77/2 77/13 |
| 22/12 25/8 25/9 | keep [4] 21/13 | 81/14 83/22 86/2 |
| 27/22 28/22 30/1 | 10 | 87/20 89/6 89/7 |
| 31/7 31/22 32/11 |  | 89/9 90/21 92/4 |
| 32/13 32/22 3 | kept [1] 86/14 | 92/9 93/7 94/15 |
| 33/10 33/13 35/20 | kick [1] 94/13 | 95/21 97/4 |
| 35/22 38/15 38/19 | kid [3] 43/2 103/11 | 15 |
| 38/21 39/13 40/15 | 119/15 | 98 |
| 40/21 44/4 45/1 | kids [1] 3 | 100/21 100/22 |
| 47/6 50/23 51/6 |  | 101/6 101/1 |


| K | 51/23 54/1 68/3 | 37/21 45/19 53/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| know... [28] 102/10 | 74/13 79/2 80/22 | 53/20 69/8 70/3 |
| 102/17 104/1 104/3 | 80/23 82/15 83/14 | 80/12 120/11 |
| 104/12 105/14 | 88/23 108/1 127/17 | leave [7] 19/19 |
| 112/10 112/23 | 128/18 | 20/11 20/14 21/7 |
| 113/1 113/4 115/3 | large [5] 1/18 62/4 | 48/6 107/12 123/10 |
| 117/18 118/3 118/9 | 77/14 78/19 131/5 | leaving [3] 15/6 |
| 118/13 119/8 | last [26] 11/5 11/13 | 48/15 130/14 |
| 119/11 119/14 | 12/10 14/4 14/8 | left [3] 30/23 56/23 |
| 119/15 119/16 | 14/10 16/8 16/9 | 75/14 |
| 119/16 119/17 | 21/5 25/15 48/12 | legal [4] 2/12 6/12 |
| 121/3 121/8 127/7 | 48/13 48/23 49/5 | 35/8 94/5 |
| 128/4 128/19 | 53/6 53/15 53/17 | legitimate [3] 30/9 |
| 129/10 | 54/18 64/9 65/15 | 33/9 92/21 |
| knowledge [1] | 65/19 65/19 78/16 | less [10] 28/21 |
| 128/4 | 94/17 108/19 122/2 | 39/18 60/22 61/23 |
| known [1] 116/1 | late [3] 84/10 84/11 | 66/5 68/12 69/11 |
| L | 85/4 | 90/20 121/21 |
| lack [1] 115/20 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ladies [1] 75/2 | 2/19 6/13 | let [7] 4/13 11/15 |
| lag [1] 96/1 | latter [1] 113/19 | 16/6 65/21 80/17 |
| land [1] 29/9 | law [8] 2/6 2/7 | 98/14 123/20 |
| landed [2] 24/13 | 27/18 77/18 89/18 | let's [11] 12/11 |
| 97/19 | 116/17 128/3 128/5 | 17/21 33/3 46/7 |
| language [32] 11/2 | lawyers [7] 20/13 | 48/10 51/3 57/11 |
| 11/4 17/8 22/10 | 29/4 35/3 35/8 36/2 | 77/5 82/14 95/6 |
| 22/19 24/14 26/22 | 39/10 127/17 | 98/2 |
| 27/10 35/23 38/14 | layer [1] 104/9 | letting [1] 124/18 |
| 39/16 43/21 44/22 | learn [1] 6/23 | liability [1] 113/8 |
| 46/15 46/20 47/14 | learned [1] 124/18 | liaison [1] 6/8 |
| 48/13 50/13 51/15 | least [9] 26/10 | licensed [1] 131/23 |

lieu [3] 109/13
109/21 111/15
light [3] 68/1 122/2 123/4
like [42] 5/10 7/22
8/19 22/19 23/3
26/5 28/6 28/23
31/7 31/19 35/15
35/18 35/19 37/18
38/19 42/23 43/20
49/16 52/16 56/6
58/1 62/19 63/12
71/8 82/9 88/20
98/2 101/19 105/14
105/21 105/23
106/19 106/19
108/6 115/4 118/16
120/2 120/13
120/22 122/7
124/16 127/11
liked [1] 17/4
likely [2] 39/18 42/18
limitations [1] 89/15
limited [1] 91/21
line [18] 17/10
17/13 17/16 17/17
18/2 18/5 34/9
35/15 36/1 52/15
58/13 59/1 64/11

65/6 66/8 66/9 67/10 90/15
lines [3] 58/11
58/20 59/5
link [2] 122/8 122/9 lost [2] 81/23 122/3
LISA [2] 3/19 7/5 $\operatorname{lot}$ [14] 21/14 24/6
list [1] 5/8
listed [1] 10/11
listen [2] 35/13
130/9
listening [1] 4/23
lite [1] 45/12
litigation [1] 25/2
little [13] 4/8 26/6
36/22 39/12 53/6
58/1 94/13 96/10
105/4 118/16 120/1
122/1 129/2
littler [1] 58/2
living [2] 73/22 112/9
LLC [1] 3/16
look [13] 13/4
18/12 18/14 51/3
58/1 65/22 66/16
82/14 82/16 83/8
98/13 120/22 124/5
look-back [1] 13/4
looked [1] 18/13
looking [2] 9/3
63/10
looks [1] 63/11

Lord [1] 132/5 lose [3] 88/1 90/7 90/11
loss [1] 95/15

24/21 24/21 42/21
52/8 82/4 92/9
95/12 101/15 102/5
115/23 121/5
124/19
loud [1] 104/7
low [1] 122/19
lower [5] 24/19
70/9 86/10 86/16
86/20
lowered [1] 95/7
luck [1] 4/7
M
ma'am [2] 55/20 123/2
made [10] 11/6 18/20 50/1 51/17 78/9 79/17 84/21
98/8 104/12 127/10
Madison [1] 45/11
main [1] 57/23
major [3] 75/22
77/20 78/10
majority [1] 45/17
make [18] 16/17
20/10 21/3 32/14

| M | 108/17 | 24/6 26/16 26/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| make... [14] 34/11 | matter [2] 78/21 | 27/23 30/11 33/1 |
| 38/18 70/1 70/5 | 131/7 | 33/11 34/5 34/21 |
| 70/6 80/7 82/10 | may [19] 8/4 14/23 | 35/1 35/11 35/15 |
| 83/21 111/20 113/6 | 15/19 24/3 30/2 | 41/11 43/2 43/8 |
| 114/2 120/13 | 30/5 30/20 36/8 | 50/17 51/9 52/9 |
| 124/16 126/10 | 42/5 55/8 64/11 | 52/17 68/17 69/10 |
| makes [7] 21/17 | 76/12 79/2 81/23 | 70/22 71/11 72/3 |
| 60/23 63/15 66/6 | 81/23 106/1 108/23 | 82/20 83/2 89/17 |
| 80/5 98/19 116/21 | 109/18 126/14 | 92/2 94/10 96/15 |
| making [9] 7/23 8/7 | May 1st [1] 108/23 | 97/10 104/10 |
| 25/18 35/16 52/5 | maybe [17] 18/21 | 106/18 107/20 |
| 71/5 78/2 90/19 | 23/12 25/12 27/9 | 112/1 114/11 115/4 |
| 118/13 | 28/8 34/10 40/11 | 116/22 118/2 |
| Manager [1] 7/4 | 52/11 52/13 62/18 | 118/21 125/19 |
| mandatory [3] 70/5 | 64/12 96/16 104/14 | 126/22 127/7 128/3 |
| 70/7 80/22 | 105/9 122/3 123/6 | meaning [1] 98/1 |
| manner [1] 71/17 | 123/6 | means [3] 8/5 87/13 |
| manually [1] 95/10 | MCCLENNEY [2] | 106/19 |
| many [3] 8/1 27/21 | 2/19 6/14 | meant [3] 52/14 |
| 107/16 | me [30] 4/13 11/15 | 81/2 81/6 |
| map [1] 58/11 | 16/6 19/3 25/15 | mechanism [2] |
| MARIE [6] 3/5 | 26/17 50/10 60/9 | 12/2 81/15 |
| 5/22 27/15 29/3 | 61/13 65/21 68/9 | media [2] 8/11 8/13 |
| 56/13 106/7 | 72/21 73/10 73/18 | meet [2] 39/7 108/5 |
| Marie's [2] 31/23 | 80/17 85/23 89/12 | meeting [15] 1/1 |
| 38/12 | 89/12 89/13 93/23 | 1/16 8/14 11/6 |
| market [2] 122/11 | 97/4 98/2 98/3 | 11/13 14/5 14/8 |
| 122/20 | 98/13 105/8 105/14 | 42/4 65/17 78/16 |
| match [2] 17/19 | 106/19 110/19 | 108/19 123/6 |
| $17 / 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 / 18 \text { 125/8 } \\ & \text { mean }[45] \quad 23 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123/15 124/6 } \\ & 130 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |

meetings [3] 65/20 111/11 130/7
MELODY [6] 2/8 6/17 10/12 14/13 16/13 107/3
Melody's [1] 18/6 member [1] 66/19 members [13] 2/5 9/18 14/17 27/20 47/7 49/14 56/21
57/2 75/15 124/2 131/15 131/18 131/19
memo [5] 10/18
76/11 78/7 119/21 119/23
memorandum [3] 10/9 11/3 14/10 mention [3] 39/8 59/12 128/19 mentioned [10] 43/19 54/6 68/3 80/19 95/6 101/18 101/19 108/21 110/18 114/8
met [2] 33/12 78/15 method [1] 70/19 MICHAEL [2] 3/1 5/19
middle [1] 53/9
might [19] 18/11

| 39/14 51/15 52/21$63 / 15$ 64/6 64/7$82 / 282 / 697 / 4$111/14 112/6112/18 117/411921 120/17mileage [1] 8/5milk [1] 74/1 |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

mind [2] 58/3 121/4 minimum [2] 74/3 112/20
minor [4] 113/10 113/14 113/19 113/23
minority [1] 69/2 minute [2] 65/15 112/6
minutes [1] 106/16 miss [1] $4 / 3$
missed [2] 30/17 64/7
misses [1] 34/14
missing [11] 33/6 33/7 40/22 109/14 109/22 110/4 110/8 111/16 111/17 114/17 114/17
mistaken [1] 23/17 mistakes [1] 11/8 misunderstood [1] 112/7

Mobile [5] 2/18 3/2 5/21 6/10 8/2 $\bmod [1] 41 / 1$
model [1] 44/4
modification [9]
27/1 40/3 41/3 42/6
43/17 79/18 79/21
103/12 126/2
modifications [1]
77/22
modified [2] 13/19 77/7
modifies [1] 117/23 modify [13] 13/21 13/23 19/7 19/15
25/13 41/19 41/21 44/16 81/6 81/8
81/18 84/8 125/14
modifying [2]
42/15 42/19
money [23] 25/15 41/17 60/23 61/1 69/19 73/19 84/16 86/14 86/18 89/19 90/11 90/15 93/2 93/9 93/20 93/22 94/19 95/11 96/8 100/19 102/1
102/23 104/17
monies [1] 101/11 Montgomery [10] 1/19 2/13 2/21 3/4

| M | 58/5 58/6 59/5 | moving [2] $15 / 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Montgomery... [6] | 60/23 61/1 61/4 | 126 |
| 3/9 3/14 3/16 5/14 | 61/8 62/21 64/11 | much [9] 8/23 25/2 |
| 125/2 131/3 | 68/22 69/9 69/12 | 42/14 59/4 73/19 |
| month [10] 12/10 | 72/17 73/20 76/21 | 94/7 104/2 108/6 |
| 37/6 37/9 73/20 | 79/6 86/18 96/10 | 130/17 |
| 84/22 84/23 85/1 | 97/4 102/5 114/16 | multiple [6] 4/7 |
| 87/23 92/3 92/19 | 115/4 118/5 119/17 | 76/7 76/18 79/5 |
| month's [1] 11/5 | 122/18 123/13 | 82/22 83/1 |
| months [32] 12/22 | 127/6 127/11 129/2 | multiplier [4] 58/1 |
| 13/2 13/5 13/11 | morning [4] 4/2 | 61/6 61/19 62/5 |
| 15/4 15/7 15/8 | 5/13 60/8 63/18 | multiply [1] 64/3 |
| 15/13 15/15 18/23 | most [8] 13/19 35/2 | multiplying [1] |
| 19/1 19/6 19/7 | 61/21 83/20 87/18 | 63/14 |
| 19/17 20/22 21/1 | 92/7 117/6 118/22 | my [43] 23/14 |
| 21/12 21/15 21/17 | mother [10] 12/15 | 24/15 25/9 27/20 |
| 21/21 22/16 31/10 | 13/20 24/17 25/8 | 28/1 30/7 30/15 |
| 33/12 46/17 54/2 | 25/9 61/2 115/23 | 30/15 32/10 34/1 |
| 77/6 79/13 81/21 | 117/5 117/18 | 36/14 42/17 43/9 |
| 81/22 82/7 86/7 | 119/14 | 60/11 60/18 68/1 |
| 86/17 | motion [11] 9/9 | 72/13 73/14 74/9 |
| Moore [1] 76/13 | 44/15 49/5 49/7 | 74/11 80/13 84/5 |
| more [58] 15/4 15/6 | 49/10 49/20 49/21 | 84/19 85/2 85/8 |
| 20/20 22/6 27/4 | 50/4 50/7 56/13 | 87/15 88/22 89/8 |
| 28/22 29/14 33/22 | 74/18 | 91/6 92/4 92/5 92/6 |
| 34/6 34/10 35/19 | motivated [1] 91/16 | 93/14 93/22 98/4 |
| 36/7 36/16 36/23 | motivation [1] | 98/6 103/1 114/1 |
| 37/5 37/9 37/19 | 83/20 | 118/4 121/4 127/13 |
| 37/20 40/3 40/22 | move [3] 49/8 56/1 | 128/11 132/3 |
| 40/23 42/14 42/18 |  | N |
| 44/17 46/16 51/16 | 9/16 50/2 | name [1] 132/3 |
| 53/11 53/20 58/4 | 9/16 50/2 | narrow [3] 15/7 |



## 25/17

narrowed [1] 78/17 Nay [1] 49/16
nebulous [1] 36/16 necessarily [3] 23/7 24/5 43/17
necessary [1] 80/11 need [23] 4/19 10/2 15/3 17/12 18/8
18/17 22/7 29/6
32/13 51/19 52/1
52/23 53/23 53/23
54/3 74/2 81/7
88/22 96/15 99/15
105/10 106/3 108/7
needed [1] 65/16 needs [6] 23/13
32/7 83/11 96/9
96/23 103/22
negative [1] 88/11 negotiating [2]
11/20 128/17
neither [1] 131/16 nerd [1] 54/13
never [3] 77/7
104/3 115/1
new [11] 58/19 62/15 62/23 70/19
78/12 86/10 86/16 97/5 100/22 101/3

## 108/20

next [12] 47/14 48/12 48/13 53/6
76/4 87/23 108/4 108/12 123/6
123/15 124/5 130/6 nice [1] 50/10
nisi [1] 41/16
no [62] 4/21 7/13
8/20 9/7 10/4 11/20
12/5 15/11 21/9
21/23 34/3 45/7
45/7 45/8 47/2
47/11 49/3 49/17
50/14 55/20 56/10
57/6 57/10 59/17
64/1 65/2 65/13
65/14 66/21 67/17
72/1 74/16 75/18
79/19 82/13 87/2
87/7 89/14 91/14
91/14 94/17 94/21
95/7 95/7 95/12
95/13 105/7 110/13
113/13 115/1
117/16 119/1
120/19 120/23
124/7 124/13
127/20 128/12
129/23 130/12
130/15 132/10
Nodding [1] 106/12
non [8] 33/7 82/20 109/2 109/21
111/12 111/22
115/17 125/9
non-agreed [1] 33/7
non-exercising [1] 125/9
non-parent [2] 109/21 111/22
non-parent's [2] 109/2 111/12
non-partisan [1] 82/20
non-relative [1] 115/17
noncustodial [1] 77/3
none [3] 74/18 87/9 93/4
nonrelative [2] 109/7 111/21
normally [1]
109/23
nose [1] 67/1
not [110] 4/17 5/7
8/20 9/8 11/10
12/13 12/19 15/15
16/15 23/6 23/17
24/5 25/10 26/9
26/20 27/8 27/12
30/2 31/17 31/18

| $\mathbf{N}$ | 121/14 125/17 | 102/16 102/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| not... [90] 33/22 | /21 126/6 | 103/7 103/14 |
| 34/1 34/3 34/20 | 126/11 126/13 | 105/22 108/4 |
| 34/21 35/11 35/20 | Notary [1] 132/11 | 113/19 116/12 |
| 36/17 37/1 38/15 | note [1] 13/14 | 128/7 128/22 |
| 41/7 41/15 42/19 | noted [1] 24/2 | number [7] 27/23 |
| 43/16 44/4 44/18 | notes [1] 118/5 | 31/10 32/16 32/23 |
| 44/19 51/19 51/19 | nothing [7] 8/5 | 81/4 81/11 132/3 |
| 51/21 52/4 52/14 | 36/20 65/3 77/15 | numbers [4] 17/10 |
| 63/11 63/12 63/13 | 77/16 95/8 125/21 | 17/14 17/16 17/18 |
| 65/14 66/3 68/7 | notice [9] 8/11 8/13 | numerous [1] 93/12 |
| 68/20 69/3 69/18 | 99/3 99/6 127/14 | 0 |
| 70/4 70/6 71/4 |  | object [1] 130/14 |
| 77/13 78/2 80/3 | noticed [1] 56/9 | objection [1] 31/17 |
| 80/3 82/3 82/6 | noun [1] 55/5 | objective [1] 32/20 |
| 82/20 84/17 84/18 |  | obligation [10] 18/3 |
| 85/21 86/19 87/21 |  | 60/21 65/3 79/13 |
| 87/23 88/7 88/8 |  | 79/14 81/5 85/15 |
| 88/17 88/19 88/19 | November 4th [2] | 88/18 92/1 101/10 |
| 89/13 89/18 91/3 | November 4th [2] 10/18 76/11 | Obligations [2] |
| 91/7 92/10 93/10 | now [41] 4/9 7/10 | 68/22 78/12 |
| 93/13 93/23 95/1 | 10/11 12/9 12/19 | obligee [2] 101/23 |
| 95/18 98/11 100/9 |  | 104/14 |
| 101/9 102/22 |  | obligor [15] 80/8 |
| 104/11 106/3 | 70/14 78/13 78/17 | 83/15 84/7 88/17 |
| 107/20 107/21 |  | 91/2 91/13 91/18 |
| 109/5 109/17 |  | 92/1 93/11 97/22 |
| 109/19 111/17 | 82/3 82/7 84/8 | 99/10 102/14 |
| 113/7 113/11 |  | 102/20 103/3 |
| 113/13 116/1 116/2 |  | 104/10 |
| 116/20 118/8 118/8 | 92/4 92/13 97/15 <br> 100/19 100/20 | obvious [1] 92/1 |
| 119/13 119/14 | 100/19 100/20 | obviously [7] 4/3 |


| 0 | 9/15 9/20 10/5 | 58/5 58/6 58/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| obviously... [6] 4/5 | 16/22 19/23 20/15 | 69/10 71/7 76/21 |
| 27/19 27/23 58/15 | 22/5 25/14 31/21 | 77/6 77/19 77/20 |
| 124/4 128/9 | 38/10 40/19 41/22 | 78/18 78/22 79/6 |
| occur [4] 66/4 66/5 | 45/21 46/11 47/3 | 80/19 81/4 81/12 |
| 67/14 68/10 | 47/9 49/1 49/9 | 84/3 87/3 89/1 |
| occurred [2] 86/17 | 49/18 50/15 52/20 | 93/19 95/3 95/13 |
| 125/8 | 53/2 53/4 53/8 | 95/13 109/15 |
| occurs [2] 33/21 | 53/21 54/8 54/8 | 109/20 110/6 |
| 94/11 | 54/23 55/15 55/22 | 112/12 113/17 |
| October [1] 8/12 | 56/15 57/1 57/4 | 115/21 129/2 |
| off [4] 45/13 87/20 | 57/7 58/3 58/7 59/9 | only [18] 11/11 |
| 87/22 106/18 | 59/15 60/9 62/8 | 13/4 13/8 15/15 |
| off-chance [2] | 63/7 64/21 67/9 | 16/14 18/20 25/6 |
| 87/20 87/22 | 67/18 74/12 74/17 | 33/21 41/8 48/6 |
| offer [1] 121/6 | 76/5 87/11 88/5 | 64/15 65/23 87/3 |
| offhand [2] 64/14 | 105/20 106/6 | 91/17 103/1 112/12 |
| 105/13 | 107/11 107/15 | 116/14 122/6 |
| office [6] 2/9 6/8 | 108/3 110/21 | ons [1] 65/4 |
| 34/17 80/13 88/10 | 113/15 119/4 | open [3] 14/15 |
| 99/19 | 120/16 121/1 | 15/12 26/12 |
| offset [1] 63/13 | 121/13 121/16 | opinion [1] 88/22 |
| often [4] 29/23 | 123/3 125/4 | opinions [1] 76/23 |
| 62/10 66/5 84/6 | older [1] 83/12 | opportunity [3] |
| Oftentimes [1] | oldest [1] 79/14 | 120/10 121/7 121/7 |
| 115/21 | once [3] 18/12 | opposed [4] 15/5 |
| oh [10] 19/21 29/11 | 33/20 129/5 | 47/10 57/5 75/17 |
| 32/8 33/2 34/3 | one [43] 11/8 11/19 | option [1] 109/20 |
| 36/17 39/17 64/1 | 14/22 15/11 20/8 | options [2] 78/8 |
| 87/17 119/4 | 28/10 33/21 34/13 | 120/2 |
| okay [69] 4/9 4/22 | 39/6 46/13 49/22 | order [56] 24/20 |
| 7/14 8/17 8/22 9/8 | 53/5 53/17 58/4 | 41/4 41/7 45/12 |


| 0 | 38/7 39/23 40/11 | 21/11 26/6 27/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| order... [52] 45/15 | 43/3 46/2 46/23 | 38/1 39/16 51/16 |
| 46/12 58/23 59/1 | 50/12 60/15 61/7 | 58/11 61/4 73/22 |
| 61/23 62/1 79/3 | 61/10 62/15 64/22 | 77/6 79/6 79/14 |
| 79/8 80/2 80/4 | 66/18 66/20 67/16 | 80/10 81/1 84/15 |
| 80/12 80/16 83/11 | 68/7 72/2 72/3 72/4 | 85/2 85/17 90/23 |
| 83/17 84/1 84/13 | 74/6 77/20 80/17 | 92/6 94/6 96/9 |
| 84/22 85/14 85/15 | 80/18 81/13 84/5 | 97/15 100/18 101/5 |
| 86/19 90/10 91/12 | 89/4 93/15 94/21 | 101/11 102/11 |
| 92/4 92/18 94/2 | 105/5 108/14 | 103/11 103/18 |
| 94/8 94/10 96/7 | 109/16 114/6 | 103/19 103/21 |
| 97/9 97/11 97/13 | 114/17 115/13 | 104/6 106/17 |
| 97/14 98/6 99/16 | 116/6 121/4 124/1 | 108/16 108/17 |
| 99/21 100/9 100/13 | 127/13 129/21 | 112/19 114/6 |
| 100/13 100/18 | 129/22 130/10 | 122/18 123/17 |
| 101/9 101/20 102/3 | 131/15 131/18 | 129/11 |
| 102/11 102/13 | 131/20 | outlets [1] 8/14 |
| 102/15 102/22 | others [1] 46/8 | outlier [1] 61/16 |
| 103/14 104/13 | our [26] 4/14 8/10 | over [11] 4/17 5/9 |
| 104/16 112/22 | 10/18 14/11 28/4 | 6/20 33/11 43/15 |
| 114/14 117/13 | 33/8 37/12 39/15 | 58/3 59/7 62/22 |
| ordered [1] 45/4 | 45/11 57/11 60/13 | 63/10 66/23 116/16 |
| ordering [1] 100/18 | 60/22 67/2 68/19 | overly [1] 32/2 |
| original [2] 1/11 | 76/5 77/18 78/16 | overnight [1] 12/20 |
| 24/12 | 86/15 95/13 103/21 | overpaying [2] 77/3 |
| originally [2] 11/14 | 108/12 116/17 | 77/8 |
| 24/9 | 120/14 123/21 | overpayment [6] |
| other [59] 3/12 8/5 | 124/9 132/5 | 84/15 85/3 92/17 |
| 14/7 15/23 17/11 | ours [1] 36/23 | 93/5 101/9 102/16 |
| 22/5 29/4 31/5 32/2 | ourselves [1] 75/23 | owe [2] 25/15 89/13 |
| 32/7 33/8 35/21 | out [45] 8/13 12/14 | owed [2] 94/18 |
| 35/23 37/19 37/19 | 14/5 19/8 20/2 21/9 | 100/20 |


| 0 | 37/16 37/20 40/5 | parents' [1] 63/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| own [2] 42/17 | 47/16 47/23 48/3 | part [8] 2/23 41/5 |
| 128/13 | 48/21 54/14 55/2 | 61/15 79/17 114/2 |
| P | 69/11 74/1 77/2 | 125/13 |
| P.M [1] 130/22 | 77/4 80/8 80/8 | Part-time [1] 2/23 |
| packet [1] 9/1 | 83/15 85/17 87/4 | partial [2] 125/10 |
| page [1] 48/18 | 90/19 91/2 98/23 | 125/16 |
| pages [2] 14/10 | 102/14 102/20 | participating [1] |
| 131/13 | 109/14 109/16 | 108/22 |
| paid [7] 61/6 72/18 | 109/17 109/21 | particular [2] 51/8 |
| 87/23 89/6 91/15 | 110/8 110/12 | 123/23 |
| 95/18 101/11 | 111/16 111/17 | particularly [2] |
| paired [1] 63/4 | 111/19 111/22 | 63/1 67/13 |
| PALMER [7] 2/22 | 112/12 112/19 | parties [14] 29/18 |
| 6/2 18/19 26/18 | 112/21 115/22 | 30/8 32/21 37/21 |
| 90/2 96/12 129/17 | 116/7 116/10 125/9 | 41/5 45/6 45/14 |
| paragraph [19] | 126/5 | 72/4 79/20 81/2 |
| 11/13 16/9 16/18 | parent's [6] 109/2 | 89/5 123/14 127/14 |
| 18/9 48/12 48/13 | 109/22 110/4 | 128/13 |
| 48/23 53/7 53/10 | 111/12 112/14 | partisan [1] 82/20 |
| 53/15 53/18 54/15 | 114/18 | party [18] 25/20 |
| 54/18 80/18 80/21 | parental [1] 77/23 | 28/17 33/8 37/19 |
| 81/1 81/4 81/11 | parenthesis [1] | 39/23 79/19 81/17 |
| 83/9 | 57/19 | 109/17 109/19 |
| paragraphs [2] | parenting [3] 58/9 | 111/18 111/19 |
| 16/10 21/5 | 62/1 62/20 | 114/22 115/5 |
| Pardon [2] 47/20 | parents [10] 11/20 | 115/14 116/5 116/7 |
| 50/21 | 22/23 23/4 34/14 | 117/11 128/9 |
| parent [51] 12/11 | 39/15 110/5 112/9 | party's [1] 26/1 |
| 18/3 22/20 23/19 | 114/13 115/20 | passed [2] 78/11 |
| 30/14 32/6 32/7 | 127/18 | 126/1 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 114/19 121/20 | 131/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| passes [1] 58/2 | 122/16 122/17 129/5 129/15 | perspective <br> 37/13 |
| past [5] 12/22 12/23 | 129/5 129/15 129/17 | 37/13 petition [18] 13/3 |
| 27/18 68/9 86/18 | per [2] 31/17 77/12 | petition [18] 13/3 $13 / 12$ $13 / 13$ |
| Past-President [1] 27/18 | perceived [1] | 19/15 23/18 25/7 |
| pay [15] 24/17 | 104/19 | 25/12 30/16 39/21 |
| 68/22 69/19 74/9 | percentage [2] 64/4 | 41/18 41/20 81/18 |
| 85/18 89/12 90/8 | 110/13 | 82/8 96/19 118/1 |
| 90/15 91/1 99/21 | perception [1] | 125/14 126/21 |
| 110/12 113/22 | 30/15 | petitioner's [1] |
| 119/11 121/20 | perhaps [2] 121/18 | 30/21 |
| 122/17 | 129/2 | petitioning [1] 26/1 |
| paycheck [1] 85/2 | period [5] 15/12 | petitions [1] 12/15 |
| paying [14] 61/4 | 23/20 33/11 40/8 | physical [13] 10/7 |
| 61/8 73/20 80/9 | 127/6 | 10/22 20/20 21/19 |
| 83/19 84/22 84/23 | periods [1] 30/17 | 22/22 37/17 40/7 |
| 89/8 92/3 92/5 | permanency [2] | 41/3 41/4 58/10 |
| 92/18 94/1 121/21 | 117/4 118/7 | 58/21 60/13 72/15 |
| 121/23 | permanent [4] | pick [1] 34/2 |
| payments [1] | 116/22 116/23 | place [11] 12/18 |
| 123/13 | 118/21 119/2 | 38/16 55/16 55/19 |
| penalty [1] 26/4 | person [7] 26/18 | 72/22 83/11 93/8 |
| pendente [1] 45/12 | 74/6 83/19 94/20 | 100/9 100/10 102/2 |
| pending [1] 124/5 | 104/4 111/20 | 102/13 |
| PENNY [8] 2/6 6/4 | 123/21 | placed [2] 46/18 |
| 16/9 22/8 28/3 37/3 | person's [1] 111/15 | 115/18 |
| 69/5 73/13 | personal [1] 74/11 | plan [4] 116/22 |
| people [17] 29/15 | personally [1] | 116/23 117/4 118/7 |
| 33/2 34/16 34/23 | 39/14 | plead [1] 43/4 |
| 38/1 42/21 45/1 | persons [4] 3/12 | pleading [1] 126/19 |
| 92/7 98/7 109/1 | 131/15 131/18 | pleadings [1] 31/2 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | potentially [2] | 74/20 110/6 110/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| point [28] 7/12 14/5 | 13/21 25/19 | 116/10 |
| 18/6 18/11 18/15 | practical [1] 86/12 | presented [9] 11/5 |
| 31/23 33/5 34/7 | practice [8] 2/17 | 17/7 28/3 28/10 |
| 34/12 36/10 38/12 | 2/22 3/4 3/6 3/10 | 46/13 69/23 76/14 |
| 43/9 44/23 50/16 | 44/23 112/17 | 78/7 130/10 |
| 72/13 72/21 92/20 | 128/17 | presenting [2] |
| 92/21 94/6 98/7 | practices [2] 112/2 | 78/17 78/22 |
| 100/14 103/1 | 113/3 | President [1] 27/18 |
| 103/21 119/7 | practicing [2] 5/23 | presumed [1] |
| 121/15 124/12 | 128/8 | 116/14 |
| 126/15 127/5 | practitioner [1] | pretty [4] 59/4 94/7 |
| pointing [1] 26/6 | 36/13 | 105/3 126/17 |
| policy [8] 2/3 7/4 | precedent [1] 89/17 | prevail [1] 28/1 |
| 7/5 7/8 68/15 68/19 | preceding [20] | previous [4] 58/16 |
| 69/14 69/22 | 12/21 13/2 13/10 | 85/14 85/15 103/14 |
| poll [2] 59/6 78/19 | 13/11 15/5 15/7 | previously [2] 29/9 |
| polled [1] 27/20 | 15/8 15/16 15/19 | 78/6 |
| pop [1] 88/1 | 18/23 19/6 19/17 | primarily [2] 11/7 |
| posed [1] 23/22 | 19/19 20/22 21/2 | 76/17 |
| position [1] 126/14 | 21/15 21/21 22/16 | primary [2] 32/19 |
| positive [1] 19/12 | 46/17 54/3 | 37/23 |
| possible [1] 110/15 | prefer [1] 35/14 <br> preferred [1] 59/7 | principal [1] 87/4 <br> printed [1] 131/13 |
| possibly [3] 19/10 | preferred [1] 59/7 prepaid [7] 87/10 | printed [1] 131/13 <br> prints [1] 58/1 |
| 42/14 125/10 | prepaid [7] 87/10 | prints [1] 58/1 |
| post [2] 50/7 86/4 | 87/13 87/17 88/2 | prior [4] 15/13 |
| post-dated [1] 86/4 | 95/5 95/9 95/20 | 28/14 32/5 101/10 |
| post-motion [1] | Prepaid just [1] | private [11] 2/17 |
| 50/7 | 87/13 | 2/22 3/4 3/6 3/10 |
| pot [1] 69/19 | prepaids [1] 87/19 | 42/23 88/7 96/3 |
| potential [3] 45/23 | present [8] 10/16 | 98/3 128/8 128/16 |
| $110 / 19111 / 10$ | 10/20 12/2 67/20 | pro [5] 42/20 67/14 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 128/16 | punish [1] 30/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pro... [3] 129/4 | pronoun [1] 55/8 | purposeful [2] 62/5 |
| 129/15 129/16 | proof [2] 125/10 | 64/7 |
| probably [8] 17/9 | 125/15 | pursuant [5] 85/14 |
| 29/5 43/3 56/5 | proper [1] 96/6 | 102/2 102/10 |
| 85/20 85/22 102/5 | proportionally [1] | 104/13 104/15 |
| 05/10 | 69/20 | put [19] 28/6 39/13 |
| problem [2] 53/6 | proposal [6] 11/11 | 69/18 79/7 86/4 |
| 101/14 | 12/8 20/18 78/18 | 86/5 86/8 90/3 |
| problems [4] 24/21 | 78/22 80/5 | 91/23 97/3 97/5 |
| 24/22 27/21 100/16 | proposals [1] 105/1 | 97/8 97/22 100/4 |
| procedure [3] | proposed [3] 11/3 | 125/1 126/14 |
| 77/21 80/11 96/6 | 125/23 128/22 | 127/17 128/14 |
| procedures [1] | proposing [1] 10/20 | 130/4 |
| 83/16 | proration [1] 64/2 | puts [1] 126/1 |
| proceeding [1] | prospective [1] | putting [5] 14/22 |
| 104/11 | 97/9 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 73/11 93/9 97/20 } \\ 102 / 19 \end{array}$ |
| proceedings [2] |  |  |
| 39/23 131/6 | 117/9 118/10 | Q |
| process [2] 83/18 |  | quell [1] 29/17 |
| 108/8 |  | question [30] 14/23 |
| processes [1] 40/22 | provision [4] 28/7 | 51/1 51/20 52/3 |
| processing [1] | 42/20 91/7 102/8 | 60/5 60/11 61/15 |
| 97/10 | public [14] 3/17 5/6 | 63/10 63/18 66/2 |
| PROFESSOR [11] | 5/7 5/8 6/20 7/11 | 68/2 68/16 69/4 |
| 2/6 2/6 2/14 2/14 | 8/16 8/18 67/13 | 84/6 84/18 88/15 |
| 5/17 17/6 17/17 |  | 92/11 95/22 97/7 |
| 59/10 63/15 63/17 | 124/10 132/11 | 98/3 108/19 109/8 |
| 65/22 | pull [3] 65/21 88/2 | 115/7 116/3 121/16 |
| Program [1] 7/6 prohibit [1] 81/17 prohibition [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pull [3] 65/21 88/2 } \\ & \text { 107/6 } \\ & \text { pulled [1] } 95 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122 / 12126 / 7 \\ & 126 / 16126 / 23 \\ & 127 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |


| $Q$ | 77/9 122/15 129/7 | 78/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| questions [10] | reads [1] 92/13 | recommend [1] |
| 14/13 14/16 59/10 | ready [1] 59/19 | 16/16 |
| 59/16 66/18 66/20 | real [2] 11/21 111/8 | endations |
| 82/12 115/10 | realized [1] 65/16 | [1] 9/5 |
| 120/17 124/2 | really [19] 13/8 | record [4] 44/19 |
| quick [1] 98/11 | 32/7 43/20 44/1 | 50/6 78/3 79/17 |
| quiet [1] 105/4 | 44/15 55/3 60/14 | red [1] 29/5 |
| quite [2] 60/23 64/8 | 62/13 71/4 71/8 | redone [1] 122/20 |
| quorum [8] 7/17 | 73/18 77/15 96/5 | reduce [2] 98/5 |
| 7/19 8/8 17/3 51/11 | 102/19 116/18 | 119/10 |
| 51/12 67/21 67/22 | 118/18 118/20 | reduced [2] 101/11 |
| R | 3] | reduction [ |
| raise [5] 26/5 26/23 | 18/15 30/9 33/9 | 84/21 |
| 47/6 69/9 82/1 | 38/11 61/14 61/16 | Referee [2] 2/23 6/3 |
| raised [2] 105/6 | 64/16 70/17 70/18 | reference [6] 12/12 |
| 105/22 | 72/20 91/23 125/21 | 17/23 18/2 18/4 |
| raising [6] 36/5 | reasons [1] 71/19 | 46/19 48/9 |
| 47/7 49/14 52/4 | recalculate [2] 12/4 | referencing [2] |
| 57/2 75/15 | 12/17 | 54/16 67/11 |
| ran [1] 61/3 | recalculation [1] | reflect [1] 123/12 |
| rate [3] 122/11 | 81/16 | reflects [1] 50/7 |
| 122/18 122/20 | recall [2] 64/13 | refunding [1] 95/11 |
| rates [2] 122/14 | 76/12 | regard [1] 9/5 |
| 131/21 | received [4] 8/21 | regarding [1] 82/15 |
| rather [6] 11/22 | 24/18 28/11 91/3 | regional [1] 62/14 |
| 73/21 81/11 100/23 | receiving [2] 98/23 | regulations [1] |
| 105/9 107/13 | 113/20 | 71/14 |
| reach [1] 123/17 | recent [2] 28/4 | Reimbursement [1] |
| read [8] 19/3 19/4 | 116/16 | 10/7 |
| 20/18 20/19 76/22 | recently [2] 60/11 | related [4] 57/8 |

related... [3] 58/17 63/22 121/5
relating [7] 10/10 41/8 47/5 59/11 66/19 66/20 123/8 relations [1] 5/21 relative [4] 109/6 115/17 131/17 131/19
Relying [1] 16/23 remedy [1] 23/22 remember [6]
17/10 28/10 105/13 105/14 106/20 107/6
remembered [1] 37/4
remembers [1]
105/19
remind [2] 4/13 4/19
remove [3] 12/3
12/16 14/1
removed [2] 87/21 119/12
repayment [2] 91/7 96/23
rephrase [2] 18/9 45/17
report [5] 10/6
14/11 76/6 122/11

122/14
reported [1] 131/6
Reporter [8] 1/17
3/15 4/14 56/2 56/4
131/4 132/2 132/10
REPORTER'S [1] 130/23
reporters [1] 5/2
Reporting [2] 3/16 132/1
representation [1]

## 13/6

representing [2] 128/7 128/9
request [1] 84/8 requested [1] 109/1 requesting [2] 84/12 114/20
require [5] 13/13 89/10 99/10 121/14 128/23
required [1] 127/23 requirement [4] 79/19 91/14 94/23 128/12
requiring [1] 83/17
research [8] $2 / 3$
108/13 110/16
110/17 111/4 113/2
113/18 120/18
resolve [1] 38/5
resources [5] 2/12

2/20 68/13 69/11 69/20
respect [1] 13/18
respectfully [1] 38/9
respond [3] 8/18
120/11 120/14
response [24] 9/7
10/4 19/13 47/2
47/11 49/3 49/17
50/14 56/10 57/6
57/10 59/17 66/21
67/17 68/1 74/16
75/18 82/13 84/20
88/12 105/7 120/19
124/7 130/12
responsibility [6]
84/2 97/8 97/18
97/23 101/2 101/7
responsible [1]
111/20
responsive [1]
126/19
result [2] 61/20 62/6
results [2] 68/5
131/21
retaliation [2] 89/4 89/11
returned [2] 94/20 95/14
reunification [1]
reunification... [1]

## 117/5

review [1] 118/4 revisions [2] 11/7 78/10
revisit [1] 31/15 right [66] 4/1 7/15 7/20 9/1 9/22 12/9
18/17 22/17 30/14
30/22 34/19 36/9
38/16 38/17 41/13
41/14 42/7 42/8
43/5 43/7 43/8
43/11 44/9 45/16
45/21 47/6 49/4
50/6 50/12 56/8
56/11 56/20 56/23
57/8 57/21 59/15
62/3 64/8 64/13
66/14 66/16 67/15
69/5 69/13 70/14
71/2 71/6 73/8
75/13 75/19 91/6
92/13 103/8 103/16 107/12 113/12
113/18 114/10
115/15 119/5 120/5
121/2 121/14 124/1
124/8 128/22
rights [4] 37/7 90/7 90/8 102/21
rolls [1] 25/11 room [2] 20/12 32/11
round [1] 76/1 rule [54] 10/21 11/3 12/3 14/4 26/20
35/1 35/3 35/5 35/9
39/13 41/16 42/1
42/1 46/20 47/4
50/18 52/9 52/15
52/19 54/1 57/8
59/20 60/16 67/19
70/13 70/13 70/16
70/19 71/5 72/22
73/10 73/11 73/12
74/19 75/2 78/10
80/4 82/10 82/15
84/11 89/16 92/13
109/1 123/10
123/12 125/13
125/15 125/21
125/23 126/15
128/5 128/19 129/4
129/7
rules [4] 75/2 93/17 120/13 129/13
ruling [1] 60/19
run [4] 44/6 109/23 110/8 110/11
running [1] 109/10

S
said [13] 24/16 28/7 29/20 30/1 30/1
30/4 34/13 72/14
92/2 92/14 98/12
104/6 114/3
said/she [1] 30/1 same [7] 17/17
18/22 34/12 35/6 53/14 59/4 94/11 satisfied [1] 104/12 saw [3] 24/20 24/21 55/13
say [48] 4/16 7/19
7/23 9/17 12/11
12/22 15/3 20/21
28/17 30/14 31/3
31/6 32/3 35/17
36/7 36/16 37/18 40/14 44/19 54/2 68/18 70/5 70/9
71/3 74/21 77/5
77/10 80/2 89/5
89/18 89/23 90/22
93/19 95/6 95/23
98/2 98/7 98/13
100/15 102/4 102/7
104/15 109/5
109/14 111/23
122/5 122/17 127/5
say-so [1] 74/21
saying [15] 9/18

| $\mathbf{S}$ | 124/14 124/22 | send [2] 56/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| saying... [14] 15/14 | search [1] 129/11 | 107/22 |
| 20/18 34/17 36/11 | second [23] 9/13 | sending [1] 59/2 |
| 51/19 53/11 56/21 | 9/14 9/15 9/16 | sends [1] 99/10 |
| 69/1 71/23 79/11 | 11/16 48/22 49/11 | sense [8] 21/17 |
| 81/19 87/21 93/13 | 49/12 50/3 50/6 | 63/15 66/6 98/20 |
| 114/5 | 50/7 54/18 56/16 | 114/2 116/21 |
| says [24] 18/2 22/20 | 56/17 56/18 75/6 | 118/13 127/10 |
| 24/3 25/13 35/1 | 75/10 75/11 75/13 | sent [4] 65/11 |
| 35/3 35/5 36/8 | 76/5 83/8 101/19 | 108/16 108/16 |
| 36/15 36/21 37/15 | 114/1 | 122/9 |
| 39/17 41/23 42/1 | secondly [1] 61/16 | separate [3] 79 |
| 45/12 53/10 54/13 | section [2] 27/18 | 94/22 117/23 |
| 55/1 79/2 81/4 | 58/ | separated [1] |
| 90/13 92/4 92/18 | see [31] 10/9 10/19 | 129/14 |
| 96/5 | 14/9 16/6 18/20 | separately [1] |
| scan [1] 120/1 | 26/22 31/22 31/23 | 82/16 |
| scenario [11] 94/7 | 42/18 48/10 48/19 | serve [3] 27/17 |
| 94/11 94/14 95/2 | 52/22 55/14 55/16 | 105/21 106/1 |
| 95/23 101/18 | 57/22 60/19 62/15 | service [2] 117/3 |
| 110/10 111/14 | 62/20 64/6 65/11 | 118/10 |
| 113/12 113/14 | 66/22 67/14 80/17 | Services [1] 117/10 |
| 114/18 | 85/11 103/10 | set [5] 12/14 31/15 |
| scenarios [3] | 118/16 119/8 120/1 | 35/12 65/15 80/23 |
| 109/12 110/16 | 123/18 129/8 130/8 | sets [2] 101/5 |
| 114/7 | seeing [3] 43/2 63/1 | 122/18 |
| schedule [5] 23/1 | 119/17 | setting [2] 98/4 |
| 23/6 30/10 51/4 | seems [4] 68/8 | 108/2 |
| 78/12 | 73/17 89/15 105/8 | settled [2] 37/5 |
| School [1] 2/7 | seen [5] 55/11 | 46/15 |
| SCOTT [6] 3/20 | 93/11 112/3 112/18 | settling [1] 31/15 |
| 6/21 7/2 46/3 | 115/2 | seven [3] 33/16 |


| S | 60/10 64/19 76/8 | 36/17 37/10 41/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| seven... [2] 33/17 | $105 / 12$ | 82/1 |
| $33 / 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sherman's } \\ & \mathbf{6 4 / 1 7} \mathbf{6 6} / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Significantly [1] } \\ & \mathbf{9 0} / 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 109/1 124/4 | shift [2] 68/11 | signs [1] 99/23 |
| shall [1] 24/6 | 70/22 | silence [1] 106/18 |
| share [2] 8/19 | shifts [1] 104/14 | silent [2] 91/10 |
| 123/19 | short [3] 76/20 | 91/13 |
| shared [20] 10/7 | 111/6 111/9 | similar [1] 58/12 |
| 10/22 11/18 11/22 | shorter [1] 17/5 | simpler [1] 105/1 |
| 12/5 12/13 14/1 | should [19] 17/19 | simplify [2] 77/21 |
| 58/9 58/9 58/21 | 17/20 26/11 49/6 | 78/21 |
| 62/1 62/19 63/2 | 55/4 59/12 67/21 | simply [2] 72/13 |
| 65/9 67/11 72/15 | 68/20 83/16 84/23 | 81/2 |
| 72/19 89/2 125/9 | 90/5 91/2 92/16 | since [4] 11/12 14/7 |
| 127/18 | 92/18 93/16 102/5 | 49/19 78/16 |
| shared-custody [2] | 104/5 111/23 120/3 | sir [1] 94/4 |
| 125/9 127/18 | shouldn't [5] 26/12 | sit [3] 87/22 102/20 |
| sharing [1] 55/3 | 40/2 89/7 93/20 | 124/18 |
| she [19] 4/23 14/14 | 93/23 | sites [1] 129/19 |
| 23/21 25/13 30/1 | show [5] 39/21 40/ | sits [1] 87/19 |
| 30/16 45/5 55/4 | 75/13 127/10 | situation [4] 58/9 |
| 55/9 55/10 60/3 | 127/11 | 58/10 74/5 109/4 |
| 66/17 68/3 88/19 | show-cause [1] | situations [1] 89/1 |
| 107/1 107/2 107/10 | 39/21 | six [1] 77/6 |
| 123/18 123/19 | shown [1] 64/11 | sleep [1] 90/7 |
| she's [3] 10/12 | sides [1] 104/21 | slept [2] 85/18 91/3 |
| 63/21 90/20 | sign [3] 5/8 49/16 | slight [1] 12/9 |
| Shelby [2] 2/23 6/3 | 97/12 | SMITH [2] 3/19 |
| SHERMAN [10] | signed [2] 5/7 96/8 | 7/3 |
| 3/1 5/20 10/13 | significant [7] | snafu [1] 4/8 |
| 16/12 18/1 24/10 | 34/14 34/15 34/18 | so [170] |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | something [30] | Specialist [1] 7/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sole [2] 61/23 62/1 | 10/1 17/11 23/6 | specific [2] 74/13 |
| solely [1] 110/11 | 27/4 28/8 28/23 | 101/5 |
| some [51] 10/14 | 2 | specifically [7] |
| 11/6 11/8 11/9 | 31/9 31/19 32/1 | 22/20 39/8 83/14 |
| 11/17 12/2 14/9 | 35/18 35/19 36/16 | 83/15 85/10 100/23 |
| 15/19 18/15 25/20 | 36/21 36/22 37/15 | 101/7 |
| 27/10 27/12 28/5 | 37/18 38/19 52/16 | specify [2] 88/16 |
| 29/14 33/9 35/20 | 69/22 70/3 81/8 | 128/19 |
| 35/23 36/4 40/10 | 89/4 89/5 89/12 | spite [1] 31/2 |
| 52/14 68/4 68/18 | 99/6 99/15 112/5 | split [1] 110/13 |
| 70/17 70/18 76/15 | sometimes [4] | spot [1] 16/7 |
| 76/20 84/14 88/22 | 98/10 98/11 112/16 | spreadsheets [1] |
| 89/17 90/21 96/23 | 122/12 | 79/16 |
| 98/7 100/3 100/14 | somewhat | Staff [1] 3/13 |
| 100/16 101/5 | 101/22 | standalone [1] |
| 103/23 104/10 | somewhere [1] | 42/11 |
| 105/11 105/22 | 55/12 | standing [1] 45/12 |
| 108/17 113/18 | sorry [4] 24/10 | standpoint [1] |
| 114/5 115/13 116/6 | 69/15 104/7 110/23 <br> sort [7] 33/1 33/6 | 54/12 <br> start [5] 5/3 5/5 5/9 |
| 119/21 120/1 | sort [7] 33/1 33/6 | start [5] 5/3 5/5 5/9 $5 / 106 / 20$ |
| 121/18 126/15 | 44/11 52/15 96/23 <br> 103/18 123/21 | state [16] 1/3 1/18 |
| $128 / 10$ <br> somebody [128/17 | sorts [2] 103/18 | $68 / 1971 / 1680 / 14$ |
| 26/16 33/15 43/1 | 103/19 | 83/10 97/16 102/8 |
| 69/6 73/18 74/3 | sound [1] 35/8 | 108/23 112/2 112/3 |
| 81/23 89/3 97/13 | sounds [1] 120/2 | 114/19 120/4 131/2 |
| 98/2 105/23 | Southern [1] 62/13 | 131/5 131/8 |
| someho | speak [6] 4/17 7/12 | stated [1] 104/18 |
| 85/9 91/1 | 25/23 26/4 46/5 | statements [1] |
| someone [2] 10/1 | 84/16 <br> special [1] 8/1 | 131/14 <br> States [6] 61 |

States... [5] 62/13
62/15 68/4 113/5 114/6
statistics [3] 2/14 5/17 62/12
statute [1] 117/15 statutes [1] 68/18 stay [1] 118/19 STEINWINDER
[1] $3 / 3$
step [1] 64/6
STEPHANIE [8]
3/13 4/4 6/6 7/16 8/10 50/9 57/14 66/15
still [22] 25/18
25/19 36/1 38/6
43/18 46/12 60/2
66/3 72/6 72/8
72/10 73/5 73/6
74/8 82/8 85/1
97/10 103/2 110/22
118/7 118/10 124/5 stone [1] 35/12 stop [4] 25/1 93/8 103/12 104/20
straight [1] 105/17 straw [3] 17/3 59/6 78/19
stress [1] 71/15 strictly [1] 116/10
stuck [1] 90/20 stylistic [1] 11/9
Subcommittee [12]
10/19 14/12 14/20
76/7 78/5 78/15 106/5 107/17
107/21 107/23
108/2 108/6
subjective [3] 14/6
31/12 34/12
subparagraph [9]
11/14 12/6 16/18
21/4 40/5 48/6
54/17 100/23 101/4
subparagraph that
[1] 100/23
subparagraphs [1]
54/13
subsection [2] 16/2 48/9
subsequent [2]
79/21 117/23
substance [2] 11/4
11/10
substantial [1]
32/17
substantially [3]
74/5 121/21 121/22 substantive [2]

## 11/12 13/9

substitute [1]
107/14
such [4] 27/22
32/23 61/17 131/19
sudden [1] 33/20
suffer [1] 69/18
sufficient [15]
38/22 39/2 40/6
40/16 40/17 40/19
40/23 43/18 44/7
47/17 48/1 48/3
48/22 51/17 127/4
suggest [2] 15/12 34/9
suggested [4] 50/12
59/6 70/3 76/15
suggesting [3]
15/10 88/16 100/12
suggestion [3]
15/21 22/19 47/15
suggestions [5]
46/2 74/15 74/20
107/22 123/8
suggestive [2] 32/2 44/23
SULLIVAN [3] 3/5
5/23 27/16
summary [2] 111/7 111/9
support [86] 1/2
1/15 2/9 2/20 6/3
6/14 7/4 8/15 10/8
10/23 11/6 11/23
12/4 12/17 13/17

| $\mathbf{S}$ | sure [9] 14/13 22/4 | 100/5 101/22 103/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| support... [71] 14/1 | 28/19 32/14 78/2 | taking [2] 63/13 |
| 18/3 24/19 25/13 | 83/21 113/6 120/9 | 104/17 |
| 27/1 32/10 41/9 | 120/14 | talk [1] 8/10 |
| 41/21 42/19 44/16 | surprised [1] 61/13 | talked [8] 11/15 |
| 58/23 58/23 60/21 | survey [2] 122/11 | 28/6 29/4 97/6 |
| 61/5 61/9 68/6 | 122/20 | 108/15 113/4 |
| 68/22 68/23 70/20 | suspect [1] 129/15 | 121/17 122/1 |
| 71/15 72/16 76/6 | suspenders [1] 22/6 | talking [16] 13/14 |
| 76/19 77/3 77/4 | system [2] 86/15 | 27/7 41/7 41/12 |
| 77/8 77/10 77/14 | 107/8 | 42/3 43/13 51/18 |
| 78/12 79/3 79/10 | sè [5] 31/17 42/20 | 60/18 63/22 71/13 |
| 79/11 81/9 81/16 | 129/4 129/15 | 113/7 113/7 113/11 |
| 81/18 81/20 82/6 | 129/16 | 113/13 113/16 |
| 85/3 86/3 86/6 | sès [1] 67/14 | 118/18 |
| 86/10 86/21 89/6 | T | TANF [2] 113/11 |
| 89/23 90/23 92/17 | table [2] 45/22 |  |
| 93/3 93/14 94/8 | 108/4 |  |
| 94/18 95/6 96/1 | tabled [2] 78/9 | 39/21 |
| 98/4 101/21 102/9 | 78/20 | teach [1] 8/3 |
| 103/12 103/13 | tablet [1] 32/11 | technically [6] |
| 104/16 109/3 110/5 | take [14] 19/8 20/1 | 47/15 49/6 49 |
| 111/13 111/21 | 21/9 21/11 29/15 |  |
| 116/4 116/9 116/11 | 32/7 58/21 64/5 |  |
| 117/14 119/15 | 78/14 85/10 97/14 | telling [3] 35/3 44/4 |
| 123/12 126/3 | 101/12 123/14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { telling [3] 35/3 44/4 } \\ & 80 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 130/20 131/9 | 124/3 | temporary [2] |
| supposed [4] 63/19 92/4 98/5 98/16 | taken [5] 61/18 | 117/12 119/3 |
| Supreme [7] 3/14 | 72/4 78/20 85/1 | tend [1] 8/9 |
| 6/7 10/20 59/23 | takes [8] 59/4 76/12 | Tennessee [1] |
| 70/1 74/20 78/11 | $84 / 194 / 1298 / 9$ | 113/4 |

term [1] 23/11 termination [2] 94/12 103/11 terms [1] 24/22
Terry [1] 76/13 test [3] 12/18 34/12 35/15 text [2] 30/3 65/18 than [42] 8/6 15/4 15/6 20/20 28/21 28/22 30/21 31/5 34/10 36/7 37/5 37/9 37/19 37/20 40/22 40/23 42/14 44/17 46/16 53/12 53/20 58/15 60/15 60/22 61/1 61/6 61/9 61/23 68/23 69/10 72/17 73/21 74/6 97/4 101/1 105/6 105/9 108/2 119/17 121/23 122/18 130/8 thank [26] 4/22 7/2 7/9 7/15 7/23 8/22 9/12 9/20 14/20 47/9 47/13 48/3 49/9 50/8 50/10 55/6 56/18 63/7 75/9 121/2 124/17 124/17 125/4 130/1

130/2 130/17 thankless [2] 67/3 $67 / 5$
that [587]
that's [84] 4/9 9/2
9/23 11/3 13/8
17/11 17/21 18/10
18/14 22/22 23/6
26/19 27/2 27/4
27/11 28/8 29/5
29/21 30/23 34/5
34/5 36/17 37/6
37/8 37/22 40/12
40/13 42/8 42/12
43/7 43/9 45/10
45/19 48/5 48/8
52/3 52/17 54/6
55/17 57/12 58/13
61/20 64/21 65/8
69/2 69/22 73/22
74/3 74/11 75/22
82/9 85/7 85/12
86/17 88/3 89/20
89/22 91/20 92/15
93/4 93/10 93/16 97/22 101/13
102/17 103/4 104/5
104/21 107/19
108/8 110/12 111/5
113/6 113/22 116/8
116/10 117/13
117/21 118/11

119/5 119/5 126/9 126/17 127/9 their [25] 11/21
22/23 30/2 34/15
37/7 38/1 69/20
80/10 80/12 81/8
81/10 83/22 85/19
96/21 97/21 102/20
109/10 110/6
115/18 116/8
127/19 128/6
128/13 128/18
128/20
theirs [1] 102/2 them [30] 4/20 11/7
18/12 25/23 27/21
28/6 29/19 32/11
35/2 35/3 38/13
42/18 44/4 81/7
94/3 96/17 98/22
105/16 112/3
114/23 115/2
115/21 117/10
117/11 128/10
128/23 129/9
129/14 129/19
129/20
themself [1] 5/4
then [67] 5/5 8/2
8/3 18/13 22/12
25/12 30/18 32/10
33/19 35/17 37/8

| T | 29/14 30/2 31/4 | 95/3 96/1 100/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| then... [56] 37/17 | 32/13 35/20 41/12 | 102/12 104/2 112/4 |
| 38/2 39/18 40/23 | 42/22 44/9 45/18 | 112/8 112/19 |
| 42/14 44/6 45/17 | 48/9 48/11 52/1 | 117/16 118/18 |
| 48/21 52/20 55/7 | 52/8 52/18 53/5 | 128/15 128/21 |
| 58/22 62/1 62/4 | 61/17 62/3 62/14 | thereof [1] 131/21 |
| 64/3 64/5 65/22 | 64/6 64/18 66/23 | these [14] 15/2 27/9 |
| 69/10 70/12 73/19 | 67/21 69/17 69/19 | 29/4 30/17 30/17 |
| 74/9 78/8 79/9 | 70/3 70/10 71/23 | 36/4 46/9 62/22 |
| 79/18 81/4 82/16 | 73/5 73/6 74/2 75/5 | 81/20 83/3 89/1 |
| 86/21 87/1 87/3 | 75/10 79/4 79/19 | 105/11 115/10 |
| 87/6 88/1 89/4 | 80/3 82/2 83/2 83/7 | 129/19 |
| 90/11 91/13 92/11 | 83/10 83/21 87/2 | they [111] 8/18 |
| 93/5 94/18 94/20 | 87/2 87/6 87/19 | 13/22 13/22 14/21 |
| 95/14 95/20 96/14 | 87/22 89/17 91/7 | 24/23 25/21 29/4 |
| 97/14 99/4 99/22 | 91/13 92/8 92/9 | 29/10 30/4 30/5 |
| 100/3 102/22 | 93/4 95/7 95/10 | 30/8 32/8 32/13 |
| 104/13 108/3 110/7 | 95/15 95/17 96/4 | 32/14 35/4 37/6 |
| 110/10 112/16 | 96/9 96/14 96/14 | 37/9 38/14 39/18 |
| 123/14 128/9 129/6 | 97/10 100/5 100/16 | 40/1 42/20 43/2 |
| 129/8 130/7 130/16 | 101/8 101/14 | 44/15 45/14 45/14 |
| theoretically [2] | 101/20 106/17 | 46/12 55/3 56/5 |
| 70/22 92/15 | 108/20 110/13 | 57/16 58/19 66/22 |
| theory [1] 45/3 | 110/14 112/19 | 69/19 70/4 70/8 |
| there [105] 5/7 5/8 | 113/8 113/19 114/4 | 70/14 70/15 70/16 |
| 5/9 10/9 11/17 12/5 | 114/5 114/6 116/2 | 72/18 72/20 73/19 |
| 12/19 13/15 15/3 | 118/8 118/17 127/4 | 74/2 74/8 74/13 |
| 15/20 16/7 17/2 | 127/20 128/12 | 76/3 77/7 77/10 |
| 21/14 21/23 22/1 | there's [23] 11/1 | 77/13 79/10 80/9 |
| 24/6 24/7 24/13 | 36/1 45/21 77/15 | 81/3 81/7 81/23 |
| 24/13 25/1 25/19 | 78/2 82/4 83/1 87/9 | 82/7 82/9 83/22 |
| 26/3 28/4 28/5 | 91/14 94/17 94/21 | 84/11 84/13 84/15 |


| T | 124/4 | 93/1 93/15 96/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| they... [53] 85/4 | think [132] 4/13 | 96/15 97/1 99/11 |
| 85/14 85/18 89/14 | 11/8 13/13 13/19 | 100/16 100/17 |
| 89/14 89/18 90/10 | 14/21 15/17 15/21 | 104/22 105/10 |
| 92/10 93/12 93/13 | 16/14 18/6 18/16 | 106/21 106/23 |
| 93/19 93/20 93/22 | 20/5 22/2 22/22 | 107/9 107/19 108/9 |
| 94/1 96/21 96/22 | 23/11 23/15 26/20 | 108/15 112/2 |
| 98/3 98/18 99/11 | 27/1 28/4 28/14 | 114/11 114/15 |
| 99/13 99/14 99/18 | 29/5 29/10 30/6 | 119/20 120/9 |
| 100/10 102/20 | 30/11 30/13 30/13 | 120/21 121/16 |
| 102/21 102/22 | 30/23 31/13 32/22 | 121/18 121/23 |
| 105/19 107/17 | 33/7 33/13 34/11 | 122/16 122/22 |
| 108/6 109/18 | 34/22 35/5 36/13 | 123/11 123/19 |
| 109/18 110/12 | 36/20 37/5 38/2 | 124/10 124/14 |
| 112/12 112/13 | 38/12 39/14 39/18 | 126/23 127/2 |
| 112/16 112/18 | 40/12 42/2 42/4 | 127/21 128/2 128/3 |
| 114/20 114/21 | 42/13 42/18 42/21 | 128/5 128/15 |
| 115/4 121/21 | 42/21 44/1 44/22 | 128/21 129/1 |
| 121/23 125/20 | 46/4 46/15 49/23 | 129/14 |
| 126/8 126/8 126/11 | 52/8 52/18 53/1 | thinking [9] 18/11 |
| 126/12 127/19 | 53/11 55/22 63/18 | 39/20 40/13 45/5 |
| 127/19 127/23 | 63/21 64/10 64/14 | 47/21 77/11 118/3 |
| 129/5 129/7 129/8 | 65/5 66/8 66/9 | 118/5 126/18 |
| 129/10 | 67/10 67/12 68/14 | third [7] 77/11 |
| they've [1] 44/18 | 68/15 68/15 68/17 | 110/10 115/5 |
| thing [14] 9/3 11/11 | 69/6 69/15 69/21 | 115/14 116/5 116/6 |
| 14/7 16/14 18/20 | 70/11 70/18 70/20 | 117/11 |
| 18/22 33/19 57/23 | 71/7 75/21 77/23 | third-party [1] |
| 80/17 80/18 81/13 | 80/1 80/6 80/13 | 115/5 |
| 113/23 122/6 129/2 | 81/13 82/22 85/2 | this [119] 7/12 11/2 |
| things [6] 5/1 39/7 | 85/7 85/7 88/21 | 11/2 11/3 11/15 |
| 39/16 59/3 71/7 | 90/9 90/14 92/12 | 11/17 12/6 12/9 |


| T | 104/23 105/10 | three [5] 59/5 77/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| this... [111] 14/1 | 108/4 108/8 109/1 | 79/12 81/20 124/11 |
| 14/22 16/12 18/1 | 112/17 116/22 | throat [1] 10/13 |
| 18/13 18/22 22/18 | 121/15 122/7 | through [7] 14/3 |
| 23/19 23/20 24/9 | 122/14 122/19 | 58/20 88/18 99/12 |
| 24/9 24/12 27/17 | 122/21 124/9 | 99/15 105/11 |
| 27/19 28/1 32/1 | 124/12 125/13 | 129/11 |
| 35/12 35/14 36/15 | 125/15 126/15 | throughout [2] |
| 37/1 37/1 39/17 | 127/15 129/3 | 47/4 80/14 |
| 39/20 40/2 40/21 | 130/11 132/4 | thumbs [1] 67/7 |
| 41/8 41/11 42/10 | those [19] 11/16 | tie [2] 38/14 66/1 |
| 42/20 43/1 46/6 | 12/5 13/19 39/15 | tied [1] 25/6 |
| 50/15 51/8 51/10 | 46/1 69/7 76/16 | tight [1] 32/23 |
| 55/23 58/7 59/7 | 76/21 76/23 77/22 | time [49] 2/23 |
| 59/13 59/18 60/9 | 79/4 82/23 83/12 | 28/12 31/16 34/16 |
| 60/17 63/18 65/14 | 83/13 92/12 93/1 | 38/1 40/8 40/23 |
| 65/15 65/16 65/17 | 110/15 119/12 | 43/1 47/5 49/6 55/2 |
| 68/5 70/16 70/19 | 122/13 | 58/2 58/4 58/5 58/6 |
| 71/4 71/5 72/15 | though [9] 34/8 | 59/18 62/22 63/12 |
| 72/17 74/6 74/14 | 40/2 41/13 42/13 | 64/4 65/1 70/21 |
| 76/8 78/9 78/17 | 66/2 69/5 72/23 | 76/20 79/1 79/6 |
| 78/20 79/12 79/15 | 73/2 91/3 | 81/12 85/23 91/4 |
| 80/6 80/13 80/23 | thought [19] 14/23 | 91/17 94/7 95/4 |
| 82/22 84/10 84/11 | 17/12 26/11 27/6 | 96/20 97/13 98/10 |
| 84/16 89/15 90/13 | 28/15 31/9 31/16 | 98/22 100/3 100/5 |
| 91/5 93/13 93/14 | 35/18 40/21 45/19 | 108/5 112/13 |
| 93/21 94/4 94/6 | 63/19 74/11 83/18 | 114/14 121/6 |
| 94/10 94/16 95/3 | 102/6 104/6 104/23 | 121/10 122/2 123/4 |
| 95/23 97/4 98/16 | 108/7 110/2 125/7 | 124/9 125/20 126/6 |
| 98/18 100/20 101/5 | thoughts [5] 15/23 | 129/17 130/6 |
| 102/5 102/6 104/2 | 22/6 67/16 123/7 | $130 / 11$ |
| 104/10 104/17 | 123/22 | time or [1] 65/1 |


| T | 131/14 | turned [3] 61/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| timely [1] 85/16 | transcripts [1] | 90/16 92/6 |
| times [4] 42/21 | 130/4 transferred [1] | turning [1] 119/7 <br> Tuscaloosa [4] 2/7 |
| 51/11 95/12 115/23 | transferred [1] | $2 / 168 / 28 / 4$ |
| timing [2] 98/8 98/9 | transportation [1] | twelve [3] 19/5 |
| tiny [1] 80/15 | 72/3 | 19/17 21/16 |
| 8/9 8/15 16/17 17/7 | treat [5] 109/2 | two [21] 14/10 16/9 |
| 51/12 78/23 79/11 | 109/9 109/10 | 21/5 45/21 46/9 |
| 81/19 126/1 | 111/12 115/4 | 48/18 61/15 65/19 |
| together [2] 14/22 | trend [1] 62/14 | 65/19 69/9 73/22 |
| 18/12 | trial [14] 24/22 | 74/7 79/7 80/21 |
| too [5] 36/11 42/14 | 26/13 26/16 27/14 | 91/17 91/21 91/22 |
| 50/10 89/23 129/18 | 29/21 36/2 60/12 | 105/1 106/11 112/8 |
| top [1] 58/11 | 77/17 78/1 79/9 | 122/20 |
| topic [3] 16/5 | 80/22 81/9 126/1 | two-part [1] 61/15 |
| 110/19 111/11 | 126/9 | two-year [1] 91/17 |
| topics [2] 108/20 | tried [3] 25/5 25/17 | type [1] 83/3 |
| 124/3 | 77/1 | typical [2] 62/21 |
| totally [2] 37/11 | triggers [1] 93/8 <br> true [2] 91/20 | 111/13 |
| $94 / 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { true [2] 91/20 } \\ & 131 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | typically [2] 109/4 $120 / 22$ |
| 93/3 | truth [1] 112/10 | typing [1] 5/1 |
| TPR [2] 119/2 | try [5] 39/15 105/9 | typographical [1] |
| 119/6 | 111/16 126/12 | 11/8 |
| tracks [2] 48/12 | 129/11 | U |
| 88/10 |  | uh [3] 19/12 88/11 |
| trade [1] 38/1 | 30/6 33/4 41/16 | 88/11 |
| tradeoff [1] 69/6 | $95 / 22$ | Uh-huh [1] 19/12 |
| training [1] 108/22 | turn [2] 57/11 | Uh-uh [1] 88/11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { transcript [5] 9/4 } \\ & 9 / 69 / 10130 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 124/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ultimately [3] } 17 / 1 \\ & \mathbf{3 5 / 7} 69 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |


| $\mathbf{U}$ | 71/10 71/12 71/15 | 120/10 130/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| unanimous [1] | 7 | 130/1 |
| 47/13 | University [3] 2/7 | use [20] 17/17 20/ |
| unchanged [1] | 5 5/1 | 20/6 20/7 2 |
| 65/17 | unless [5] 10/1 81/3 | 39/22 62/1 68/6 |
| uncle [1] 115/17 | 117/19 117/22 | 72/20 109/12 |
| uncontested [1] | 122/4 | 109/20 111/15 |
| 127/16 | until [2] 108/4 | 111/18 112/3 |
| under [14] 33/13 | 119/2 | 112/13 114/20 |
| 42/20 60/13 61/7 | unusual [1] 114/16 | 114/22 115/2 116/8 |
| 72/18 77/17 82/21 | up [34] 4/10 5/7 | 116/10 |
| 89/2 89/15 89/18 | 11/15 14/8 14/16 | used [2] 60/17 |
| 125/13 125/14 | 17/21 27/11 30/18 | 99/21 |
| 126/15 127/3 | 33/2 34/2 58/8 | using [4] 24/15 61/5 |
| underlying [1] | 64/11 64/16 67/8 | 79/3 116/5 |
| 44/13 | 73/19 76/12 77/1 | usual [1] 131/21 |
| undermine [1] | 77/13 78/14 88/1 | usually [10] 63/3 |
| 39/14 | 92/21 96/11 96/17 | 63/5 77/10 84/8 |
| undermines [1] | 107/7 110/18 113/4 | 98/22 112/12 |
| 72/21 | 115/11 119/20 | 112/13 115/22 |
| understand [6] | 119/23 120/12 | 117/12 124/23 |
| 32/18 36/19 39/11 | 122/13 122/17 | V |
| 81/3 81/7 85/6 |  | valid [2] 30/11 36/4 |
| understanding [4] | 99/4 108/13 | variables [1] 82/5 |
| 87/16 91/6 126/7 | upset [1] 101/2 | varies [1] 112/17 |
| 126/16 | upward [1] 72/2 | vary [1] 112/2 |
| undue [2] 36/21 38/19 | us [17] 4/11 4/23 | VENOHR [14] 2/2 |
| unexcused [1] | 17/7 17/14 36/22 | 60/7 60/9 62/10 |
| 28/23 |  | 67/6 69/1 121/2 |
| uniform [1] 71/17 | $78 / 1395 / 16 \text { 119/21 }$ | 121/11 121/14 |
| uniformity [5] 71/7 | 78/13 95/16 119/21 | 121/18 122/3 |


| V | g [1] | 57/15 57/20 70/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nohr's [2] 68/1 | 106/8 | 77/21 78/14 97/20 |
| 120/18 |  |  |
| Vermont [2] 17/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5 0} \\ & \mathbf{5 9} / \end{aligned}$ | wants [1] 33/10 |
| 59/13 | voted [1] 52/1 |  |
| RNECIA [2] | votes [1] 17/2 | was [84] |
| version [4] $17 / 5$ | W | 11/5 11/17 |
| 59/2 59/13 122/2 | wage [10] 74/4 | 14/617/2 |
| versions [1] 65/19 | 80/12 80/15 97/9 | 26/3 26/8 28/10 |
| versus [5] 19/1 19/7 $37 / 1490 / 590 / 16$ | 99/21 100/13 | 30/19 31/2 |
| 37/14 90/5 90/16 very [8] 8/23 31/12 | 100/17 102/22 | 31/17 31/18 31/20 |
| very [8] 8/23 31/12 <br> 58/11 62/10 67/4 <br> $80 / 517$ | 103/14 112/20 | 33/19 34/18 35/19 |
| 58/11 62/10 67/4 <br> 80/15 101/14 108/9 | want [47] 7/12 1 | 45/5 46/15 47/15 |
| 80/15 101/14 108/8 | 14/20 15/13 18/12 | 47/21 47/22 48/7 |
| vexing $[1] 101 / 14$ via $[4] 1 / 192 / 48 / 3$ | 19/2 19/3 19/19 | 55/4 55/9 55/10 |
| via [4] 1/19 2/4 8/3 131/15 | 27/2 29/14 29/17 | 55/17 55/21 59/7 |
|  | 29/19 34/10 37/23 | 60/12 60/18 60 |
| Video [1] 3/16 videoconference [1] | 38/13 45/23 51/1 | 61/17 61/2 |
| videoconference [1] $1 / 20$ | 51/9 51/9 51/13 | 6/10 63/19 64/13 |
| 1/20 view [2] 30/15 | 51/21 57/23 65/2 | 65/10 65/14 65/15 |
| view [2] 30/15 $42 / 17$ | 67/23 68/2 68/1 | 72/13 74/5 7 |
| 42/17 ${ }^{\text {Virtual [2] }} 1 / 202 / 4$ | 68/17 71/9 71/19 | 77/4 77/7 7 |
| Virtual [2] 1/20 2/4 | 74/13 74/14 75/23 | 77/19 77/20 78/3 |
| visitation [7] 12/21 | 85/9 92/22 92/22 | 78/5 78/18 78/20 |
| 23/20 32/18 37/7 | 94/6 102/17 103/21 |  |
| 1/11 127/2 | 106/1 106/8 113/6 | $87 / 287$ |
| visiting [1] 6/23 | 11 | $98$ |
| voice [1] 102/6 | 123/10 123/11 |  |
| ced [2] 32/5 78/4 | 124/3 126/12 |  |
| voluntarily [1] 23/1 <br> volunteer [1] 106/9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wanted [11] } 12 / 1 \\ & 25 / 1935 / 1739 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 106/22 107/1 107/2 |

weeks [3] 73/22 74/7 75/21 weigh [1] 127/8 weighing [1] 63/12 welcome [2] 107/16 130/6
well [39] 7/15 15/14 16/9 17/14 20/10 22/2 23/13 23/15 24/2 30/21 31/14 32/16 33/6 34/16
42/6 44/14 46/12 46/21 52/19 81/22 83/3 83/5 85/20 88/8 89/5 90/22
91/20 93/19 96/16 97/6 104/15 107/5 107/15 116/4
119/19 122/17
126/22 127/5
130/16
were [21] 8/14
17/10 17/18 24/14
25/18 28/4 35/18 42/3 46/12 55/3
57/16 58/19 78/11 85/4 104/17 105/3
106/17 106/20
107/3 108/20 111/1
weren't [2] 11/16 52/5 61/10 61/10
weekends [1] 33/18

12/6 13/6 13/14 17/10 17/21 18/4 20/18 22/17 25/21 26/6 26/20 27/2 27/11 28/16 31/2
32/4 34/5 35/1 35/3
35/5 36/11 37/1
39/11 40/13 43/8
44/7 57/15 57/22
58/12 60/19 62/14
62/20 63/16 65/7
65/11 66/3 66/4
69/20 70/6 71/11
71/12 71/12 71/13
74/4 74/21 79/23
81/4 85/9 88/6 88/7
89/20 89/22 92/2
92/12 92/14 95/22
96/4 96/6 96/14
98/20 101/7 101/12 101/13 102/17
103/5 106/20
112/11 112/20
113/6 114/5 119/17
119/18 121/8
121/23 122/18
123/13 126/9
127/18 128/5
what's [3] 86/14
100/20 105/6
whatever [7] 16/17 41/5 70/15 74/2

| W | 104/11 109/4 110/6 | 108/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| whatever... [3] 99/2 | 112/8 112/17 | WHITMIRE [2] |
| 99/4 99/22 | 113/15 113/19 | 3/10 6/15 |
| when [46] $8 / 13$ | 114/6 115/11 117/3 | who [18] 11/16 |
| 17/3 20/6 24/23 | 117/8 117/13 118/8 | 22/23 32/6 55/23 |
| 27/12 27/19 28/9 | 118/11 118/13 | 83/19 83/22 101/6 |
| 29/15 30/5 41/12 | 119/9 125/1 126/19 | 105/15 105/17 |
| 45/4 45/14 58/13 | whereas [1] 13/5 | 105/18 107/21 |
| 61/3 64/1 72/14 | Wherever [1] | 108/10 109/9 |
| 72/16 79/9 79/13 | 109/18 | 111/17 111/19 |
| 86/13 89/7 90/5 | whether [17] 13/18 | 111/21 116/13 |
| 90/11 90/15 93/9 | 13/22 16/15 26/11 | 117/1 |
| 93/23 94/16 96/1 | 35/21 51/20 68/2 | whole [3] 50/16 |
| 100/17 101/12 | 82/23 85/8 113/21 | 104/13 107/16 |
| 102/11 102/14 | 116/5 122/19 | whose [4] 97/7 |
| 104/1 104/3 109/3 | 125/20 126/2 126/8 | 97/18 101/6 127/13 |
| 109/10 111/12 | 126/11 126/12 | why [10] 25/22 |
| 113/8 113/9 114/3 | which [32] 4/16 8/5 | 27/10 30/23 40/1 |
| 114/8 118/6 118/6 | 14/9 16/23 17/2 | 61/20 66/12 93/22 |
| 118/6 118/18 | 18/4 23/1 25/22 | 97/22 104/5 127/9 |
| 26/13 | 29/1 37/9 37/22 | wife [1] 61/1 |
| whenever [1] 24/20 | 39/22 44/17 54/15 | will [39] 5/5 5/6 5/9 |
| where [46] 10/23 | 58/15 62/15 64/4 | 6/19 7/10 8/10 10/9 |
| 11/14 22/20 26/18 | 67/12 67/21 69/8 | 14/15 18/16 18/17 |
| 33/8 35/18 37/15 | 70/20 77/12 78/18 | 22/3 33/1 50/16 |
| 39/23 42/20 46/19 | 80/12 81/1 83/2 | 50/16 56/12 76/3 |
| 54/2 54/14 55/2 | 84/6 90/12 95/16 | 76/21 79/6 79/14 |
| 58/13 58/20 60/12 | 99/8 99/11 121/10 | 82/16 86/9 90/22 |
| 64/12 64/12 67/10 | whichever [2] 20/8 | 99/5 99/19 106/4 |
| 76/17 76/23 79/4 | 57/19 | 107/12 107/18 |
| 89/3 92/10 93/12 | while [5] 66/17 <br> 67/20 94/13 105/4 | 108/4 112/5 112/16 <br> 119/23 121/14 |
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