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MR. MADDOX: All right. We are ready to go.

MS. DAVIS: All right. Thank you, each of you, for your participation on our Child Support Guidelines Enforcement Committee.

First, I would like to start by recognizing Jeana Boggs again. If you would, wave so everybody will see you and recognize you.

THE COURT REPORTER: (Waving).
MS. DAVIS: She is our Court Reporter and has done a great job trying to record everybody in our Zoom mode, and we really appreciate her efforts.

To assist her, again, let me remind everyone, if you would please, when we are talking with numbers, would you say -- or saying three ninety-five, if it's three dollars and ninety-five cents, you would say it that way. If it's three hundred and ninety-five dollars, you would state it that way. Likewise, percentages,
if it's $2 \%$ or $5 \%$, if you would, just indicate what your number is intended to correlate with.

Bob, at this time, if you would please call the roll.

MR. MADDOX: Yes, ma'am. Once I call your name, please unmute yourself and say "present", "here" or whatever you want to say, that you are here.

The Honorable Sarah Stewart? (No response).

MR. MADDOX: The Honorable William
Thompson?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: The Honorable Don
McMillan?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Judge McMillan did email Penny and me earlier. I think he had a hearing. So, he may join late.

The Honorable Michael Sherman?
HON. SHERMAN: I am present.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. The

Honorable Aubrey Ford?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: The Honorable Julie Palmer?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: The Honorable Karen
Dunn Burks?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Professor Penny Davis
is on. She just spoke. Amanda Cox?
MS. COX: Here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Angela
Campbell?
MS. CAMPBELL: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Drew
Whitmire?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Greg Starkey?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Jennifer Bush?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Jennifer Bush, she is
on. She may not be able to unmute herself.
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Can you hear me, Jennifer?
MS. BUSH: I am present.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Jessica
Kirk Drennan?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Jim Jeffries?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Katie Steinwinder?
Did I say that right?
MS. STEINWINDER: It's
Steinwinder, but that's okay. You have me identified as Rachel King, though, Bob.

MR. MADDOX: I will change that.
I am sorry.
MS. STEINWINDER: That's okay. I am here, though.

MR. MADDOX: Steinwinder, right?
Steinwinder?
MS. STEINWINDER: You got it.
That's right. I am going to say it right
the next time. I promise, Katie.
Lathesia McClenney?
(No response).
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MR. MADDOX: Lathesia McClenney?
I don't see her on.
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Melody Baldwin?
MS. BALDWIN: Present.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Professor Brian Gray?

PROFESSOR GRAY: I am here, Bob.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Stephen
Arnold?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Stephen Arnold?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Rachel King?
MS. KING: The real Rachel King is here.

MR. MADDOX: I am sorry. Mallory Hall?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: We know Jeana is on.
She was identified earlier.
The Honorable Julie Weller?
(No response).
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MR. MADDOX: I haven't seen her on. Stephanie Blackburn?

MS. BLACKBURN: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Nathan Wilson?

MR. WILSON: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Thanks, Nathan. The Honorable Matt Fridy?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: For your information, everyone, Judge Thompson I believe has -- I believe officially resigned from the Committee. Stephanie can verify that. But I believe he has chosen Judge Matt Fridy, who is also on the Alabama Court of Civil Appeals, to replace him as a member. Is that correct, Stephanie?

MS. BLACKBURN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. MADDOX: I think he had a another rules committee meeting this morning, so he may join us later, as well.

Dr. Venohr? She's on. I can
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Clifford Smith?
MR. SMITH: Here.
MR. MADDOX: Cliff, did you want
to speak at the end?
MR. SMITH: I do not.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Tiffany
Gates?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Tiffany Gates?
(No response).
MR. MADDOX: Lisa Clark?
MS. CLARK: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Would you like to
speak at the end, Lisa?
MS. CLARK: No, thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Okay. Thank you.
Lee Wood?
MS. WOOD: I am here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Would you
like to speak at the end?
MS. WOOD: No, thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Tina

Boggs Reporting \& Video LLC 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com

Wright? Ms. Wright?
MS. WRIGHT: I am here. I am
here.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Would you
like to make some comments at the end of the meeting?

MS. WRIGHT: I'm not sure. I
guess we will see how it goes.
MR. MADDOX: Okay. We will come back to you at the end and ask you again. Thank you for joining us.

MS. WRIGHT: Yes. You are
welcome. Thank you.
MR. MADDOX: All right. Penny, I
think that's all I had right now.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Bob.
Stephanie, do we have a quorum at this point?

MS. BLACKBURN: Not at this point, we do not.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. If you would, when and if we get a quorum at an appropriate time, would you indicate that
for us?
MS. BLACKBURN: Yes. Definitely. MS. DAVIS: Thank you. I appreciate that. And also would you verify that we have authorization for a video conference through the Supreme Court?

MS. BLACKBURN: We do. The order granting us that authorization is in effect until September 30th. So, it's still good.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that reminder. And, Bob, would you verify the notification to the media.

MR. MADDOX: Yes, ma'am. As we have done in previous meetings, the news media was informed by email from Scott Hoyem, Public Information Officer in the Administrative Office of Courts in an email dated April 27th, 2021, that there would be a meeting today, May 21st, that allowed for the public to provide written comments by last Thursday, May 13, and also to join by Zoom by this past Wednesday May 19th.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Bob. And
were there any written comments sent in
to the -- by the deadline?
MR. MADDOX: No, ma'am.
Stephanie, is that true?
MS. BLACKBURN: We have not received any.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. I wanted to confirm. I knew I had not seen any either. All right. Well, thank you. I appreciate that.

Okay. At this time, we would look to approve the transcript. I think everyone has an opportunity to review the transcript. Are there any changes or corrections that anyone would like to make?

MR. MADDOX: Penny, I do have this one little minor correction I found after the fact on page 73, line 22. Page 73, line 22, it should say little "b" instead of "1" I think.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Bob. Anyone else have any --

MS. BALDWIN: This is Melody Baldwin. I did notice, unless it was changed in the first copy that I received that was sent out, page 40, line 19 and 23 needed to be the number 40, four zero, instead of IV-D as in numerals for the IV-D program.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. Any other corrections?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: All right. Do I hear a motion to approve the transcript with those corrections?

HON. SHERMAN: So moved.
MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge.
HON. SHERMAN: Michael Sherman.
MS. DAVIS: Thank you, judge. Do I hear a second?

MS. STEINWINDER: I second. Katie Steinwinder.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. And, Bob, if you get a chance, you may want to rename Rachel King, the second, to Katie. There
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you go. Thank you.
MR. MADDOX: I just did.
MS. DAVIS: Thank you. I
appreciate that. All in favor, if you would raise your hands.
(Committee members raising hands).

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Those -you can put your hands down. Thank you.

Those who are not visible if you would unmute and register your vote of the Committee members?

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

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. All right. Everyone that was visible voted yea, as did Angela. Anyone who is opposed, if you would, unmute and indicate that of the Committee members.
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you very
much. Obviously it passes.
All right. We are, at this point,
going to continue our discussion on updating and revising the self-support reserve adjustment as well as just the general discussion of updating the child support schedule. So, I would like to turn it over to Dr. Venohr at this time. Jane, if you would, unmute and take over the discussion.

I think Jane is unmuting and dealing with the phone. Phone problems. DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I am sorry about that. Okay. So, we can look at the memo on May 13 is a good place to start. And regarding my background, I decided to leave it up. I was a panelist in a conference sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation On Fathers and Families. So, they made us all have this background in the -- for the panel.

So, when Bob saw it, he thought, well, that's interesting. It kind of breaks it up so you don't have to see my messy office. So, that's a history of
that.
So, if we go to the May 13th memo -- there we go. So, at the top, there's those bullets, what we are going to do today. And we are going to look at the examples of the worksheet, and I want to say thank you to Angela Campbell for really looking at it and finding some little typos and seeing how it works. So, I think this is very insightful for the Committee. And I truly appreciate that she did that. And the issue -- One of the issues of concern is the percentage. We are still talking about what percentage. We call it a work incentive, but it also addresses payroll taxes. And where we left was the Committee was favoring by straw poll putting the adjustment in the worksheet, and that adjustment would vary by the number of children.

So, they wouldn't be the same order amount when there were two children, three, four children, and it would actually
increase.
And the second bullet -- taking a look at where we would have to make language changes for the low-income adjustment, and remember I am an economist, not an attorney. So, I think it's important for the Committee members to draft that, but at least I can point to it, you know, mathematically. So, I have some places where I am pointing to that, but I would appreciate if Committee members, such as, you know, what Angela has done is really to look at it and take a hard look at it from a person that's using the Guidelines.

So, we are going to look at the impact of the work incentives. And then, as Judge Palmer noted, there's all sorts of temporary changes to the federal tax credits relating to children, and I wanted to just go over that. Previously I had suggested that maybe you can deal with it in your deviation criteria. So, I have
something in there about that. But, again, I am an economist. So, you know, the role of the Committee, you are the experts on the policy and can think about whether it's appropriate, and you don't need me to fine tune the language, you know. So, anyway. So, underneath this is the contents, and I am going to go through it just really quickly hopefully. If we scroll down below the contents, it's just a little math there on how the -- where we have that percentage. In this example we -- did you want to say something, Penny? I thought I heard somebody.

Okay. So, in this example, we have a party's monthly adjusted gross income of $\$ 1,257$. So, that's equivalent to full-time minimum wage earnings. We have a self-support reserve of $\$ 981$, which is the Federal Poverty Level adjusted for Alabama incomes. The remaining income is $\$ 276$. And we know some of that is going to go to payroll taxes.

So, that's a policy decision what to use. In this particular example, I have 75\%. And we call this the work incentive. It actually is -- We could just call it the percentage.

And if you read the text, I say that the tax rates are going to be about $13 \%$ to $18 \%$. Later, I show that it's even up to 19\% for an income of $\$ 3,000$, which would be important for a family with six kids, that they might actually be eligible for the self-support reserve if they had an income of $\$ 3,000$ just because of how much the schedule amounts are for an increment of $\$ 3,000$.

So, what that means that, if the tax rates are between $13 \%$ and 19\% -- I think somebody needs to be put on mute. I think what we are hearing.

MR. MADDOX: Yes. Jane, it's Ms. Wright. Ms. Wright, could you mute yourself, please, ma'am?

MS. WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you.
DR. VENOHR: Thank you, Ms. Wright.

So, what that means is you probably want a percentage that's less than 80\% if you really want a true work incentive.

So, if you go to the next page, there's a table that shows some of the ones that we looked at when preparing this brief. So, the numbering is a little weird just to be consistent with previous memos. And all of them rely on a self-support reserve of $\$ 981$. And you can see we use a variable amount for the Option B.4a. It's 80\% for one child, and then 85\% for two or -- or more children. For B.4b, it's 75\% for one child, 80\% for two children, and then three children is 85\%. And that would be for three or more children.

For Option B.4c, it's 70\% for one child, 75\% for two children, and then three children it's 80\%, and that's 80\% or more.

That would be the option that I feel the most comfortable with as a minimum to get that economic incentive to increase earnings with the -- you know, obviously this is a policy decision. And because of that variable tax rate, you know, 85\% would be okay, I think, from a mathematical perspective, which is what I am going to talk about is always the mathematical and the economic perspective.

And then Option B.4d is clearly has a bigger incentive. It's 65\% for one child, 70\% for two children, and 75\% for three and more children.

So, before we delve into these calculations, I wanted to go over the tax credit information that Judge Palmer brought up the last meeting just because, you know, taxes are obviously a really important decision when we talk about that. And as Judge Palmer pointed out, the American Cares Act, or Rescue Act, I am sorry, it did some temporary changes in tax
code, and those are only in effect for this tax year, so 2021. And the major one is the increase in the child tax credit. It increases from $\$ 2,000$ per child per year to \$3,000 per child per year, and that amount is more if the child is six or less. It's $\$ 3,600$ per year.

And in the past, low income households weren't eligible for that full tax credit of $\$ 2,000$. So, a custodial parent making minimum wage wasn't eligible for that full $\$ 2,000$ per child per year because you have to have some sort of tax liability. And obviously, you know, the earned income tax credit is going to interfere with that.

And so, a person doesn't -- a person with children doesn't have any tax liability until their income starts getting closer to $\$ 2,000$ or $\$ 3,000$.

So, what that child -- What the old child tax credit did was only advance \$1,400. This temporary change for 2021
will advance the whole amount.
So, it's not just $\$ 1,400$ per year that that person will get. It will be $\$ 3,000$ per child per year but just for calendar year 2021 even though they tried to make it permanent at some -- it's a controversial issue. I'm not sure that will occur.

The other thing to realize about it is that that amount is going to be advanced. And Bob found an article about it. I'm not sure if he shared it with others. That it will start being advanced as of July 2021, this year. So, the last six months will advance -- be advanced. And I think the rest of it will happen with the tax return, if I remember right, next April.

And this is unusual because it's never been advanced before. So what happens is that families don't get it until they file their tax return, say, in April, and it's like, whoa, I get a little bit of
a refund here or a tax credit or I don't have to pay taxes. And the research shows that usually -- that money is usually spent to pay down debt or major households items such as if a family needs to buy tires for their vehicle or a broken refrigerator.

So, what most states have taken the perspective is that because it is not advanced and most families live paycheck to paycheck, that we don't usually consider it in the gross income calculation when we do our -- do the child support calculations. I mean, we could. There's been a couple of states that do such as Vermont does, New Jersey does, and I think there's one other state. And you certainly could do that from a policy perspective. It makes it messy. It makes it another calculation or another table.

Also, the whole formula for the childcare tax credit is very complicated. It phases in and it phases out. So, it hits just a certain amount of income, and
it varies by the number of children.
So, if you want to get to that detail, it's a very -- it's -- it is not easy. You know, you certainly can do it, and I would probably recommend against it. I don't think it's worth the hassle with the old tax code. With this new tax code that's temporary, and I am not sure it's worth the hassle for this either. But I will talk about it a little bit more. And, again, this is your policy decision. I am just looking at it from an economic point in a mathematical point.

And I am going to break in just a couple of minutes, but I want to go through the other changes because I think they are all important.

The second change is that this is temporary for 2021 as they expanded the earned income tax credit for childless adults. And it nearly tripled it. And it's about $\$ 125$ per month, but it is not advanced. It's not going to be advanced
like that child tax credit.
So, a childless adult is not -- an eligible childless adult isn't going to realize it until he or she files tax returns as of April. But then they are probably going to get a little bit of a windfall or more than they have gotten in the past. And I figure out, if you average it, it would be \$83 per month more for a minimum wage earner. But, again, they are not going to see that in their paycheck unless they ask their employer to do their -- and payroll withholding allowance differently.

And the last thing that has changed for just 2021 is they expanded the child and a dependent care credit. And this -- before -- the way it's worked historically, it's a maximum of $\$ 250$ per child that you can get a credit of, and then it's a percentage of that. It's about $25 \%$ of that. And then for two or more children, it was $\$ 300$. And then it was a
maximum of $25 \%$ that would only hit a certain income bracket, usually those with incomes above $\$ 3,000$, and then again there's a phaseout. So, it's a very select group that it affects.

And now they are expanding it, so it will consider childcare taxes -childcare expenses up to $\$ 667$ per month for one child. And $\$ 1,337$ per month for more children. So, what this means is, for a middle class family that has childcare expenses, this can substantially reduce their childcare expenses just for this calendar year.

And some states include the childcare tax credit when they talk about it in their calculation and their Guidelines and other states don't. I would say the majority don't, and Alabama is one of those.

So, if you scroll down to the very end, "What the Increased Child Tax Credit Means for Spendable Income Available to the

Obligee," and if we just assume the case that's age average case based on the ALECS data, which is title IV-D, the Roman numeral IV-D, case that they might get a partial tax credit of $\$ 133$ per month beginning in July for the rest of the year. So, they would see an increase in their paycheck if they were earning minimum wage. Now, I mentioned before that there's also going to be a change for the obligated parent. And that would be an average $\$ 83$ per month, but he or she is not going to see that right away just because it is not being advanced by the child tax credit. So, here's the policy decision: Is it a wash? You know, \$83 versus \$133, it's a $\$ 50$ difference in income whether you want to address it, I mean, some of the factors that don't make it a wash are the obligee -- obligor is not eligible because he or she has income greater than minimum wage. He or she has other children in the home. I already talked about one being
advanced and the other one not being advanced. The receiving parent has more income, so that would change it up.

And then after that, I am going to slowly get into some language. But then the next thing is to show you how that chart is something that I pulled from the Congressional Records Office Report just showing how that change in that, the childless adult and where it's kind of confusing.

So, the brown line just shows you now it's hitting a minimum wage worker, this earned income tax credit. Before, you could see that that prior law, if you look at that brown line, it peaked below an income of $\$ 10,000$ per year. And, you know, where minimum wage worker is going to have income just below the $\$ 15,000$ per year point or really close to that.

So, you can see that he or she -well, actually it's going to be to the right of the income of $\$ 15,000$ per year. I
am pointing to the screen, like, when you can see my fingers. But it's going to be a little bit less than that.

So, it just shows that the -- oh, look at that. Bob has got a lot of skills. So, anyway, but it just shows the obligor is probably going to get something too in those cases where both parents are earning minimum wage.

So, if you move on to page four and you look at table one, you know, you already have some -- this is the deviation criteria. And, again, I am not an economist -- I mean, I am an economist and not a policy person. So, I just put suggestions some place where I thought you could put language. And my intent was to get language that reflected the economics and the math of it. If you wanted to put something in there that allowed judges to deviate, I mean, I know there's a whole perception of fairness, and, you know, that is an issue, even though mathematically I
showed you the increases. You know, there's an increase, but it's probably not enough to move that needle by about 9\%, which is your -- one of your modification criteria. But I slipped some language in there just to be generated discussion.

And I am going to stop there and just let people comment and see what they think. And I have other languages for the other tax credits. So, we will just stop there and open it up for comment.

MS. DAVIS: I have one question initially. Is spendable income a defined term?

DR. VENOHR: It --
MS. DAVIS: I think I know what you mean, but $I$ don't know if that's a defined term.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. It's -- I am using it more general than the defined term. I am using it synonymous with after-tax income. And there's a defined term -- I am pretty sure that's the term
that they use in the Consumer Credit Protection Act, and I am not using that definition. When they use that definition, they include after deductions for health insurance. So, it's a little bit further. So, that's a good point, Penny.

And I see that I use that term in (g), and I probably could use after-tax income in a month. Because when I was trying to discern between his or her income changing on average for the year or his or her income actually being affected on a monthly basis like it would be because now they are advancing the child tax credit. I don't know. Does it clarify it?

MS. DAVIS: Yeah. I think I knew what you intended, but $I$ am just -- I am approaching it from the lawyer side as opposed to the economist's side in terms of the judges have to -- if we write something like changes in federal tax laws that result in a parent having an increased or decreased income, that doesn't use the word
"spendable," but it may capture it without having -- the people to have to litigate what's intended by "spendable."

DR. VENOHR: Point well taken.
MS. DAVIS: And it may be -- the others really don't speak -- The other deviations don't speak in terms of spendable income versus just the income in general that's available.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. And I think the more general question is whether the Committee feels like there needs to be -this issue needs to be addressed. I mean, it's a temporary situation. Who knows. We can't predict Congress, you know.

MS. DAVIS: Right. So, let's open it up for that discussion in general. And let me stop and ask Stephanie. I assume we still do not have a quorum; is that correct?

MS. BLACKBURN: Sorry about that. I was trying to figure it out. No, we do not have a quorum.
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So, Bob, could you switch us to the Brady bunch view and see if we can -if anyone would like to discuss this point.

All right. So, we are addressing the questions to the Committee members. So, would anyone on the Committee like to discuss the federal tax credit changes and any idea with regard to putting it into a deviation or addressing it some other way than that?

HON. SHERMAN: Penny, I will make a comment. This is Michael Sherman.

If we were going to address it, I like the idea of addressing it in this place in the Guidelines as a grounds for deviation. I'm not sure that we need to. But my concern is -- I say I am not sure we need to because, like Dr. Venohr points out, it's temporary right now. It may
become permanent. We don't know. But I'm not sure -- I mean, speaking from the trial judge's perspective -- that many, if any, trial judges are going to have the context and knowledge that she just gave us in those three or four paragraphs to even understand what the impact of those tax credits would be to then intelligently apply a deviation to the guidelines that would be rationally related to the financial difference it actually makes for that family.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge. Jane, I know you were focusing on the Alabama data that you were sent. But that relates primarily to what are the IV-D cases, not the overall average -- you know, average me, Minnie or Mo type of situation.

So, drawing on your expertise from other states where you have a broader amount of cases to pull from, are a lot -are many -- what percentage would you estimate roughly would be impacted by these
federal tax changes in a significant way?
DR. VENOHR: That's a good
question. I think it would probably be the non-IV-D world that would be the most affected, and it would be -- so, that's roughly $50 \%$ or $40 \%$ of your cases, and then a sub-group of that. So, I am working down to it.

MS. DAVIS: Right.
DR. VENOHR: It is not going to be all 40\%. And then it would be those where the custodial parent gets to claim the children. And I don't have data. A lot -So, it's private cases. Not in the Social Security IV-D with the Roman numbers on caseload.

And I don't have numbers in
Alabama to know if they are splitting the tax credits. The only state I have ever had numbers on that was in Arizona, and they pretty much split the tax credits equally in that state.

So, it would have to be a scenario
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Then it becomes a segment of that percentage. And then I think it would be -- you know, the case example that comes in mind where the custodial parent might be a school teacher, that would be about the right income range, you know, where not a nurse supervisor. But, you know, a nurse with a few years of experience. They might be at that income range that's affected.

And, then, if they had more children, you know, obviously it's going to be a bigger impact. And our ALECS data showed us that the majority of cases are one child.

So, as I talk this out, I am thinking it's going to be maybe $10 \%$ of the cases that there's a -- might be an equity concern because they are getting that
additional \$200 per month statewide. That would be my back of the envelope calculation. And maybe some of the judges know better that are hearing non-IV-D cases on that situation I describe.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. That was helpful to me with your -- I understand I put you on the spot. It's a rough estimate. So, at $10 \%$ or so, I am probably less inclined to think we ought to do anything that would make a calculation very complicated since it's going to impact only on a small percentage.

And I would tend to think that those that have the higher incomes are more likely to have attorney representation so they can negotiate with the tax
consequences. I see some heads nodding. Would that be a fair statement from those of you who are either practiced or on the bench or both?

MS. KING: This seems accurate for me. This is Rachel King.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Rachel.
Okay. And I guess -- I think I am leaning towards not putting it in because of the lesser number impacted and the fact that it probably is already in a considered already when the parties are negotiating.

Does anyone feel strongly that we should include this as a deviation? If you would, just go ahead and raise your hand or unmute and let us know if you feel strongly that you would like to. (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Anyone -- just to be fair, I am going to ask the other side, anyone that feels strongly that we should not, if you would raise your hand or unmute and speak to that point.
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Well, I don't see that -- there's a lot of strong feelings one way or the other. So, unless anyone has any other questions, then I think we will just go on to the next point,

Dr. Venohr. I think that was very helpful information for all of us.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. If we scroll down and just going to -- I don't think we need to discuss this right now, but just to save time because I want to -- but if we scroll down to that same page, there's one for addressing the federal childcare tax credit.

And if you scroll down to the bottom, I just have a sentence in there. And you can talk about this more later among yourself. I don't think you need me.

But this would be a place that if you wanted to put in the federal child and dependent childcare tax credit, you can just say it may be considered. You know, but for the same reasons that you are thinking that it's a small percentage of your caseload, we only found that 14\% of those with documented Guidelines calculations in ALECS had childcare expenses.

So, that would be the state child support caseload that they had childcare expenses. And all of them had too low of an income to realize the childcare tax credit.

So, you know, if they are thinking about how many cases are affected, there would probably be even fewer cases that would be affected by the federal childcare tax credit when talking about childcare expenses.

So, if you are okay with it, Professor Davis, I think we can just move on unless the Committee wants to make a comment real quick on that.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I am going to open it up for discussion. Anybody want to comment or ask Jane a question before we move on?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Jane, I think we are ready to move on. Thank you.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. So, then, we
are moving on to the next page, and this just show that what we do when we do the tax -- the conversion from -- we convert up to gross income. So, instead of calculating from gross income to after-tax income, we -- our measurements of child-rearing costs are expressed as a percentage of expenditures. We convert that to after-tax income, and then we gross it up to develop the schedule. And we use income withholding formulas. And we use the income withholding formula for single taxpayer which is pretty much the same as a head of household. There's just a little bit difference in the brackets. But -- and we use the formula for 2021, which does not have this advanced child tax credit.

So, this is what we get when we look at the payroll tax calculated from the federal and state income withholding formulas as published as of December or January 2021. So, this just shows you that, again, that the percentage that we
want to talk about if we are concerned about every single additional dollar in gross income going to child support, we want to reduce that by at least 80\%, because about roughly 20\% were going to go to taxes.

So, if we scroll down a little bit, the last time somebody asked about the federal requirement. And one of the reasons that we are taking so much time on this on the self-support reserve is that there's a new federal requirement that requires states to consider the basic subsistence needs of the noncustodial parent (and at the State's discretion, the custodial parent and children) who has a limited ability to pay by incorporating a low-income adjustment, such as a self-support reserve or some other method determined by the State.

So, that's one of the reasons that the Committee is refining the self-support reserve. Not only are you talking about
updating with that amount of that self-support reserve is, but you are talking about making it transparent obvious in the schedule and applying it to both parents.

So, this next table, and this is something you can look at on your own without me later is this just as a markup of where you probably would want to put some language to address it and how. And one of the things that I am going to mathematically show you in a minute when we get to the worksheet is that you have to move those additional expenses for health insurance and childcare to make this all work.

So, there's a considerable amount of markup in the language to accommodate putting that self-support reserve in the worksheet. So -- and that language continues on the next page.

I also inserted some of the language from other states because one of 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com
the things that the Committee was favoring was making that adjustment discretionary. And discretionary meaning that you consider the custodial parent's income too. And that makes it a little bit more tricky in the language in the worksheet.

So, I was playing around with some of the language. There really isn't too much that you can adopt from other states. I have included Arizona, Georgia, what we proposed in Kentucky, New Jersey, because all of these states, what they do is they do that self-support adjustment at the very end.

So, they do it after a consideration of childcare and health insurance, where Alabama is talking about doing the self-support reserve consideration, then doing the add-ons for childcare and health insurance. And you can change it up. That's a policy decision. You know, I am just trying to work out the math on doing that.

So, I think probably the best thing to do right now is -- Bob, do you mind flipping to Angela's worksheet because she's got -- she caught some of my typos. And that's probably a better place to look at it.

So, this is -- Here's a draft worksheet where we have a monthly gross income of $\$ 1,907$. So, that's assuming that the federal minimum wage increases to $\$ 9.50$, or you can look at it as, you know, what the -- it approximates what a restaurant person would make, a cook. And then we have the defendant making minimum wage in this example.

And then I programmed this on Excel. So, when I do it, it takes that basic child support obligation from the schedule. And I have to do a million other steps to get Excel to round off, and I was more concerned about getting the math right for those add-ons, the childcare and the health insurance.

So, when you see that Angela scribbled out those -- the dollar amounts, you can see that she's got $\$ 344$, and I have \$346. She is using the round-off, the 60\%, the 40\%. And if you go to the Excel, I have it to an infinite amount of decimal points.

So, that's why you see the discrepancy there. And I would be glad to share my Excel spreadsheet with anybody. And then, you see that New Line 6, or if you look, you say, Consideration of Subsistence Needs, Self-Support Reserve. And you can word this however you feel is appropriate. You may skip if each parent's income is above XXX. And we don't know what XXX is until you decide what that percentage, that work incentive should be. So, then, our new Line 6 would be the self-support reserve. And a beautiful thing about this is that it applies to both parents, to each parent. And you can change that $\$ 981$. The Committee can do it
on their own. You don't have to hire me back to make the change in the schedule. It's going to work. The math is all there that's going to work.

And Angela suggested that we clarify Line 1 , minus Line 6 or Line 7 to get -- to understand the directions.

And then the New 8 would be the percentage of adjustment. So, this is how it would look like. And you could put some instructions on it. Here we have a variable percentage. And one concern was whether this would be confusing. And then New Line 9 is the maximum share of basic obligation --

MS. DAVIS: Jane?
DR. VENOHR: Go ahead.
MS. DAVIS: Just this is a little confusing to me on Line 8. We used 75\% for one person, but on the third, over on the right-hand side where it says $100 \%$ ?

DR. VENOHR: Oh, we should take that out. I am sorry.

MS. DAVIS: I think it should just be a blank there, shouldn't it?

DR. VENOHR: Right. Good comment.
MS. DAVIS: I think that's a little bit confusing to people.

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I agree. And I am just going to make a note of it. It's a very good comment.

And then, so, then new Line 9 would be the maximum share of basic obligation if SSR applies. And I really had trouble wording this because, in most states, it's the preliminary order. But the preliminary order considers the childcare and the health insurance. So, I just thought -- I am just going to use the language that it really truly means. But I think other people on the Committee are in a better position to get the -- refine the language. And so, it's consistent with your laws and regulations.

So, but I think for now you
understand that that's the maximum. And I
put less than $\$ 50$, add $\$ 50$. So, that means that there's always a minimum order of $\$ 50$.

And so, then, the new Line 10 is just whether the parents have -- or the party has sufficient income to cover his or her share of the basic obligation and the SSR. And all it does is that it compares that Line 9 with that Line 7. And you can see that the -- the parent -- the plaintiff that her Line 7 is more than Line 9. So, yeah, the plaintiff has enough income.

And you can use different wording. Some states like Tennessee, they use a little bit different language, whether he is eligible for the self-support reserve, but they have already identified which parent is the obligated parent at this point.

So, there's some playing around that could be done. Now, when you look at the defendant, you will see that his or her Line 7, the defendant's Line 7, is more than the maximum share of the SSR. So,
actually that's not how it works. It should be compared to the New Line 5. I told you the wrong line to compare it to. So, I was comparing it to Line 7, but it's actually the Line 5 that we are comparing it to.

So, the -- for the plaintiff, you can see that $\$ 695$ is greater than $\$ 344$. So, yes, the plaintiff can afford to pay \$344.

And then for the defendant, the New Line 9 is \$207, and the obligated parent cannot afford to pay that New Line 5 of \$230. So, he or she has a "no" in that New 10.

And then this is where it gets different is that now we do the consideration, the additional expenses. And Angela filled this in. Most states do not do this. They do it the way that Angela has it where they put the information right -- they don't have that shading there. They actually put each
parent's information right there.
And then Angela and I, obviously, you know, because I am using Excel, we have a little bit of a difference on New Line 14. She caught a little error in my multiple line. I have got Excel that has its numbering which isn't consistent with the numbering here. So, it's always a challenge to get it consistent.

So, again, I can't thank Angela enough. She did a similar thing in New Line 15. And this is --

MS. DAVIS: Jane, before you quit, I am thinking that if we are going to use something like this, that on the total additional expenses on New Line 13, we may want to have the same sort of suggested language that she had before and just say, add lines 12 and -- you would add lines 11 and 12 to get -- where you say, new lines?

DR. VENOHR: Right.
MS. DAVIS: A total new line. You do a parenthesis and said add lines 11 and 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com
12.

DR. VENOHR: Right. Okay. That's easy. And I am happy if there's -- you know, if you decide to do a work group, I am happy to give you the Excel spreadsheet, you know, if there's other language changes and stuff you want or I can make them too.

So, then, when you get to New Line 16, you see what the obligor's adjusted share of additional expense is. And that's similar to how you have the worksheet established.

And then I don't know how you want to do this last part because you are making the deviation -- I mean, the self-support reserve discretionary. So, I put it both ways. I put in the recommended child support order with no SSR adjustment. And then I put in the recommended child support order with the SSR adjustment. And you can that see there's a difference of, you know, $\$ 247$ and $\$ 226$. And Angela noted that I didn't correct that Line 16. I am sorry,

Professor Davis. Go ahead.
MS. DAVIS: I had a question. On Line 17, it says the sum of Line 9, Line 9 is \$207, and Line 16 -- and Line 16 is the \$20.

DR. VENOHR: So, that's --
MS. DAVIS: Is that $\$ 227 ?$
DR. VENOHR: That's another typo.
It should be sum of Line 5. Sorry about that. Because Line 5 is the amount without the self-support reserve.

MS. DAVIS: Line 5. Okay.
DR. VENOHR: So, yeah. So, on that -- instead of Line 9 in that directions of New Line 17, it should be Line 5. That was another thing Angela picked up.

Again, $I$ am doing this in Excel, so I don't -- I don't have -- I have to manually do the line numbers.

MS. DAVIS: So, it would be $\$ 230$ plus the -- under her, it's $\$ 230$ plus the $\$ 20$, it would be $\$ 250$; is that correct?
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DR. VENOHR: Right. Right. And the difference is just the round-off.

MS. DAVIS: Yeah. Thank you. That makes more sense.

DR. VENOHR: And then you can see at the bottom the existing would be $\$ 259$ for this case. And the difference is just because we have a little bit of a decrease in that proposed schedule.

So, I am using the updated schedule. We have -- I think it's about a decrease of $\$ 20$ around that point. That's about the maximum.

Bob, do you mind flipping back to the memo, or do people want to make a comment on this before they -- because I want to show this just a slightly different way to do the worksheet.

MS. DAVIS: Anybody have any questions?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Go ahead.
DR. VENOHR: So, this is on page
11. Then, if you go to the add-ons, what is different here -- and I color coded it yellow because on the -- on the Excel spreadsheet, this is where you would enter the information.

So, if anybody wants to use that Excel spreadsheet, they can look at where I have the yellow. And that's where you would enter the case circumstances.

And here I have done it a little bit different than your existing worksheet. This is more what Angela was kind of getting at, that you could put that information in that column for each party. And then as Professor Davis pointed out, that New Line 13 should be the sum of Line 11 and Line 12. And then you would -- and Line 14, you multiply it by each parent's additional share -- pro rata share of income.

And then that New Line 15 is the obligor's credit only. And so, you pull that down. And then you take the net of

New Line 14 and 15. And that's the add-on for additional expenses is $\$ 19$ or $\$ 20$ if we were rounding off.

The one thing that this does that we are seeing in other cases -- in other states is that new Line 11, that work-related childcare expenses, it allows for them to be incurred by the obligated, or the defendant, and be considered in the calculation which is a reality in a lot of states. I mean, and this happens just because they might have some sort of time-sharing arrangement where the obligor has the child and puts the child in childcare expenses.

So, this achieves and ends up with the same end result, the same dollar amount. We are not changing it at all. It's just the sequence and the order of the worksheet. It's a little bit different, and the directions are a little bit different.

So, my suggestion would be, if I
could have it any way, is to have some sort of workgroup. If you are thinking about putting it in the worksheet, have some sort of workgroup refine the language in the worksheet so it's appropriate for your rules and legislation.

I am going to stop there. No comments?
(No response).
DR. VENOHR: Do you want to go to the percentage if there's no comments? Do you want to look at the percentages then?

And then we can move on to the comparisons because that's another issue.

So, there's a couple of other issues we are bringing up to today: One is whether you want to make any changes to your Guidelines to accommodate the federal tax changes. Two is on that -- getting a draft of a worksheet and the language in your Guidelines to accommodate so they mesh together. That's another issue. And then the third issue that we still have to deal
with is those percentages assuming that you are going to go with the adjustment in the worksheet.

So, these are our case scenarios. And the first case scenario, the ones that we've been looking at quite awhile is our current minimum wage, which is $\$ 7.25$ an hour. It's been that way since about 2006. And there was a federal proposal to increase that to $\$ 9.50$ by the summer. It didn't make it into the House bill. But there is still a lot of movement to increase the federal wage, minimum wage. So, I won't be surprised if it goes up to somewhere between $\$ 9.50$, $\$ 11$ or $\$ 12$ an hour.

The proposal earlier this year was to go up to $\$ 15$ an hour by 2025. I would be surprised if it went there, I mean, just based on my reading. It's something that I track pretty closely. But that's where we get these case examples.

So, if we go down to Figure 1, we 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com
have -- these are the options. And you don't need to flip back to the options. The options are listed on page two of the memo.

So, there's an existing order
amount. And Option B.4a is to use 80\% for one child, and 85\% for two or more children.

And then Option B.4b is to use 75\% for one child, 80\% for two children, and 85\% for three or more children.

And then Option B.4c is to use 70\% for one child, 75\% for two children, and 80\% for three or more children.

And then Option B.4d is to use 65\% for one child, 70\% for two children, and then 75\% for three children.

And in this -- because of case scenario, you can see that the obligor's gross income is $\$ 1,257$. The Federal Poverty Level for one person is \$1,073. When we adjust it for Alabama incomes, it's \$981. So, we have payroll taxes of $\$ 159$. 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com

So, roughly there's about \$200 of -- I'll use the term "spendable income" more because it's after-tax income and after the self-support reserve.

And you will see that any of these options are going to result in a lower amount than the existing amount. And the "a" is the most conservative option, and then "d" is the most generous option.

So, you can see that it's a small decrease for Option B.4a for one child, which is the vast majority of the orders. They would go from $\$ 246$ to $\$ 221$. And probably where there's a little bit of pain is that three-child amount, that that now it would be $\$ 419$, and it would go down to $\$ 235$. And that would be Option B.4a or Option B.4b. It didn't make any difference.

And -- but remember that it's very unlikely that that federal minimum wage is going to keep at $\$ 7.25$ an hour. So, this is probably the most painful scenario to
consider because this is where you are going to see the precipitous decreases. So, if we go down to Figure 2, which is more likely a scenario that when and if minimum wage increases, so this would be $\$ 9.50$ an hour. And what you will see is that for the scenario for one child and for two children, the order isn't even affected by the self-support reserve. And that's because both parents essentially got an increase in their income because of the increase in the federal minimum wage.

If you look at that side box, if they are working full time at minimum wage, their income would be $\$ 1,647$, and their payroll taxes would be only $\$ 245$ a month for an obligated parent assuming the federal income withholding formula, the state income withholding formula and FICA. So, there's no consideration of the EITC being advanced.

And so, you know, if you take $\$ 1,647$ and subtract $\$ 245$, that roughly
means there's about $\$ 400$ that he or she has available for -- I am sorry, and then you subtract the self-support reserve. There's about $\$ 400$ available. And I am rounding down.

So, that's why you see that it's met in the one child and the two child. So, it's just roughly -- it's a little over $\$ 400$, but I rounded down when I gave you that number.

When you do see the self-support reserve as an impact, you see it for the three-child. It doesn't impact the Option B.4a or B.4b, but it does impact B.4c and B. 4 d which are more generous.

So, again, I want to emphasize that that one-child amount decreasing from \$312 to \$299 is just that new Betson-Rothbarth measurements are showing a little bit of a decrease at those incomes, and only a small increase for the two-child amount.

So, then, if we scroll down to \$11
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an hour, the next scenario, this self-support reserve is not kicking in for any of these scenarios. As we go -- you can see because all of them result in the same dollar amount. And this means that the parent has sufficient income -- both the parents have sufficient income to meet that $\$ 981$ self-support reserve.

And then you see a little bit of a decrease for one child. And, again, that's just because the new Betson-Rothbarth measurements are coming out a little bit lower for one kid at very low incomes, not at higher incomes.

And then we can scroll down to the \$12-an-hour example, and they see this same outcome. And then the next page we see the \$15 an hour, and it's the same outcome.

And then we scroll down to the scenario -- and this happens in a few cases -- where the obligated parent's income is \$7.25 an hour, and the receiving parent's income is zero instead of using \$1,257.

And there's a footnote on page 13 that I am reading to tell you what the percentage of orders are. Among those cases where it's about 33 -- let's see. It may be 65\% of the cases that would fall into this scenario. But, again, you can see that there's bigger differences at that $\$ 7.25$ an hour that it's going to result in some decreases to what you currently do no matter what percentage you use.

When we go to the next scenario, which is the $\$ 9.50$ per hour case where the obligated parent earns $\$ 9.50$ and the receiving parent has zero income -- and again this is probably less than 1\% of your cases. You just don't have this happen particularly with two and more children. You see that, for the three-child, there's going to be some decreases if you go with the more generous options. But there are no decreases. It's all -- You can just apply the schedule amount as you would
normally for mostly one and two children regardless of the percentages.

So, then the last set of comparisons, assume what happens when the receiving parent has more income, which is actually we are finding this to be more common in other states and more so. And still the more typical situation is, if both parents have equal income, if income is imputed at minimum wage for the obligated parent, it's usually imputed at minimum wage for the receiving parent. And that's usually over 50\% of the cases.

And then, the other cases are mixed as far as where they land when the income is imputed to the obligated parent. But there are some cases where it's more common for the income to be more of the receiving parent than zero in these cases.

So, this just shows the impact. And, again, it's that $\$ 7.25$ an hour that would have the most impact. But once minimum wage increases, it's -- it
really -- the self-support reserve won't kick in.

So, in short, you know, even though I am suggesting that you are going to have to change your language to accommodate that self-support reserve in the worksheet, and you are going to have to put some thought into that worksheet and how you want it structured, if the feds raise minimum wage, you are probably rarely going to use it, particularly if you keep that self-support reserve at $\$ 981$ a month. You know, that the increase in minimum wage is just going to take care of that whole issue.

So, I guess what I am saying is, you know, you only have so much time. So, think about that when you are thinking about what you do. I still really love the idea of you putting it in the worksheet because it gives you the opportunity to change that self-support reserve. I think that $\$ 981$, I think that is a good
self-support reserve. You might gain some experience from it and want to change it later.

You know, if we get blind-sided by a bunch of inflation, which I think we are going to have a little bit of inflation, but unless we have something crazy happen, I don't think it's going to be like 10\%, 20\%. I mean, that might be something that you might say, look, we have got to change this amount, and you can do that without me.

So, I love this approach, but I don't want you to over-think it just because of the -- I think there's an imminent change in the federal minimum wage.

So, I am going to stop there and let people discuss and ask questions.

MS. DAVIS: Bob, why don't we go back to the Brady bunch view and see if anyone wants to respond. (No response).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Does anyone have any questions? If you would, just raise your hand and unmute.

MS. CAMPBELL: Penny, this is
Angela Campbell. I had one question, and I may have just missed it.

When you were talking about on the worksheet, Jane, with the consideration of subsistence needs may skip of each parent's income as above certain XXX. You said we would have to determine that once we got the percentage, correct?

DR. VENOHR: Right. And that would be something I would give you, you know. And that was brought up -- I forgot who brought it up. But they said: Do we have to make this calculation for everybody?

And I said, no. You know, like, if you look at the West Virginia worksheet, which is in the April materials, they say -- I forgot what income. But they say you only need to do this calculation if the
income is below this.
So, that is just to ease those that are calculating it manually. You could calculate it for everybody and it won't affect a thing.

MS. CAMPBELL: All right. Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Other questions or comments?

HON. SHERMAN: I'll just -- I will make a comment, Penny.

I am interested to hear others, on the Committee, thoughts. And I have missed the last couple of meetings because I had conflicts with the JIC.

But, when I look at these draft worksheets, it is a little intimidating. And I am concerned about -- let me put it this way: It has me -- like, I was a proponent of putting it in the worksheet. I like the flexibility and sort of the nimbleness it would allow us to respond to future events. But it's got me
reconsidering that position, to be quite frank, because I think -- it's mitigated somewhat by the answer that Dr. Venohr just gave Angela about, you know, there was some way to say you don't even need to worry about all of this unless the income is X . You know, that would mitigate it somewhat.

But -- and in particular when I hear Dr. Venohr say the impact of this essentially goes to nil as soon as the federal -- or as soon as the minimum wage goes up or at least maybe that's not how she put it, but that's sort of the way I interpreted it.

And so, I don't know. It's just giving me some pause about the complexity, the layers of complexity, we will be adding to include the self-support reserve in the worksheet.

MS. COX: This is Amanda Cox. I agree with Judge Sherman. I was also in favor of putting it in the worksheet. I like the transparency. But if that's about
to go away, that's several lines there that I think could come out. And I am not sure about having the layers of the percentages either, if that's even necessary.

But, yeah, I think it needs to come out.

HON. SHERMAN: Let me just -- if I can add a comment, Dr. Venohr, to give you some context.

So, a lot of times when I am trying cases, it is a source of eternal frustration for a trial judge. But often the lawyers are not calculating child support until they are in the courtroom. Sometimes that is necessary because they learn something during the trial that impacts what income figure they think the evidence has proven.

And so, they are hand doing these worksheets on the fly, so to speak, in the courtroom frequently.

And so, with the -- what I think are very simple worksheets we have now, you
would be surprised -- and this is not meant as any insult to any lawyer on this call. I am a lawyer. But the difficulty they seem to have filling out the worksheets we have right now in doing them by hand would maybe surprise an economist.

MS. KING: This is Rachel King. Oh, I am sorry. Go ahead, Dr. Venohr. Go ahead.

DR. VENOHR: I think if you don't put it in the worksheet, you have two options: One is you go back to putting it in the schedule, which isn't that great. I mean, you have already identified the issues with that.

The second would be that you just have a provision, but you don't put it in the worksheet. And if you look at page six and seven on the memo, you can use the language like Arizona or even Georgia.

Arizona at first didn't have -they used to have this language but no adjustment in their worksheet. They now
have an adjustment in their worksheet. But they just used to have this language.

And then Georgia does not have anything in their worksheet, but they clearly have a self-support reserve.

So, what that does is it puts the burden on whoever wants that adjustment. You know, it's almost like -- if you look at Georgia, it's a deviation, you know, instead, but Arizona's isn't a deviation. It's just not in the worksheet.

I am going to stop there. I am sorry, Rachel. I probably jumped the gun. I should have let you talk.

MS. KING: I'm like Judge Sherman. I've missed the last two meetings because of trial conflicts. And I guess I don't necessarily deal within my practice as a private litigator with the self-support reserve from the standpoint of my clients earning a minimum wage. But what often happens is we have, you know, one parent who works primarily at home as a homemaker
and taking care of the children.
And my question is -- and you may
have already addressed it. If so, I apologize. But my question is: What do we do when we are now imputing income at minimum wage? Do we also provide that self-support? I mean, I don't understand how if you are imputing they also get that benefit. Does that makes sense? Does my question makes sense?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. I think the federal rule changes, what it does is it's highly encouraging. It states to use real income, actual income. So, they want to minimize income imputation. And, then, so, from there, though, they also want you to have states to have a self-support reserve. And just the way the math is happening, the Federal Poverty Level, which is what most states use for their self-support reserve and minimum wage, federal minimum wage, are very, very close together right now. The gap is -- it's less than \$200.

So, I don't -- I have never seen a state say that, if we impute income, we can't apply the self-support reserve. I'm not sure if that's what you are getting at.

MS. KING: Yeah. I mean, it seems counter-productive, though. I mean, what's the point of then imputing income I guess is my question. I guess my question stems more from my private practice representing parties where there is a higher income but perhaps one party is working at home and, so, is not actually receiving, you know, a direct income. But when we go in and we impute it for trial purposes, are we then also going to say that they get that adjustment?

DR. VENOHR: Well, would you impute at minimum wage, or would you be imputing at other --

MS. KING: Well, I think that if they have -- I mean, in my experience, if they have a history of work somewhat recently, then we would impute -- the Court
tends to impute what they were earning. But if they don't, if they have been a homemaker for quite some time or have never worked during the marriage, then you are looking at more of a minimum wage irrespective of what the other party may earn.

DR. VENOHR: Right. And I think the federal intent would -- would be that that's just a labor market issue. You know, let's say that you have that minimum wage of $\$ 1,257$ and the Federal Poverty Level for one person is $\$ 1,073$--

MS. KING: It's by that
imputation?
DR. VENOHR: Yeah. It's just -you know, if they were working that job, they would be.

MS. KING: But I don't think it's intended -- what I am saying is, to me it is not intended. Let's say the other spouse is earning over a $\$ 100,000$. For calculating child support, it's not -- it
seems like this provision is not intended to be used on that type of situation even though the spouse may not be earning any actual income; is that correct?

DR. VENOHR: I'm not sure I understood it. But, yeah, the self-support reserve, if somebody is making a \$100,000 a year, they have sufficient income. But I don't --

MS. KING: The spouse. And I am saying let's say for purposes of talking, the husband is earning roughly a $\$ 100,000$, the wife is a homemaker. If we are imputing minimum wage to her, are we also saying that this provision is intended to apply to her despite the fact that her spouse may be making a $\$ 100,000$ ?

DR. VENOHR: I'm not sure I understood it. But if you are doing equal treatment, which, you know, the goose/gander thing, then if you are imputing minimum wage, you are assuming that they have the capacity to make minimum 800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com
wage, and it wouldn't matter if they are the receiving or the paying party is the way I was thinking.

And this is a -- really is a policy decision. But that's what I heard you guys saying before. I mean, you might -- I have never seen -- I haven't seen a state that treats it differently just because the obligated parent has higher income imputed.

MS. KING: Okay.
DR. VENOHR: But you could, I suppose. I am just kind of racking my brain to think if I have ever seen that. You know, to me it's kind of a slippery slope. I am thinking spousal maintenance, you know, in that case.

MS. KING: Sure.
DR. VENOHR: I'm not sure I am answering your question. I guess I am just racking my brain to think if I have ever seen that.

MS. BALDWIN: This is Melody

Baldwin.
Rachel, I don't know which meetings you missed. But, you know, I think -- and somebody can correct me if I am wrong. But one of the primary reasons we were talking about putting the self-support reserve in the worksheet is because -- and it's probably going to be on the minimum wage cases for both parents or close to that for both parents is that the mother wasn't getting any credit for it, and her percentage might be the higher -there was just some concern that -- well, the custodial parent might be disadvantaged by not putting it in the worksheet versus just putting it in the schedule. I think that's why we even started looking at it. And then we started talking about one, two, three children after that.

MS. KING: Well, I think that kind of answers it because I think that that -if that's the intent, I guess that's where I was heading is, it doesn't seem like -800.397.5590/www.boggsreporters.com
you know, are we going to have a provision where it applies only if both parents are at minimum wage or if only one parent is.

MS. BALDWIN: Because if we put it in the schedule and not the worksheet, it can only apply to the noncustodial parent. That's where the whole -- that's where this whole thing hinged.

MS. KING: Okay.
MS. BALDWIN: I understand you.
MS. KING: Thank you.
MS. BALDWIN: Somebody can correct me if I am wrong.

MS. CAMPBELL: Hey, this is Angela Campbell.

MS. DAVIS: Go ahead, Angela.
MS. CAMPBELL: I actually practice with the worksheet. That's with -- that's how I found some of the typos. And it did not take me significantly longer to actually calculate and do it. And I think if we put enough instructions like this line minus this line, or whatever, actually
physically on the worksheet, it would make it easier for those who are actually calculating the Guidelines.

MS. DAVIS: I have another thought, and it may be -- I don't know if it's more complicated or not. But the self-support reserve calculation only comes into play if -- would not come to play at all if both parents' income is above X amount. So, I think there's a possibility that we could have two forms and use Form A if -- which would be the majority of the cases. Form A if both parties' income is above X amount. And then you use Form B if either party's income is less than $X$ amount.

So, you would still keep the very simple -- simpler form that we are accustomed to for the majority of the cases which would help the attorneys that are having to do their manual calculation and the judges indicate, because the majority of the cases would still be using the very
shorter, less complicated form.
But if you did have situations where one was the less than X amount, then they would use -- that would be the only time they would use the Form B. I don't know. That would at least take the aspect of the complication in the form out of the equation in terms of whether to use the dual self-support reserve test that we had wanted to earlier.

And I am going to pause here to see if anybody wants to comment, including Jane. Is that an easy doable thing to do, or is that more complicated in terms of --

DR. VENOHR: Oh, no. I like the idea. I think that's a good compromise. I mean, you know, you might get a third worksheet when you get your time-sharing adjustments. So, that's my only hesitancy.

But I actually love the idea of putting it in the worksheet. I think the Committee has come up with so many good reasons to do it. And I apologize.

You know, the only way the math could get a little bit simpler is if we do the childcare and the add-ons at the very end. I mean, do the -- if we move that section, we flip them, and then it would shorten it, but I'm not sure you want to go there.

So, we actually have four options now: One is the worksheet sort of like I have got it structured. Two work sheets like Penny suggested keeping it in the schedule. And the other option is just doing like Arizona and Georgia language and have nothing in the worksheet. And then a fourth option is to do it -- do the self-support reserve after the add-ons, and that would make the math simpler, and you could just have one worksheet.

MS. DAVIS: What is the
disadvantage to doing -- just doing the worksheets as they are and then doing the self-support reserve at the end if it's applicable from a con-standpoint?

DR. VENOHR: Then the add-ons, if we do it at the end like all the other states do, then the order amounts are going to be less because it considers the childcare expenses. You know, like if mom has got $\$ 200$ of childcare expenses and there are equal incomes, the way this proposed worksheet, the one that's in the memo, dad is going to have to pay that $\$ 100$ no matter what.

And in other states, if he is low income, he is not going to have to pay that \$100 for his share of the childcare. So, that's a disadvantage of doing the simplified, that Option 5.

And, then, if you have no adjustment at all, if you just put the language like Arizona or Georgia, those states that don't have it on their worksheet it never gets applied. I mean, it's sort of what Judge Sherman was saying that -- you know, implying that, you know, you really have to spell things out for
people to use them and make it really user friendly. I mean, I think that was his overarching message, you know, how important simplicity is.

MS. DAVIS: Well, Judge Sherman indicated he is about to have to leave. He has another meeting he has to go to. So, I want to give you an opportunity, Judge, to speak if you would like to before you have to leave.

HON. SHERMAN: I don't really have anything else to add. I do kind of like, Penny, your suggestion as a possibility. You would still have a simple form for the majority of cases where the SSR wouldn't apply.

And then we still allow it on the worksheet for all the beneficial reasons we have already identified for the cases and the families where it does apply. So, I kind of like that as a possibility.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge.
HON. SHERMAN: Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Would it be helpful to the Committee if we get Jane to do a mock of the current Alabama worksheet and then do another mock where the self-support reserve is calculated based only on -- and we will just use X dollars, whatever you want to put in there for the time being. I guess -- What amount would you use for the X dollars at the current economic structure?

DR. VENOHR: It depends on the percentages. So, I am going to say it's going to be somewhere between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

HON. SHERMAN: By monthly gross incomes?

DR. VENOHR: Probably individual. Both of them would have to have income above that.

HON. SHERMAN: Okay.
MS. DAVIS: By percentages, you are talking about whether we use the -- you are talking about the 80\% --

DR. VENOHR: (Nodding in the affirmative).

MS. DAVIS: -- if we go with $80 \%$, say? And that's -- we haven't made that decision. But if we went with 80\% or $85 \%$-- or $80 \%$ for one child, is that the percentage you are talking about there?

DR. VENOHR: Yeah. Yeah. That would affect it. And, you know, I mean, it's always -- to be honest, for one child, it's probably going to be closer to maybe $\$ 1,800$ a month. But to consider six children, you know, because that self-support reserve would be effective at a very, very -- at a higher income. You know, that's where it would be closer to $\$ 3,000$.

So, we could say something like -this just gets more complicated. If both parties' incomes are less than \$1,600 and there's one child, use worksheet $B$, or else we could just say if -- and then if their incomes are six children and each income is
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above or below \$2,600 -- and I am just pulling out where I think the numbers might land -- use worksheet B. Or you could just come up with a general rule that says, if the parties' incomes -- each party's income is below $\$ 2,600$, use worksheet B. But chances are that because of that one child amount, remember I was showing you that the one-child amount that self-support reserve doesn't affect the amount. You know, you probably could get by with only calculating the worksheet $B$ and for less than $\$ 1,600$. I'm not sure if that makes sense. It's a little nuance just to help you simplify it.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. So, you could do something like -- you could say if both parties' income is greater than X amount, use -- or less, either way, you say X amount being one particular amount or you could do it based on the number of children that are being calculated. And it would still be -- you just look and see if it's
two children, it might be -- I'll make it up. If it's one child, it's \$1,600. If it's two children, it's $\$ 1,800$. If it's three children -- I am making up numbers obviously -- \$2,000, whatever.

DR. VENOHR: You're in the ballpark. You're definitely in the ballpark with the incomes you are talking about.

MS. DAVIS: So, it would be fairly simple just to have that up there even if you wanted -- instead of just using a flat amount if you did it per child, that would still be simple. It would be one little box you decide, you know, whether you had the number of children. So, still fairly simple to do that.

I think I would kind of like to see that, and then maybe the next time we will have a quorum so we can kind of vote on that issue and then go forward.

DR. VENOHR: I think -- go ahead.
MS. CAMPBELL: I am sorry. This
is Angela Campbell again.
And I may be -- the numbers maybe just rolling in my head, and I am not getting it right.

But if we -- I think it was Stephanie that said that if we just do one percentage instead of the graduated percentages, that would also simplify the worksheet, correct?

DR. VENOHR: Yes.
MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.
HON. SHERMAN: That was one of the areas, when I was looking at it, that I was, like, here's a spot people are going to make a mistake when they are filling out the form.

MS. CAMPBELL: This is Angela
again. I think that's the way we need to go, then, instead of the graduated percentages. Let's just settle on a percentage that we think is reasonable and that will work mathematically and then go with it.

MS. COX: This is Amanda Cox. I wonder if we even need the percentages. It didn't look like it was making that much of a difference in the examples. But that's just a thought too. That could take out a whole -- whole lot of calculation.

MS. DAVIS: Well, Alabama's -- you said the vast majority of the data that you received was calculated based on one child. Is that true of other states, as well, or just the data that you received which was the IV-D data?

DR. VENOHR: I think in Alabama we saw a higher proportion of one-child orders than other states, but it's definitely the majority in Social Security IV-D -- Title IV-D cases. And non-IV-D cases are a little bit less, but it's still -- I would say it's one or two children in -- in non-IV-D cases with one child just having a slightly -- slight edge.

MS. DAVIS: So, in our calculation, if we are going to come up
with a figure, then we would consider it's going to be a household that's probably going to have no more than two children at most, the majority of the cases?

DR. VENOHR: Right. Right.
MS. DAVIS: Both IV-D and private cases, correct?

DR. VENOHR: Right. I would say we are pretty safe assuming that less than 7\%, maybe 9\%, of Alabama cases, IV-D and non-IV-D are three or more children.

MS. DAVIS: Okay.
DR. VENOHR: You know, regarding Amanda's comment on taking all of it, a lot of states do that. They don't have that percentage to account for payroll taxes. I mean, it's a sensitive thing. I mean, it's a nice thing to do, but you don't have to. Nebraska doesn't. Nebraska doesn't even put it in their worksheet, but it never gets applied either.

You know, one other thing, I can correct that worksheet for the next time,
but I really can't finalize it until you come up with a percentage. So -- but I can't come up with that income threshold.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I am going to suggest that you use 80\% because that's somewhere -- that gives people credit for their taxes, just as an example.

Does anybody have another suggestion they think would be a better percentage to use just for an example for us to look at?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Jane, could you base it on 80\%? Maybe do one with 80\% and one with a 100\%.

DR. VENOHR: (Nodding in the affirmative).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Any other considerations that we would like for Jane to look at the next time as far as the worksheets are concerned?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Any other
questions regarding what we have discussed in general so far, or comments?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Dr. Venohr, did you have something else you wanted to discuss with us?

DR. VENOHR: I think the only thing, Penny, is we had on the agenda to talk about the schedule. I am not sure if you want to do that or wait.

MS. DAVIS: Well, we don't have a whole lot of time. I just put that on the agenda so that we would be alerted to -the public would be alerted to the fact that we might speak beyond the May 13th memo .

Does anyone have any other questions or comments regarding just the overall approach to the Child Support Guidelines? I know there's some thought that we may want to address the joint custody cases because there is an increase in that. And I guess the question that I
would have to you, Dr. Venohr, is, do we need to address that in any way now while we are looking at adjusting the child support amount, the calculations relating to the amount per child with the age categories, the economic aspect of it?

DR. VENOHR: No. Most states make the adjustment in the worksheet. They don't make it in the schedule. In fact, one of the few lingering states that made it in the schedule, Pennsylvania pulled it out, and they think it's going to be finalized. They just posted it up for a public comment earlier in this year. But I think it will be finalized later this year.

And the reason they pulled it out was they assumed 30\% time-sharing. And that's just -- it's so highly variable from case to case. I mean, $20 \%$ of the cases are interstate cases. So, there's no way that obligated parent has $30 \%$ of the time with the child.

So, I would highly recommend
against putting it in the schedule. I mean, but what it means is it makes that worksheet more complicated, and it is not uncommon. If you look at South Carolina, I think they have three worksheets.

So, you know, right now you are talking about a worksheet for sole custody with those no self-support reserve, and then the self-support reserve adjusted one, and then possibly a third one for shared parenting. But I would recommend not -- I think the math is cleaner if you let a state -- a party that gets the adjustment for shared parenting or the self-support reserve, not one on top of the other.

So, in short, what I am saying is, even though you're talking about different worksheets for the self-support reserve and then possibly a shared parenting adjustment down the road, at maximum, it would be three worksheets, not four.

MS. DAVIS: So, if you do a shared reserve calculation, you would not have the
self-support reserve; is that what you are saying?

DR. VENOHR: Right. If there's a shared custody adjustment or -- you know, it's such -- what term to use. Parenting time adjustment.

MS. DAVIS: Right.
DR. VENOHR: That you get the parent -- you can't have a self-support reserve adjustment on top of that.

MS. DAVIS: So, you could have -and I am trying to think in terms of what we would do with regard to the two -trying to have two forms relating to the self-support reserve.

So, you could have the -- we'll call it the primary form, Form A, would -if we decide to do a shared custody type calculation, you could do that on the Form A as an -- that would be -- you would figure out all your current calculations, and then you would stop there. But if it wound up being a joint custody type shared
arrangement, then you would go on to the next calculation, or would you suggest just having a total different form? Isn't it based on percentages usually or days of the --

DR. VENOHR: It depends on what formula you use. Most states -- the most popular formula is cross-credit or an offset which essentially means you -- and that requires two forms. And that's you calculate an order -- a theoretical order for one parent. You calculate a theoretical order for the other parent. You weigh each by the time with the child has with the other parent, and then you look at the difference. And the parent owing the larger of the theoretical order is the payer. That requires another form. That's the most common method. It's used maybe in -- oh, it's changed, but used in maybe 25, 28 states.

If you use a simple percentage -and the states I would recommend looking at
are Iowa -- they only have about three or four time ranges. I like Missouri the best. Then you can put it on one form. And Arizona has a percentage range too. Then you can get it all on one form.

Oregon has a percentage, but it's a two-page table where the intervals for the number of overnights are something like three overnights. So, it's like zero to three overnights, and then four to seven overnights. So -- and their worksheet is so complicated, it's like four pages.

So, I would highly recommend Missouri. I would recommend looking at Missouri, and I would recommend looking at South Carolina. Missouri for a percentage. I like the way they do it. I think it's very clean. South Carolina's is very clean if you are going to have a separate worksheet.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I think you have answered my question. So, at this juncture if -- we will do the two forms
based on whether it's a self-support reserve is in play. And then, if we decide later to deal with the shared parenting, then we would have a third form. And then -- so the initial question that the parties would have to decide if we go this format to try to keep it as streamlined as possible, they would have to make the initial determination of whether to use Form A, B or C. And then once they have made that determination, then they would use that calculation.

So, Form A would be the one we have now with no self-support reserve because of the person's income level is above that amount. Form B, for example, the one you will be working on now, would be where you have your traditional obligor/obligee relationship, and you have self-support that does apply.

And then the third form, if we do decide to take up that later, would be -you would have no self-support reserve
circumstances, but you would have the shared custody arrangement.

And so, depending on what the child custody arrangement was and the economics of the parties, you would select either Form A, B or C; is that correct?

DR. VENOHR: (Nodding in the affirmative).

MS. DAVIS: Okay. All right. Anybody have any questions? Any other questions?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: All right. Well, that's very helpful information. Thank you, Jane. You do a great job of explaining things.

All right. At this point, I think we will turn to the public. Let me ask this: Does anybody else on the Committee have any other comments or questions before we do turn to the public comment?
(No response).
MS. DAVIS: Okay. At this time,

Bob, if you would read the list of the public members, and we will see if anyone now would like to speak.

MR. MADDOX: Yes, ma'am. Cliff
Smith, would you like to speak at this time?

MR. SMITH: No, I would not.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Lisa
Clark, would you like to speak?
MS. CLARK: No, sir.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Lee Wood, would you like to speak?

MS. WOOD: No thank you.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Ms. Wright, Tina Wright, would you like to speak?

MS. WRIGHT: No thanks.
MR. MADDOX: Thank you. That's all I had, Penny.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Bob.
I think we had Tiffany Gates was -- had not --

MR. MADDOX: Correct.
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MS. DAVIS: -- indicated she was here before. And I don't think Judge Fridy was able to join us.

So, Stephanie, we never did have a quorum, did we, to vote on anything?

MS. BLACKBURN: No. No quorum.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you. All right. Well, no quorum, so we can't vote on things. But I think we have advanced the ball down the field a little bit with Jane's help.

So, we will meet next week -- I mean, next month. Bob, do you have that date handy?

MR. MADDOX: I am sorry. Friday, June 11, 10:00 o'clock to 12:30. I believe I have got enough responses. Hopefully we will have a quorum at that meeting.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. That's great.
MR. MADDOX: I think we have scheduled Thursday, August 12, as well, if you-all want to put that on your calendar. That is not really set in stone. I haven't
gotten a lot of responses on that one. So, that's still up in the air. But if you want to go ahead and pencil it in, Thursday, August 12, 10:00 o'clock.

Also, again, I apologize to Katie and Rachel for that mixup earlier.

MS. DAVIS: Didn't we also pick September the 2nd?

MR. MADDOX: I don't have that on my list.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. I guess that's my list. My thoughts. Okay. No, that's a different one. I am sorry. I was looking at the wrong committee. I am on so many committees it seems like.

All right. Thank you. My apologies to the group. You would have been joining us on an adoption committee meeting, which you are welcome to do that if you are interested in that also.

All right. Thank you each one of you for your time. And I appreciate the public, particularly, for joining us.

Again, even though you didn't choose to speak today, if you have any comments that you would like to express to the Committee members, as you think about this, then feel free to write them down and submit them to the Committee, and we will disperse those to the Committee members.

All right. Thank you-all for participating. Bob, thank you so much for your wonderful efforts on the Zoom.

MR. MADDOX: No problem. I am getting better at it, I hope.

MS. DAVIS: You are. Thank you.
PROFESSOR GRAY: Good job, Bob.
MS. DAVIS: We are adjourned then. Thank you.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Have a good weekend.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Bye-bye.
(Conclusion of Advisory
Committee Meeting at 11:58
A.M.)
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| 14/16 35/15 71/10 | 9/3 9/18 11/19 12/2 | 88/21 89/3 90/16 |
| 73/7 87/11 87/23 | 12/7 13/5 34/21 | 91/10 93/7 93/22 |
| 88/15 88/20 92/12 | 105/6 | 94/6 94/12 95/4 |
| MR. MADDOX: | MS. BUSH: [1] | 95/13 95/18 95/23 |
| [61] 3/23 5/6 5/12 | 7/2 | 96/4 96/11 98/22 |
| 5/15 5/18 5/23 6/3 | MS. CAMPBELL: | 99/7 99/11 101/21 |
| 6/6 6/9 6/12 6/15 | [9] 6/14 15/13 70/4 | 103/9 103/13 |
| 6/18 6/20 6/22 7/3 | 71/6 82/14 82/17 | 103/23 104/20 |
| 7/6 7/8 7/13 7/17 | 91/23 92/11 92/17 | 105/1 105/7 105/19 |
| 8/1 8/4 8/6 8/9 8/12 | MS. CLARK: [3] | 106/7 106/11 |


|  | \$1,400 [2] 23/23 | \$226 [1] 54/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MS. DAVIS:... [3] | 24/2 | \$227 [1] 55/7 |
| 107/13 107/15 | \$1,600 [3] 89/20 | \$230 [3] 52/14 |
| 107/19 | 90/12 91/2 | 55/21 55/22 |
| MS. KING: [14] | \$1,647 [2] 63/15 | \$235 [1] 62/17 |
| 8/15 39/22 74/7 | 63/23 | \$245 [2] 63/16 |
| 75/15 77/5 77/20 | \$1,800 [2] 89/12 | 63/23 |
| 78/14 78/19 79/10 | 91/3 | \$246 [1] 62/13 |
| 80/11 80/18 81/20 | \$1,907 [1] 47/9 | \$247 [1] 54/22 |
| 82/9 82/11 | \$10,000 [1] 30/17 | \$250 [2] 27/19 |
| MS. | \$100 [2] 86/9 86/13 | 55/23 |
| STEINWINDER: | \$100,000 [4] 78/22 | \$259 [1] 56/6 |
| [4] 7/10 7/15 7/19 | 79/7 79/12 79/17 | \$276 [1] 19/21 |
| 14/19 | \$11 [2] 60/15 64/23 | \$299 [1] 64/18 |
| MS. WOOD: [3] | \$12 [2] 60/15 65/16 | \$3,000 [9] 20/9 |
| 10/19 10/22 104/13 | \$125 [1] 26/22 | 20/13 20/15 23/5 |
| MS. WRIGHT: [5] | \$133 [2] 29/5 29/16 | 23/20 24/4 28/3 |
| 11/2 11/7 11/12 | \$15 [2] 60/18 65/18 | 88/14 89/17 |
| 20/23 104/17 | \$15,000 [2] 30/19 | \$3,600 [1] 23/7 |
| PROFESSOR | 30/23 | \$300 [1] 27/23 |
| GRAY: [2] 8/8 | \$159 [1] 61/23 | \$312 [1] 64/18 |
| 107/14 | \$19 [1] 58/2 | \$344 [3] 48/3 52/8 |
| THE COURT | \$2,000 [6] 23/4 | 52/10 |
| REPORTER: [1] | 23/10 23/12 23/20 | \$346 [1] 48/4 |
| 4/11 | 88/13 91/5 | \$400 [3] 64/1 64/4 |
|  | \$2,600 [2] 90/1 90/6 | 64/9 |
| \$ | \$20 [4] 55/5 55/23 | \$419 [1] 62/16 |
| \$1,073 [2] 61/21 | 56/12 58/2 | \$50 [4] 29/17 51/1 |
| 78/13 | \$200 [4] 39/1 62/1 | 51/1 51/2 |
| \$1,257 [4] 19/17 | 76/23 86/6 | \$667 [1] 28/8 |
| 61/20 66/1 78/12 | \$207 [2] 52/12 55/4 | \$695 [1] 52/8 |
| \$1,337 [1] 28/9 | \$221 [1] 62/13 | \$7.25 [5] 60/7 62/22 |


| \$ | 57/18 58/1 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$7.25... [3] 65/22 | 15 $58 / 1$ | 30 [2] 97/17 97/21 |
| 66/9 67/21 | 58/1 | 30th [1] 12/9 |
| \$83 [3] 27/9 29/12 | 16 [4] 54/9 54/23 | 33 [1] 66/5 |
| 29/16 | 55/4 55/4 | 36104 [1] 3/8 |
| \$9.50 [6] 47/11 | $18 \text { [1] 20/8 }$ | 4 |
| 60/10 60/15 63/6 |  |  |
| 66/13 66/14 | $20 / 17$ | 37/6 37/11 48/5 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \$ 981[7] ~ 19 / 19 \\ 21 / 14 ~ 48 / 23 ~ 61 / 23 \end{array}$ | 19th [1] 12/22 | 5 |
| 65/8 68/12 68/23 | 2 | 50 [2] 37/6 67/13 |
| 1 | 20 [3] 44/5 69/9 | 6 |
| 10 [5] 38/21 39/9 | 97/19 6006 | 60 [1] 48/4 |
| 51/3 52/15 69/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 2006[1] 60 / 8 \\ & 2021[13] 1 / 41 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 65 [3] 22/12 61/15 |
| 100 [2] 49/21 95/15 | 2021 [13] 1/4 1/20 <br> 12/18 23/2 23/23 | 66/6 |
| 107 [1] 108/12 | 12/18 24/5 24/14 26/19 | 7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 00[4] \quad 1 / 5 \quad 1 / 20 \\ & 105 / 16 \text { 106/4 } \end{aligned}$ | 24/5 24/14 26/19 | 70 [4] 21/21 22/13 |
| 11 [6] 53/19 53/23 | 108/12 109/5 | 61/12 61/16 |
| 57/1 57/17 58/6 | 2022 [1] 109/11 | 73 [2] 13/19 13/19 |
| 105/16 | 2025 [1] 60/18 | 75 [8] 20/3 21/17 |
| 11:58 [1] 107/22 | 21 [3] 1/4 1/20 | 21/22 22/13 49/19 |
| 12 [6] 53/19 53/20 | 109/10 | 61/9 61/13 61/17 |
| 54/1 57/17 105/21 | 21st [2] 12/19 | 7th [1] 109/4 |
| 106/4 | 108/12 | 8 |
| 12:30 [1] 105/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 22[2] ~ \\ & 23[13 / 19 \\ & 23 / 4 \\ & 14 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 8/9/2022 [1] 109/11 |
| 13 [7] 12/21 16/13 | $\begin{aligned} & 23[1] \\ & 25[3] \\ & 27 / 22 \\ & 27 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | 80 [16] 21/6 21/16 |
| 20/8 20/17 53/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 25[3] 27 / 2228 / 1 \\ & 100 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | 21/18 21/23 21/23 |
| 57/16 66/2 | $\text { 27th [1] } 12 / 18$ | 44/4 61/6 61/10 |
| 13th [2] 17/2 96/15 | $28 \text { [1] 100/21 }$ | 61/14 88/23 89/3 |
| 14 [4] 41/20 53/5 | 2nd [1] 106/8 | 89/5 89/6 95/5 |


| 8 | 98/17 101/1 107/4 | add-ons [6] 46/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80... [2] 95/14 95/14 | above [8] 28/3 | 47/22 57/1 85/3 |
| $85[6]$ 21/16 21/19 | 48/16 70/10 83/9 | 85/16 86/1 |
| 22/6 61/7 61/11 | 83/14 88/19 90/1 | adding [1] 72/17 |
|  | 102/16 | additional [8] 39 |
| 9 | accommodate [4] | 5/1 |
| 9/30/21 [1] 109/10 | 68/6 | 58/2 |
| A | account [1] 94/16 | address [5] 29/18 |
| A.M [3] | ACCR [2] 109/2 | 35/17 45/10 96/21 |
| 107/23 | accurate [1] 39/22 | addressed [2] |
| ability [1] 44/17 <br> able [2] $6 / 23105 / 3$ | accustomed [1] | 76/3 |
| able [2] 6/23 105/3 about [59] 16/12 | 83/19 <br> achieves [1] 58 | addresses [1] 17/15 <br> addressing [4] 35/8 |
| 17/14 19/1 19/4 | Act [3] 22/22 22/22 | 35/13 35/18 41/8 |
| 20/7 22/9 22/20 | A3/2 | adjourned [1] |
| 24/9 24/11 26/10 | actual [2] 76/14 | 107/15 |
| /22 27/21 28/16 | 79/4 | Adjunct [1] 2/6 |
| 29/23 32/3 34/21 | actually [18] 17/23 | adjust [1] 61/22 |
| 38/10 41/12 42/7 | 20/4 20/11 30/22 | adjusted [4] 19/1 |
| 42/10 44/1 44/2 | 33/12 36/11 38/2 | 19/20 54/9 98/9 |
| 44/5 44/8 44/23 | 52/1 52/5 52/2 | adjusting [1] 97/3 |
| 45/3 46/17 47/21 | 67/6 77/12 82/17 | adjustment [22] |
| 48/21 55/9 56/11 | 82/21 82/23 83/2 | 16/3 17/18 17/19 |
| 56/13 59/2 60/8 62/1 64/1 64/4 66/5 | 84/20 85/8 | 8/5 44/18 46/2 |
| 62/1 64/1 64/4 66/5 68/18 68/19 70/7 | add [13] 46/19 | 46/13 49/9 54/18 |
| 68/18 68/19 70/7 | 47/22 51/1 53/19 | 54/20 60/2 74/23 |
| 71/18 72/4 72/6 | 53/19 53/23 57/1 | 75/1 75/7 77/16 |
| 72/16 72/23 73/3 | 58/1 73/8 85/3 | 86/17 97/8 98/13 |
| 81/6 81/18 87/6 | 85/16 86/1 87/12 | 98/19 99/4 99/6 |
| 88/22 88/23 89/7 | add-on [1] 58/1 | 99/10 |


| A | 52/13 | 3/10 3/11 3/13 3/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| adjustments [1] | after [12] 13/18 | 3/16 3/16 9/15 |
| 84/19 | 30/4 32/22 33/4 | 19/20 28/19 36/15 |
| Administrative [2] | 33/8 43/5 43/9 | 37/18 46/17 61/22 |
| 3/16 12/17 | 46/15 62/3 62/4 | 88/3 93/13 94/10 |
| adopt [1] 46/9 | 81/19 85/16 | 108/2 108/5 108/8 |
| adoption [1] 106/18 | after-tax [5] 32/22 | 109/1 |
| adult [3] 27/2 27/3 | 33/8 43/5 43/9 62/3 | Alabama's [1] 93/7 |
| 30/10 | again [20] 4/8 4/16 | ALECS [3] 29/2 |
| adults [1] 26/21 | 11/10 19/1 26/11 | 38/17 41/22 |
| advance [3] 23/22 | 27/10 28/3 31/13 | alerted [2] 96/13 |
| 24/1 24/15 | 43/23 53/10 55/18 | 96/14 |
| advanced [13] | 64/16 65/10 66/7 | all [45] 3/23 4/3 |
| 24/11 24/13 24/15 | 66/16 67/21 92/1 | 11/14 11/15 13/10 |
| 24/20 25/9 26/23 | 92/18 106/5 107/1 | 14/11 15/4 15/15 |
| 26/23 29/14 30/1 | against [2] 26/5 | 15/23 16/18 18/18 |
| 30/2 43/17 63/21 | 98/1 | 21/13 26/17 35/1 |
| 105/9 | age [2] 29/2 97/5 | 35/8 37/11 41/2 |
| advancing [1] | agenda [2] 96/8 | 42/3 45/15 46/12 |
| 33/14 | 96/13 | 49/3 51/7 58/18 |
| ADVISORY [4] | agree [2] 50/6 | 65/4 66/22 71/6 |
| 1/1 1/15 107/21 | 72/21 | 72/6 83/9 86/2 |
| 108/9 | ahead [9] 40/9 | 86/17 87/18 94/14 |
| affect [3] 71/5 89/9 | 49/17 55/1 56/22 | 99/21 101/5 103/9 |
| 90/10 | 74/8 74/9 82/16 | 103/13 103/17 |
| affected [6] 33/12 | 91/22 106/3 | 104/19 105/7 |
| 37/5 38/14 42/7 | air [1] 106/2 | 105/22 106/16 |
| 42/9 63/9 | ALABAMA [37] | 106/21 107/8 107/8 |
| affects [1] 28/5 | 1/3 1/18 1/19 2/7 | 108/21 |
| affirmative [3] 89/2 | 2/7 2/10 2/12 2/12 | allow [2] 71/22 |
| 95/17 103/8 | 2/15 2/17 $2 / 18$ 2/20 | 87/17 |
| afford [2] 52/9 | 2/22 3/3 3/3 3/5 3/8 | allowance [1] 27/13 |


| A | 45/11 46/22 49/23 | 64/17 64/22 65/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| allowed [2] 12/19 | 50/7 50/16 | 66/23 69/11 83/ |
| 31/20 | 53/14 54/3 54/5 | 83/14 83/16 84/3 |
| allows [1] 58/7 | 54/23 55/18 56/10 | 88/8 90/8 90/9 |
| almost [1] 75/8 | 59/7 64/2 64/4 66/3 | 90/10 90/18 90/20 |
| already [8] 29/23 | 68/4 68/16 69/18 | 90/20 91/13 97/4 |
| 31/12 40/5 40/5 | 71/12 71/18 73/2 | 97/5 102/16 |
| 51/16 74/14 76/3 | 73/10 74/3 74/8 | amounts [3] 20/14 |
| 87/19 | 75/12 75/12 78/20 | 48/2 86/3 |
| also [18] 9/15 12/4 | 79/10 80/13 80/16 | ANGELA [21] 2/ |
| 12/21 17/15 25/20 | 80/19 80/20 81/5 | 6/12 15/13 15/17 |
| 29/10 38/2 45/22 | 82/13 84/11 88/12 | 17/7 18/12 48/1 |
| 72/21 76/6 76/8 | 90/1 91/4 91/23 | 49/5 52/19 52/21 |
| 76/16 77/15 79/14 | 92/3 95/4 96/9 | 53/2 53/10 54/22 |
| 92/8 106/5 106/7 | 98/16 99/12 105/15 | 55/16 57/12 70/5 |
| 106/20 | 106/13 106/14 | 72/4 82/14 82/16 |
| always [4] 22/9 | 107/11 108/16 | 92/1 92/17 |
| 51/2 53/8 89/10 | 108/18 108/20 | Angela's [1] 47/3 |
| am [96] 5/22 6/14 | 108/23 | Annie [1] 16/16 |
| 7/2 7/14 7/16 7/20 | AMANDA [4] 2/11 | another [12] 9/21 |
| 8/8 8/17 9/3 9/6 | 6/10 72/20 93/1 | 25/18 25/19 55/8 |
| 10/13 10/19 11/2 | Amanda's [1] | 55/16 59/14 59/22 |
| 11/2 15/14 16/11 | 94/14 | 83/4 87/7 88/4 95/8 |
| 18/5 18/10 19/2 | American [1] 22/22 | 100/18 |
| 19/8 22/8 22/22 | among [2] 41/13 66/4 | answer [1] 72/3 answered [1] |
| 26/8 26/11 26/14  <br> $30 / 4$ $31 / 1$ <br> $1 / 13$  | amount [36] 17/22 | $101 / 22$ |
| $30 / 431 / 1 ~ 31 / 13$ $31 / 1432 / 7$ $32 / 19$ | 21/15 23/5 24/1 | answering [1] |
| 32/21 32/23 33/2 | 24/10 25/23 36/21 | 80/20 |
| 33/17 33/17 35/21 | 45/1 45/17 48/6 | answers [1] 81/21 |
| 37/7 38/20 39/9 | 55/10 58/18 61/6 | any [30] 13/1 13/6 |
| 40/2 40/14 42/16 | 62/7 62/7 62/15 | 13/10 13/15 13/23 |


| A | applicable [1] | are [130] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| any... [25] 14/8 | 85/23 | areas [1] 92/13 |
| 23/18 35/12 36/3 | applied [2] 86/20 | Arizona [7] 37/20 |
| 40/22 56/19 59/1 | 94/21 | 46/10 74/20 74/21 |
| 59/17 62/5 62/18 | applies [3] 48/21 | 85/13 86/18 101/4 |
| 65/3 70/2 74/2 74/2 | 50/11 82/2 | Arizona's [1] 75/10 |
| 79/3 81/11 95/18 | apply [8] 36/9 | Arnold [2] 8/10 |
| 95/23 96/17 97/2 | 66/23 77/3 79/16 | 8/12 |
| 103/10 103/10 | 82/6 87/16 87/20 | around [3] 46/7 |
| 103/20 107/2 | 102/20 | 51/19 56/12 |
| 108/17 | applying [1] 45/4 | arrangement [4] |
| anybody [8] 42/17 | appreciate [8] 4/15 | 58/13 100/1 103/2 |
| 48/10 56/19 57/6 | 12/4 12/11 13/11 | 103/4 |
| 84/12 95/8 103/10 | 15/4 17/11 18/11 | article [1] 24/11 |
| 103/19 | 106/22 | as [56] 7/12 9/16 |
| anyone [13] 13/16 | approach [2] 69/13 | 9/22 12/13 14/6 |
| 13/23 15/17 35/7 | 96/19 | 15/16 16/3 16/3 |
| 35/10 40/7 40/13 | approaching [1] | 18/12 18/18 22/2 |
| 40/15 40/22 69/22 | 33/18 | 22/21 24/14 25/5 |
| 70/1 96/17 104/2 | appropriate [4] | 25/14 26/19 27/5 |
| anything [5] 35/3 | 11/23 19/5 48/15 | 33/18 35/19 38/20 |
| 39/11 75/4 87/12 | 59/5 | 40/8 43/7 43/13 |
| 105/5 | approval [1] 15/14 | 43/21 43/21 44/18 |
| anyway [2] 19/6 | approve [2] 13/13 | 45/8 47/11 57/15 |
| $31 / 6$ | 14/12 | 64/12 65/3 66/23 |
| apologies [1] | approximates [1] | 67/15 67/15 70/10 |
| 106/17 | 47/12 | 72/10 72/10 72/11 |
| apologize [3] 76/4 | April [5] 12/18 | 72/11 74/2 75/18 |
| 84/23 106/5 | 24/18 24/22 27/5 | 75/23 85/21 87/13 |
| Appeals [2] 2/12 | 70/21 | 87/21 93/10 95/7 |
| 9/16 | April 27th [1] | 95/20 95/20 99/20 |
| APPEARANCES | 12/18 | 102/7 102/7 105/21 |
| [3] 1/22 3/6 3/18 |  |  |


| A | average [6] 27/8 | be [125] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| as... [3] 107/4 109/1 | 29/2 29/12 33/11 | beautiful [1] 48/20 |
| 109/2 | 36/17 36/18 | because [52] 20/13 |
| ask [7] 11/10 27/12 | away [2] 29/13 73/1 | 22/5 22/18 23/13 |
| 34/18 40/14 42/18 | awhile [1] 60/6 | 24/19 25/8 26/16 |
| 69/19 103/18 | B | 29/13 29/20 33/9 |
| asked [1] 44/8 | B.4a [5] 21/15 61/6 | 40/3 41/6 44/5 |
| aspect [2] 84/6 97/6 | 62/11 62/17 64/14 | $45 / 2346 / 1147 / 3$ |
| assist [1] 4/16 <br> Associate [2] 3/2 | B.4b [4] 21/17 61/9 | 50/12 53/3 54/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Associate [2] 3/2 } \\ & \mathbf{3 / 1 3} \end{aligned}$ | 62/18 64/14 | 55/10 56/8 56/16 |
| assume [3] 29/1 | B.4c [3] 21/21 | 57/3 58/12 59/14 |
| 34/18 67/4 | B.4d [3] 22/11 | 61/18 62/3 63/1 |
| assumed [1] 97/17 | 61/15 64/15 | 63/10 63/11 65/4 |
| assuming [5] 47/9 | back [7] 11/10 39/2 | 65/11 68/21 69/15 |
| 60/1 63/17 79/22 | 49/2 56/14 61/2 | 71/14 72/2 73/15 |
| 94/9 | 69/21 74/12 | 75/16 80/9 81/8 |
| attorney [10] 2/11 | background [2] | 81/21 82/4 83/22 |
| 2/17 2/19 3/5 3/10 | 16/14 16/18 | 86/4 89/13 90/7 |
| 3/12 3/15 18/6 | BALDWIN [4] | 95/5 96/22 102/15 |
| 39/16 108/17 | 2/21 8/4 14/2 81/1 | become [1] 36/1 |
| Attorney's [1] 2/21 | ball [1] 105/10 | becomes [1] 38/6 been [6] 24/20 |
| attorneys [1] 83/20 | ballpark [2] 91/7 | $25 / 1360 / 660 / 8$ |
| Aubrey [1] 6/1 August [2] 105 | 91/8 | 78/2 106/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { August [2] } 10 \\ & 106 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | base [1] 95/14 | before [15] 1/16 |
| August 1 | based [7] 29/2 | 22/15 24/20 27/18 |
| 105/21 106/4 | 60/20 88/5 90/21 | 29/9 30/14 42/18 |
| authorization [2] | 93/9 100/4 102/1 | 53/13 53/18 56/16 |
| authorization 12/5 12/8 | basic [5] 44/13 <br> 47/18 49/14 50/10 | 80/6 87/9 103/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { available [4] 28/23 } \\ & \mathbf{3 4 / 9} 64 / 264 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | 51/6 <br> basis [1] 33/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105/2 108/8 } \\ & \text { beginning [1] 29/6 } \end{aligned}$ |

being [10] 24/13
29/14 29/23 30/1
33/12 63/21 88/7 90/20 90/22 99/23 believe [4] 9/11 9/12 9/14 105/16 below [7] 19/10 30/16 30/19 71/1 90/1 90/6 109/3 bench [1] 39/21 beneficial [1] 87/18 benefit [1] 76/9 best [2] 47/1 101/3 Betson [2] 64/19 65/11
Betson-Rothbarth [2] 64/19 65/11
better [5] 39/4 47/5 50/19 95/9 107/12 between [4] 20/17 33/10 60/15 88/13 beyond [1] 96/15 big [1] 38/2 bigger [3] 22/12 38/17 66/8 bill [1] 60/11 Birmingham [1] 3/5
bit [23] 24/23 26/10 27/6 31/3 33/5 43/15 44/8 46/5

50/5 51/14 53/4
56/8 57/11 58/20
58/21 62/14 64/20
65/9 65/12 69/6
85/2 93/18 105/10
BLACKBURN [2]
3/9 9/2
blank [1] 50/2
blind [1] 69/4
blind-sided [1] 69/4 bringing [1] 59/16
Board [1] 109/1
BOB [21] 3/15 5/4
7/12 8/8 11/16
12/11 12/23 13/22
14/21 16/20 24/11
31/5 35/5 47/2
56/14 69/20 104/1
104/20 105/13
107/9 107/14
Boggs [6] 1/17 3/7
3/8 4/8 108/4 109/9
both [17] 31/8
39/21 45/4 48/21
54/16 63/10 65/6
67/9 81/9 81/10
82/2 83/9 83/13
88/18 89/19 90/17
94/6
bottom [2] 41/11
56/6
box [2] 63/13 91/15
bracket [1] 28/2
brackets [1] 43/15
Brady [2] 35/6
69/21
brain [2] 80/14 80/21
break [1] 26/14 breaks [1] 16/22
BRIAN [2] 3/1 8/7
brief [1] 21/11
broader [1] 36/20
broken [1] 25/6
brought [3] 22/18
70/15 70/16
brown [2] 30/12
30/16
bullet [1] 18/2
bullets [1] 17/4
bunch [3] 35/6 69/5
69/21
burden [1] 75/7
Burks [1] 6/7
BUSH [3] 2/16 6/20
6/22
buy [1] 25/5
bye [2] 107/19
107/19
Bye-bye [1] 107/19
C
calculate [4] 71/4
82/21 100/11
100/12

| C | 41/16 42/13 45/7 | cases [35] 31/8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| calculated [4] | 46/9 46/21 47/11 | 36/17 36/21 37/6 |
| 43/19 88/5 90/22 | 48/3 48/14 48/22 | 37/14 38/18 38/2 |
| 93/9 | 48/23 51/8 51/12 | 39/4 42/7 42/8 58/5 |
| calculating [6] 43/5 | 52/8 52/9 54/7 | 65/21 66/5 66/6 |
| 71/3 73/13 78/23 | 54/20 56/5 57/7 | 66/17 67/13 67/14 |
| 83/3 90/11 | 59/13 61/19 62/10 | 67/17 67/19 73/11 |
| calculation [16] | 65/4 65/15 66/7 | 81/9 83/13 83/19 |
| 25/11 25/18 28/17 | 66/22 69/11 73/8 | 83/23 87/15 87/19 |
| 39/3 39/11 58/10 | 74/19 81/4 82/6 | 93/17 93/17 93/20 |
| 70/17 70/23 83/7 | 82/12 91/20 94/22 | 94/4 94/7 94/10 |
| 83/21 93/6 93/23 | 101/3 101/5 | 96/22 97/19 97/20 |
| 98/23 99/19 100/2 | can't [7] 34/15 | Casey [1] 16/17 |
| 102/12 | 53/10 77/3 95/1 | categories [1] 97/6 |
| calculations [5] | 95/3 99/9 105/8 | caught [2] 47/4 |
| 22/16 25/12 41/22 | cannot [1] 52/13 | 53/5 |
| 97/4 99/21 | capacity [1] 79/23 | CCR [1] 109/9 |
| calendar [3] 24/5 | capture [1] 34/1 | Center [1] 2/3 |
| 28/14 105/22 | care [3] 27/17 | Central [1] 3/10 |
| call [7] 5/5 5/7 | 68/14 76/1 | cents [1] 4/20 |
| 17/14 20/3 20/4 | Cares [1] 22/22 | certain [3] 25/23 |
| 74/2 99/17 | Carolina [2] 98/4 | 28/2 70/10 |
| CAMPBELL [7] | 101/16 | certainly [2] 25/16 |
| 2/13 6/13 15/14 | Carolina's [1] | 26/4 |
| 17/7 70/5 82/15 | 101/18 | CERTIFICATE [1] |
| 92/1 | case [14] 29/1 29/2 | 108/1 |
| can [52] 7/1 9/13 | 29/4 38/8 56/7 57/9 | Certified [4] 1/17 |
| 9/23 15/9 16/12 | 60/4 60/5 60/22 | 108/4 109/2 109/10 |
| 18/8 18/22 19/4 | 61/18 66/13 80/17 | certify [3] 108/6 |
| 21/14 26/4 27/20 | 97/19 97/19 | 108/16 108/23 |
| 28/12 30/21 31/2 | caseload [3] 37/16 | Chair [1] 2/6 |
| 35/6 39/17 41/12 | 41/20 42/2 | challenge [1] 53/9 |


| C | 58/14 58/14 61/7 | 44/16 61/8 61/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| chance [1] 14/22 | 61/10 61/13 61/16 | 61/11 61/13 61/14 |
| chances [1] 90/7 | 62/11 62/15 63/7 | 61/16 61/17 63/8 |
| change [14] 7/13 | 64/7 64/7 64/13 | 66/18 67/1 76/1 |
| 23/23 26/18 29/10 | 64/17 64/21 65/10 | 81/19 89/13 89/23 |
| 30/3 30/9 46/21 | 66/19 73/13 78/23 | 90/21 91/1 91/3 |
| 48/23 49/2 68/5 | 89/6 89/10 89/21 | 91/4 91/16 93/19 |
| 68/22 69/2 69/10 | 90/7 90/9 91/2 | 94/3 94/11 |
| 69/16 | 91/13 93/9 93/14 | choose [1] 107/1 |
| changed [3] 14/3 | 93/20 96/19 97/3 <br> 97/5 97/22 100/14 | chosen [1] 9/14 <br> Circuit [1] 2/9 |
| 27/16 100/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97/5 97/22 100/14 } \\ & 103 / 4 \text { 108/9 } \end{aligned}$ | Circuit [1] 2/9 circumstances |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { changes [12] } 13 / 15 \\ & 18 / 418 / 1922 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | child-rearing [1] | 57/9 103/1 |
| 26/16 33/21 35/11 | 43/7 | Civil [2] 2/12 9/15 |
| 37/1 54/6 59/17 | childcare [24] | claim [1] 37/12 |
| 59/19 76/12 | 25/21 28/7 28/8 | clarify [2] 33/15 |
| changing [2] 33/11 | 28/11 28/13 28/16 | 49/6 |
| 58/18 | 41/8 41/16 41/22 | CLARK [3] 3/20 |
| charged [1] 108/21 | 42/2 42/4 42/9 | 10/12 104/9 |
| chart [1] 30/7 | 42/10 45/15 46/16 | class [1] 28/11 |
| child [71] 1/2 1/15 | 46/20 47/22 50/15 | clean [2] 101/18 |
| 2/14 2/17 2/22 4/5 | 58/7 58/15 85/3 | 101/18 |
| 16/4 21/16 21/18 | 86/5 86/6 86/13 | cleaner [1] 98/12 |
| 21/22 22/13 23/3 | childless [4] 26/20 | clearly [2] 22/11 |
| 23/4 23/5 23/6 | 27/2 27/3 30/10 | 75/5 |
| 23/12 23/21 23/22 | children [42] 17/20 | clients [1] 75/20 |
| 24/4 25/12 27/1 | 17/22 17/23 18/20 | Cliff [2] 10/4 104/4 |
| 27/17 27/20 28/9 | 21/17 21/18 21/19 | CLIFFORD [2] |
| 28/22 29/14 33/14 | 21/20 21/22 21/23 | 3/19 10/2 |
| 38/19 41/15 42/1 | 22/13 22/14 23/18 | close [3] 30/20 |
| 43/7 43/17 44/3 | 26/1 27/23 28/10 | 76/22 81/10 |


| C | Commission [1] | 25/21 39/12 83/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| closer [3] 23/20 | 109/11 | 84/1 84/14 89/19 |
| 89/11 89/16 | Commissioner [2] | 98/3 101/12 |
| code [3] 23/1 26/7 | 1/18 108/5 | complication |
| 26/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { committee [36] } 1 / 1 \\ & 1 / 152 / 54 / 69 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | compromise |
| coded [1] 57/2 <br> College [1] 3/2 | 9/21 15/6 15/12 | 84/16 |
| color [1] 57/2 | 15/19 17/10 17/17 | computer [1] |
| Colorado [1] 2/4 | 18/7 18/11 19/3 | 108/13 |
| column [1] 57/14 | 34/12 35/9 35/10 | computer-printed |
| come [9] 11/9 73/2 | 4 | [1] 108/ |
| 73/6 83/8 84/22 | 48/23 50/18 71/13 | con [1] 85/23 |
| 90/4 93/23 95/2 | 84/22 88/2 103/19 | con-standpoint [1] |
| 95/3 | 106/14 106/18 | 85/23 |
| comes [2] 38/8 83/7 | 107/3 107/6 107 | concern [5] 17/13 |
| comfortable [1] | 107/22 108/9 | 35/21 38/23 49/12 |
| 22/2 | 108/14 108/18 | 81/13 |
| coming [1] 65/12 | 108/19 | concerned [4] 44/1 |
| commencing [1] | committees [1] | 47/21 71/18 95/21 |
| 1/20 | 106/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conclusion [1] } \\ & \text { 107/21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| comment [14] 32/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { common [3] 67/7 } \\ & 67 / 18100 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | conference [2] 12/6 |
| 32/11 35/16 42/15 $42 / 1850 / 3$ 50/8 | compare [1] 52/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conference [2] 12/6 } \\ & 16 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 42/18 50/3 50/8 56/16 71/11 73/8 | compared [1] 52/2 | confirm [1] 13/9 |
| 84/12 94/14 97/14 | compares [1] 51/7 | conflicts [2] 71/15 |
| 103/21 | comparing [2] 52/4 | 75/17 |
| comments [10] | 52/6 <br> comparisons [2] | confusing [4] 30/11 49/13 49/19 50/5 |
| 11/5 12/20 13/1 | comparisons [2] 59/14 67/4 | Congress [1] 34/15 |
| 59/8 59/11 71/9 $96 / 296 / 18103 / 2$ | complexity [2] | Congressional [1] |
| 107/2 | 72/16 72/17 | 30/8 |
| Commerce [1] 3/2 | complicated [8] | consensus [1] 35/4 |


| C | convert [2] 43/3 | 2/14 108/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| consequences [1] | 43/8 | couple [4] 25/13 |
| 39/18 | cook [1] 47/13 | 26/15 59/15 71/14 |
| conservative [1] | copy [1] 14/3 | Court [13] 1/17 |
| 62/8 | correct [15] 9/17 | 2/12 3/7 3/10 3/13 |
| consider [7] 25/10 | 9/19 34/20 54/23 | 4/12 9/15 12/6 |
| 28/7 44/13 46/3 | 55/23 70/12 79/4 | 77/23 108/4 109/1 |
| 63/1 89/12 94/1 | 81/4 82/12 92/9 | 109/2 109/10 |
| considerable [1] | 94/7 94/23 103/6 | courtroom [2] |
| 45/17 | 104/23 108/13 | 73/14 73/21 |
| consideration [6] | correction [1] | Courts [2] 3/16 |
| 46/16 46/19 48/12 | 13/18 | 12/17 |
| 52/18 63/20 70/8 | corrections [3] | cover [1] 51/5 |
| considerations [1] | 13/16 14/9 14/13 | COX [4] 2/11 6/10 |
| 95/19 | correlate [1] 5/3 costs [1] 43/7 | $\begin{aligned} & 72 / 20 \text { 93/1 } \\ & \text { crazy [1] 69/7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| considered [3] 40/5 | costs [1] 43/7 |  |
| 41/17 58/9 | could [30] 20/4 | credit [28] 22/17 |
| considers [2] 50/14 | 20/21 25/13 25/16 | 23/3 23/10 23/15 |
| 86/4 | 30/15 31/17 33/8 | 23/22 25/1 25/21 |
| consistent [4] 21/12 | 35/5 49/10 51/20 | 26/20 27/1 27/17 |
| 50/20 53/7 53/9 | 57/13 59/1 71/4 | 27/20 28/16 28/22 |
| Consumer [1] 33/1 | 73/2 80/12 83/11 | 29/5 29/15 30/14 |
| contain [1] 108/13 | 85/2 85/18 89/18 | 33/1 33/14 35/11 |
| contents [2] 19/8 | 89/22 90/3 90/11 | 41/9 41/16 42/5 |
| 19/10 | 90/16 90/17 90/21 | 42/10 43/17 57/22 |
| context [2] 36/4 | 93/5 95/13 99/11 | 81/11 95/6 100/8 |
| 73/9 | 99/16 99/19 | credits [7] 18/20 |
| continue [1] 16/1 | counsel [1] 108/17 | 32/10 36/8 37/19 |
| continues [1] 45/21 | counter [1] 77/6 | 37/21 38/1 38/5 |
| controversial [1] | counter-productive | criteria [3] 18/23 |
| 24/7 | [1] 77/6 <br> County [3] 2/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 1332 / 5 \\ & \text { cross [1] 100/8 } \end{aligned}$ |


| C | dealing [1] 16/10 | 33/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cross-credit [1] | Dean [1] 3/2 | ve [1] 22/15 |
| 100/8 | debt [1] 25/4 | Denver [1] 2/4 |
| Culverhouse [1] | December [1] | Department [2] |
| 3/2 | 43/21 | 2/14 2/17 |
| current [4] 60/7 | decide [7] 48/17 | dependent [2] |
| 88/3 88/9 99/21 | 54/4 91/15 99/18 <br> 102/2 102/6 102/22 | 27/17 41/16 <br> depending [1] |
| currently [1] 66/10 | decided [1] 16/15 | depending [1] 103/3 |
| custodial [6] 23/10 | decimal [1] 48/6 | depends [2] 88/11 |
| 37/12 38/9 44/16 $\mathbf{4 6 / 4}$ 81/14 | decision [8] 20/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { depends [2] 88/11 } \\ & \mathbf{1 0 0 / 6} \end{aligned}$ |
| 46/4 81/14 custody [7] 96/22 | 22/5 22/20 26/11 | describe [1] 39/5 |
| 98/7 99/4 99/18 | 29/15 46/22 80/5 | despite [1] 79/16 |
| 99/23 103/2 103/4 | 89/5 | detail [1] 26/3 |
| customary [1] | decrease [5] 56/8 | determination [2] |
| 108/22 | 56/12 62/11 64/20 | 102/9 102/11 |
| D |  |  |
| dad [1] 86/9 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 13 | 66/10 66/20 66/22 | 44/20 |
| data [7] 29/3 36/15 | decreasing [1] | develop [1] 43/10 |
| 37/13 38/17 93/8 | 64/17 | deviate [1] 31/21 |
| 93/11 93/12 | deductions [1] 33/4 | deviation [9] 18/23 |
| date [1] 105/14 | defendant [4] 47/14 | 31/12 35/13 35/20 |
| dated [1] 12/18 | 51/21 52/11 58/9 | 36/9 40/8 54/15 |
| DAVIS [5] 2/6 6/9 | defendant's [1] | 75/9 75/10 |
| 42/13 55/1 57/15 | 51/22 | deviations [1] 34/7 |
| day [1] 109/4 | defined [4] 32/13 | did [17] 5/18 7/9 |
| days [1] 100/4 | 32/18 32/20 32/22 | 10/4 14/2 15/2 |
| deadline [1] 13/2 | definitely [3] 12/2 | 15/16 17/11 19/13 |
| deal [4] 18/22 59/23 | 91/7 93/15 | 22/23 23/22 53/11 |
| 75/18 102/3 | definition [2] 33/3 | 82/19 84/2 91/13 |

D

46/2 46/3 54/16 discuss [5] 35/7 35/11 41/5 69/19 96/6
discussed [1] 96/1 discussion [6] 16/1
16/4 16/8 32/6
34/17 42/17
disperse [1] 107/6
District [1] 2/21
Division [3] 2/9
2/22 3/15
do [85] 10/6 11/17 11/20 12/7 13/17 14/11 14/17 17/5 25/11 25/12 25/14 25/16 26/4 27/12 34/19 34/22 35/3 38/3 39/10 43/2
43/2 46/12 46/13 46/15 47/2 47/2 47/17 47/19 48/23 52/17 52/19 52/20
52/20 53/23 54/4
54/14 55/20 56/14
56/15 56/18 59/10
59/11 64/11 66/10 68/19 69/11 70/16 70/23 76/4 76/5
76/6 82/21 83/21
84/13 84/23 85/2
85/4 85/15 85/15

86/2 86/3 87/12 88/2 88/4 90/17
90/21 91/17 92/6
94/15 94/18 95/14
96/10 97/1 98/22
99/13 99/18 99/19
101/17 101/23
102/21 103/15
103/21 105/13
106/19 108/6
doable [1] 84/13
documented [1]
41/21
does [19] 25/14
25/15 33/15 40/7
43/16 51/7 58/4
64/14 70/1 75/3
75/6 76/9 76/9
76/12 87/20 95/8
96/17 102/20
103/19
doesn't [8] 23/17
23/18 33/23 64/13
81/23 90/10 94/19
94/19
doing [12] 46/18 46/19 46/23 55/18 73/19 74/5 79/19
85/13 85/20 85/20
85/21 86/14
dollar [4] 44/2 48/2 58/17 65/5


| E | \| 2/16 2/19 2/21 3/4 | 47/20 48/5 48/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| email... [2] 12/15 | 3/9 3/12 3/15 | 53/3 53/6 54/5 $55 / 1857 / 3$ 57/7 |
| 12/17 | essentially [3] | 55/18 57/3 57/7 |
| emphasize [1] | 63/10 72/10 100/9 established [1] | existing [4] 56/6 <br> 57/11 61/5 62/7 |
| 64/16 | 54/12 | $\operatorname{Exp}[1] ~ 109 / 10$ |
| employee [2] 108/17 108/19 | estimate [2] 36/23 | expanded [2] 26/19 |
| employer [1] 2 | 39/9 | 27/16 |
| encouraging [1] | eternal [1] 73/11 | expanding [1] 28/6 |
| 76/13 | even [17] 20/8 24/5 | expenditures [1] |
| end [11] 10/5 10/15 | 31/23 36/6 42/8 | 43/8 |
| 10/21 11/5 11/10 | 63/8 68/3 72/5 73/4 | expense [1] 54/10 |
| 28/22 46/14 58/17 | 74/20 79/2 81/17 | expenses [14] 28/8 |
| 85/4 85/22 86/2 | 91/11 93/2 94/19 | 28/12 28/13 41/23 |
| ends [1] 58/16 | 98/17 107/1 | 42/3 42/11 45/14 |
| ENFORCEMENT | events [1] 71/23 | 52/18 53/16 58/2 |
| [4] $1 / 21 / 164 / 5$ | ever [3] 37/19 | 58/7 58/15 86/5 |
| 108/10 | 80/14 80/21 | 86/6 |
| enough [5] 32/3 | every [2] 38/5 44/2 | experience [3] |
| 51/11 53/11 82/22 | everybody [4] 4/9 | 38/13 69/2 77/21 |
| 105/17 | 4/14 70/18 71/4 | expertise [1] 36/1 |
| enter [2] 57/4 57/9 | everyone [4] 4/17 | experts [1] 19/3 |
| envelope [1] 39/2 | 9/11 13/14 15/16 | expires [1] 109/11 |
| equal [3] 67/9 | evidence [1] 73/18 | explaining [1] |
| 79/19 86/7 | evidenced [1] 109/2 | 103/16 |
| equally [1] 37/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { example [9] } 19 / 12 \\ & 19 / 1520 / 238 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | express [1] 107/3 <br> expressed [1] 43/7 |
| equation [1] 8 equity [1] 38/22 | 47/15 65/16 95/7 | F |
| equivalent [1] | 95/10 102/16 |  |
| 19/17 | examples [3] 17/6 | $\text { 79/16 96/14 } 97$ |
| error [1] 53/5 | Fxcel [10] 47/17 | factors [1] 29/19 |
| Esquire [8] 2/11 | Excel [10] 47/17 | fair [2] 39/19 40/14 |


fairly [2] 91/10 91/16
fairness [1] 31/22 fall [1] 66/6
families [4] 16/17
24/21 25/9 87/20
family [4] 20/10
25/5 28/11 36/12
far [3] 67/15 95/20 96/2
Fathers [1] 16/17 favor [3] 15/4 15/14 72/22
favoring [2] 17/17 46/1
federal [26] 18/19
19/20 33/21 35/11
37/1 41/8 41/15
42/9 43/20 44/9 44/12 47/10 59/18 60/9 60/13 61/20 62/21 63/12 63/18 69/16 72/11 76/12 76/19 76/21 78/9 78/12
feds [1] 68/9
feel [5] 22/1 40/7 40/10 48/14 107/4 feelings [1] 40/21 feels [2] 34/12 40/15
few [3] 38/13 65/20 fly [1] 73/20 97/10
fewer [1] 42/8
FICA [1] 63/19
field [1] 105/10
figure [7] 27/8
34/22 60/23 63/3
73/17 94/1 99/21
file [1] 24/22
files [1] 27/4
filled [1] 52/19
filling [2] 74/4 92/15
finalize [1] 95/1
finalized [2] 97/13
97/15
financial [1] 36/11
financially [1]
108/20
finding [2] 17/8
67/6
fine [1] 19/5
fingers [1] 31/2
first [4] 4/7 14/3
60/5 74/21
five [3] 4/19 4/20
4/22
flat [1] 91/12
flexibility [1] 71/21
flip [2] 61/2 85/5
flipping [2] 47/3
56/14
focusing [1] 36/14
following [1] 109/3
footnote [1] 66/2
Ford [1] 6/1
foregoing [1]
108/12
forgot [2] 70/15 70/22
form [22] 83/11
83/13 83/14 83/18 84/1 84/5 84/7 87/14 92/16 99/17 99/17 99/19 100/3 100/18 101/3 101/5 102/4 102/10 102/13 102/16 102/21 103/6
format [1] 102/7
forms [4] 83/11
99/14 100/10
101/23
formula [7] 25/20 43/12 43/16 63/18 63/19 100/7 100/8
formulas [2] 43/11 43/21
forward [1] 91/21
found [5] 13/18
24/11 41/20 82/19 109/3
Foundation [1]

F
Foundation... [1] 16/17
four [9] 14/5 17/23
31/10 36/6 85/8
98/21 101/2 101/10 101/12
fourth [1] 85/15 frank [1] 72/2
free [1] 107/5
frequently [1]

## 73/21

FRIDAY [4] 1/4 1/20 105/15 108/12 Fridy [3] 9/8 9/14 105/2
friendly [1] 87/2 frustration [1]
73/12
full [4] 19/18 23/9 23/12 63/14
full-time [1] 19/18 further [3] 33/5 108/16 108/23
future [1] 71/23

gain [1] 69/1
gander [1] 79/21
gap [1] 76/23
Gates [3] 10/8
10/10 104/21
gave [3] 36/5 64/9 72/4
general [8] 16/4
32/20 34/9 34/11
34/17 35/3 90/4 96/2
general than [1] 32/20
generated [1] 32/6 generous [3] 62/9 64/15 66/21
Georgia [6] 46/10 74/20 75/3 75/9
85/13 86/18
get [32] 11/22 14/22 22/2 24/3 24/21
24/23 26/2 27/6
27/20 29/4 30/5
31/7 31/18 43/18
45/13 47/20 49/7
50/19 53/9 53/20
54/8 60/22 69/4
76/8 77/15 84/17
84/18 85/2 88/2
90/11 99/8 101/5
gets [6] 37/12 52/16
86/20 89/19 94/21
98/13
getting [9] 23/19
38/23 47/21 57/13
59/19 77/4 81/11
92/4 107/12
give [4] 54/5 70/14 73/8 87/8
gives [2] 68/21 95/6 giving [1] 72/16 glad [1] 48/9 go [45] 4/2 15/1
17/2 17/3 18/21
19/8 19/22 21/8
22/16 26/15 40/9
40/23 44/5 48/5
49/17 55/1 56/22
57/1 59/10 60/2
60/18 60/23 62/13
62/16 63/3 65/3
66/12 66/20 69/20
73/1 74/8 74/8
74/12 77/13 82/16
85/6 87/7 89/3
91/21 91/22 92/19
92/22 100/1 102/6 106/3
goes [4] 11/8 60/14 72/10 72/12
going [73] 7/20 16/1 17/4 17/5 18/16 19/8 19/22 20/7 22/8 23/15 24/10 26/14 26/23 27/3 27/6 27/11 29/10 29/13 30/4 30/18 30/22 31/2 31/7 32/7 35/17

| $\mathbf{G}$ | 106/1 | 20/12 37/20 38/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [48] 36/4 | graduated [2] 92/7 | 41/22 42/2 42/3 |
| 37/10 38/16 38/21 | 92/19 | 50/12 53/18 55/2 |
| 39/12 40/14 41/4 | granting [1] 12/8 | 70/5 71/14 84/9 |
| 42/16 44/3 44/5 | GRAY [2] 3/1 8/7 | 91/15 96/8 104/19 |
| 45/11 49/3 49/4 | great [4] 4/13 74/13 | 104/21 104/21 |
| 50/7 50/16 53/14 | 103/15 105/19 | HALL [2] 3/4 8/18 |
| 59/7 60/2 62/6 | greater [3] 29/21 | hand [6] 40/9 40/16 |
| 62/22 63/2 66/9 | 52/8 90/18 | 49/21 70/3 73/19 |
| 66/20 68/4 68/7 | Greg [1] 6/18 | 74/5 |
| 68/11 68/14 69/6 | gross [9] 19/16 | hands [3] 15/5 15/7 |
| 69/8 69/18 75/12 | 25/11 43/4 43/5 | 15/9 |
| 77/15 81/8 82/1 | 43/9 44/3 47/8 | handy [1] 105/14 |
| 84/11 86/3 86/9 | 61/20 88/15 | happen [3] 24/16 |
| 86/12 88/12 88/13 | grounds [1] 35/19 | 66/17 69/7 |
| 89/11 92/14 93/23 | group [4] 28/5 37/7 | happening [1] |
| 94/2 94/3 95/4 | 54/4 106/17 | 76/18 |
| 97/12 101/19 | guess [11] 11/8 40 | happens [5] 24/21 |
| good [11] 12/9 | 68/16 75/17 77/7 | 58/11 65/20 67/4 |
| 16/13 33/6 37/2 | 77/8 80/20 81/22 | 75/22 |
| 50/3 50/8 68/23 | 88/8 96/23 106/11 | happy [2] 54/3 54/5 |
| 84/16 84/22 107/14 | GUEST [1] 2/2 | hard [1] 18/13 |
| 107/18 | guidelines [13] 1/2 | has [35] 4/13 9/11 |
| goose [1] 79/21 | 1/16 4/5 18/15 | 9/14 13/14 18/12 |
| goose/gander [1] | 28/18 35/19 36/9 | 22/12 27/15 28/11 |
| 79/21 | 41/21 59/18 59/21 | 29/21 29/22 30/2 |
| got [12] 7/19 31/5 | 83/3 96/20 108/10 | 31/5 40/22 44/16 |
| 47/4 48/3 53/6 | gun [1] 75/13 | 51/5 51/11 52/14 |
| 63/10 69/10 70/11 | guys [1] 80/6 | 52/21 53/6 58/14 |
| 71/23 85/10 86/6 | H | 64/1 65/6 66/15 |
| 105/17 ${ }^{\text {gotten [2] } 27 / 7}$ | had [22] 5/19 9/20 <br> 11/15 13/9 18/21 | 80/9 84/22 86/6 |

has... [6] 87/7 87/7
97/21 100/15 101/4 101/6
hassle [2] 26/6 26/9 have [174]
haven't [4] 9/1 80/7 89/4 105/23
having [6] 33/22
34/2 73/3 83/21 93/20 100/3
he [20] 5/19 5/20
9/14 9/20 9/22
16/20 24/12 27/4
29/12 29/21 29/22
30/21 51/14 52/14
64/1 86/11 86/12 87/6 87/6 87/7 head [2] 43/14 92/3 heading [1] 81/23 heads [1] 39/18 health [6] 33/4 45/14 46/16 46/20 47/23 50/15
hear [5] 7/1 14/11
14/18 71/12 72/9
heard [2] 19/14 80/5
hearing [3] 5/20 20/19 39/4
held [1] 1/16
help [3] 83/20

90/14 105/11
helpful [4] 39/7
41/1 88/1 103/14
her [14] 4/15 4/16
8/2 9/1 33/10 33/12
51/6 51/10 51/21
55/22 79/14 79/16
79/16 81/12
here [21] 5/8 5/9
6/11 6/14 7/16 8/8
8/16 9/3 9/6 10/3
10/13 10/19 11/2
11/3 25/1 49/11
53/8 57/2 57/10
84/11 105/2
here's [3] 29/15
47/7 92/14
herself [1] 6/23
hesitancy [1] 84/19 Hey [1] 82/14
higher [7] 39/15
65/14 77/10 80/10
81/12 89/15 93/14
highly [4] 76/13
97/18 97/23 101/13
him [1] 9/16
hinged [1] 82/8
hire [1] 49/1
his [6] 33/10 33/11
51/5 51/21 86/13
87/2
historically [1]

## 27/19

history [2] 16/23
77/22
hit [1] 28/1
hits [1] 25/23
hitting [1] 30/13
home [3] 29/23
75/23 77/11
homemaker [3]
75/23 78/3 79/13
honest [1] 89/10
HONORABLE [12] 2/8 2/11 3/13 5/10
5/12 5/15 5/21 6/1
6/3 6/6 8/22 9/8
hope [1] 107/12
hopefully [2] 19/9 105/17
hour [12] 60/8 60/16 60/18 62/22
63/6 65/1 65/16 65/18 65/22 66/9 66/13 67/21
House [1] 60/11
household [2]
43/14 94/2
households [2] 23/9 25/4
how [17] 11/8 17/9 19/11 20/13 30/6 30/9 42/7 45/10
49/9 52/1 54/11

| H | impacts [1] 73/17 | 33/9 33/10 33/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| how... [6] 54/13 | implying [1] 86/22 | 33/23 34/8 34/8 |
| 68/9 72/12 76/8 | important [5] 18/7 | 38/11 38/14 42/4 |
| 82/19 87/3 | 20/10 22/20 26/17 | 43/4 43/5 43/6 43/9 |
| however [1] 48/14 | 87/4 | 43/11 43/12 43/20 |
| Hoyem [1] 12/16 | imputation [2] | 44/3 44/18 46/4 |
| Human [2] 2/15 | 76/15 78/15 | 47/9 48/16 51/5 |
| 2/17 | impute [5] 77/2 | 51/11 57/20 61/20 |
| hundred [1] 4/22 | 77/14 77/18 77/23 | 62/2 62/3 63/11 |
| husband [1] 79/12 | 78/1 | 63/15 63/18 63/19 |
|  | imputed [4] 67/10 | 65/6 65/7 65/22 |
| I | 67/11 67/16 80/10 | 65/23 66/15 67/5 |
| I'll [3] 62/2 71/10 | imputing [6] 76/5 | 67/9 67/9 67/16 |
| 91/1 | 76/8 77/7 77/19 | 67/18 70/10 70/22 |
| I'm [12] 11/7 24/7 | 79/14 79/22 | 71/1 72/6 73/17 |
| 24/12 35/20 36/1 | incentive [6] 17/15 | 76/5 76/14 76/14 |
| 75/15 77/3 79/5 | 20/3 21/7 22/3 | 76/15 77/2 77/7 |
| 79/18 80/19 85/6 | 22/12 48/18 | 77/10 77/13 79/4 |
| 90/13 | incentives [1] 18/17 | 79/8 80/10 83/9 |
| I've [1] 75/16 | inclined [1] 39/10 | 83/13 83/15 86/12 |
| idea [5] 35/12 35/18 | include [4] 28/15 | 88/18 89/15 89/23 |
| 68/20 84/16 84/20 | 33/4 40/8 72/18 | 90/5 90/18 95/3 |
| identified [5] 7/12 | included [1] 46/10 | 102/15 |
| 8/21 51/16 74/14 | including [1] 84/12 | incomes [13] 19/21 |
| 87/19 | income [90] 18/4 | 28/3 39/15 61/22 |
| imminent [1] 69/16 | 19/17 19/21 20/9 | 64/20 65/13 65/14 |
| impact [10] 18/17 | 20/13 23/8 23/15 | 86/7 88/16 89/20 |
| 36/7 38/17 39/12 | 23/19 25/11 25/23 | 89/23 90/5 91/8 |
| 64/12 64/13 64/14 | 26/20 28/2 28/23 | incorporating [1] |
| 67/20 67/22 72/9 | 29/17 29/21 30/3 | 44/17 |
| impacted [2] 36/23 | 30/14 30/17 30/19 | increase [12] 18/1 |
| 40/4 | 30/23 32/13 32/22 | 22/3 23/3 29/7 32/2 |

I
increase... [7] 60/10 60/13 63/11 63/12 64/21 68/13 96/22 increased [2] 28/22 33/22
increases [5] 23/4 32/1 47/10 63/5 67/23
increment [1]

## 20/14

incurred [1] 58/8 indicate [4] 5/2
11/23 15/18 83/22 indicated [2] 87/6 105/1
individual [1]
88/17
infinite [1] 48/6
inflation [2] 69/5 69/6
information [9]
9/10 12/16 22/17
41/2 52/22 53/1 57/5 57/14 103/14 informed [1] 12/15 initial [2] 102/5 102/9
initially [1] 32/13 inserted [1] 45/22 insightful [1] 17/10 instead [9] 13/20

14/6 43/4 55/14
65/23 75/10 91/12 92/7 92/19 instructions [2] 49/11 82/22 insult [1] 74/2 insurance [6] 33/5 45/15 46/17 46/20 47/23 50/15 intelligently [1] 36/8 intended [7] 5/2 33/17 34/3 78/20 78/21 79/1 79/15 intent [3] 31/17 78/9 81/22 interested [3] 71/12 106/20 108/20 interesting [1] 16/21
interfere [1] 23/16 interpreted [1] 72/14
interstate [1] 97/20 intervals [1] 101/7 intimidating [1] 71/17
Iowa [1] 101/1 irrespective [1]

## 78/6

is [239]
isn't [7] 27/3 46/8

53/7 63/8 74/13 75/10 100/3
issue [11] 17/12
24/7 31/23 34/13
38/2 59/14 59/22
59/23 68/15 78/10 91/21
issues [3] 17/12
59/16 74/15
it [274]
it's [119]
items [1] 25/4
its [1] 53/7
IV [16] 14/6 14/6
29/3 29/4 36/16
37/4 37/15 39/4
93/12 93/16 93/17
93/17 93/20 94/6 94/10 94/11
IV-D [11] 14/6 14/6
29/3 29/4 36/16
37/15 93/12 93/16
93/17 94/6 94/10
J
JANE [15] 2/3 16/6 16/9 20/20 36/14 42/18 42/21 49/16 53/13 70/8 84/13 88/2 95/13 95/19 103/15
Jane's [1] 105/11
January [1] 43/22

| J |
| :--- |
| January $2021[1]$ | 43/22

Jeana [6] 1/17 3/7 4/8 8/20 108/4 109/9
Jeffries [1] 7/6 JENNIFER [4] 2/16 6/20 6/22 7/1 Jersey [2] 25/15 46/11
Jessica [1] 7/3
JIC [1] 71/15
$\operatorname{Jim}[1] 7 / 6$
job [4] 4/13 78/17
103/15 107/14
join [4] 5/20 9/22
12/21 105/3
joining [3] 11/11
106/18 106/23
joint [2] 96/21
99/23
judge [19] 2/9 2/12
5/18 9/11 9/14
14/15 14/17 18/18
22/17 22/21 36/13
72/21 73/12 75/15
86/21 87/5 87/8
87/22 105/2
judge's [1] 36/3
judges [5] 31/20
33/20 36/4 39/3

83/22
Julie [2] 6/3 8/22
July [2] 24/14 29/6
July 2021 [1] 24/14 jumped [1] 75/13 juncture [1] 101/23
June [2] 105/16 109/4
June 11 [1] 105/16 just [110]
Justice [1] 3/13
K
Karen [1] 6/6
KATIE [6] 2/19 7/8
7/21 14/19 14/23
106/5
keep [4] 62/22
68/11 83/17 102/7
keeping [1] 85/11
Kentucky [1] 46/11
kick [1] 68/2
kicking [1] 65/2
kid [1] 65/13
kids [1] 20/11
kind [10] 16/21
30/10 57/12 80/13
80/15 81/20 87/12
87/21 91/18 91/20
King [6] 7/12 8/14
8/15 14/23 39/23
74/7
Kirk [1] 7/4
knew [2] 13/9 33/16 know [83] 8/20 18/9 18/12 19/2 19/6 19/22 22/4 22/6 22/19 23/14 26/4 29/16 30/17
31/11 31/21 31/22
32/1 32/16 32/17
33/15 34/15 36/1
36/14 36/17 37/18
38/3 38/3 38/8
38/11 38/12 38/16
39/4 40/10 41/17
42/6 46/22 47/11
48/16 53/3 54/4
54/6 54/13 54/21
63/22 68/3 68/13
68/17 69/4 70/15
70/19 72/4 72/7
72/15 75/8 75/9
75/22 77/12 78/11
78/17 79/20 80/15
80/17 81/2 81/3
82/1 83/5 84/6
84/17 85/1 86/5
86/22 86/22 87/3
89/9 89/13 89/16
90/10 91/15 94/13
94/22 96/20 98/6 99/4
knowledge [1] 36/5

| K | 50/21 | 61/21 76/19 78/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| knows [1] 34/14 | lawyer [3] 33/18 | 102/15 |
| L |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { liability [2] 23/ } \\ & 23 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| labor [1] 78/10 | layers [2] 72/17 | licensed [1] 108/23 |
| land [2] 67/15 90/3 | 73/3 | like [59] 4/7 10/14 |
| language [25] 18/4 | leaning [1] 40/2 | 10/21 11/5 13/16 |
| 19/6 30/5 31/17 | learn [1] 73/16 | 16/5 24/23 27/1 |
| 31/18 32/5 45/10 | least [4] 18/8 44/4 | 31/1 33/13 33/21 |
| 45/18 45/20 45/23 | 72/12 84/6 | 34/12 35/7 35/10 |
| 46/6 46/8 50/17 | leave [3] 16/15 87/6 | 35/18 35/22 40/11 |
| 50/20 51/14 53/18 | 87/10 | 49/10 51/13 53/15 |
| 54/6 59/4 59/20 | LEE [3] 3/21 10/18 | 69/8 70/19 71/19 |
| 68/5 74/20 74/22 | 104/11 | 71/21 72/23 74/20 |
| 75/2 85/13 86/18 | left [1] 17/16 | 75/8 75/15 79/1 |
| languages [1] 32/9 | Legal [1] 3/15 | 81/23 82/22 84/15 |
| Large [2] 1/18 | legislation [1] 59/6 | 85/9 85/11 85/13 |
| 108/5 | less [16] 21/5 23/6 | 86/2 86/5 86/18 |
| larger [1] 100/17 | 31/3 39/10 51/1 | 87/9 87/12 87/21 |
| last [9] 12/21 22/18 | 66/16 76/23 83/15 | 89/18 90/17 91/18 |
| 24/14 27/15 44/8 | 84/1 84/3 86/4 | 92/14 93/3 95/19 |
| 54/14 67/3 71/14 | 89/20 90/12 90/19 | 101/2 101/8 101/9 |
| 75/16 | 93/18 94/9 | 101/12 101/17 |
| late [1] 5/20 | lesser [1] 40/4 | 104/3 104/5 104/9 |
| later [8] 9/22 20/8 | let [10] 4/16 32/8 | 104/12 104/15 |
| 41/12 45/8 69/3 | 34/18 40/10 69/19 | 106/15 107/3 |
| 97/15 102/3 102/22 | 71/18 73/7 75/14 | likely [2] 39/16 |
| Lathesia [2] 7/22 | 98/12 103/18 | 63/4 |
| 8/1 | let's [6] 34/16 66/5 | Likewise [1] 4/23 |
| law [3] 2/6 2/7 | 78/11 78/21 79/11 | limited [1] 44/17 |
| 30/15 | 92/20 | line [54] 13/19 |
| laws [2] 33/21 | level [6] 2/17 19/20 | 13/20 14/4 30/12 |


| L | 27/6 31/3 33/5 | 60/12 73/10 93/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| line... [50] 30/16 | 43/14 44/7 46/5 | 94/14 96/12 106/1 |
| 48/11 48/19 49/6 | 49/18 50/5 51/14 | love [3] 68/19 69/13 |
| 49/6 49/6 49/14 | 53/4 53/5 56/8 | 84/20 |
| 49/19 50/9 51/3 | 57/10 58/20 58/21 | low [6] 18/4 23/8 |
| 51/8 51/8 51/10 | 62/14 64/8 64/20 | 42/3 44/18 65/13 |
| 51/10 51/22 51/22 | 65/9 65/12 69/6 | 86/11 |
| 52/2 52/3 52/4 52/5 | 71/17 85/2 90/14 | low-income [2] |
| 52/12 52/13 53/4 | 91/14 93/18 105/10 | 18/4 44/18 |
| 53/6 53/12 53/16 | live [1] 25/9 | lower [2] 62/6 |
| 53/22 54/8 54/23 | LLC [1] 3/8 | 65/13 |
| 55/3 55/3 55/3 55/4 | longer [1] 82/20 | M |
| 55/4 55/9 55/10 | look [31] 13/12 16/12 17/5 18/3 | ma'am [5] 5/6 |
| 55/12 55/14 55/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 1217 / 518 / 3 \\ & 18 / 1318 / 1318 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | 12/13 13/3 20/22 |
| 55/16 55/20 57/16 | 30/15 31/5 31/11 | 104/4 |
| 57/16 57/17 57/18 |  | MADDOX [1] 3/15 |
| 57/21 58/1 58/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43/19 45/7 47/5 } \\ & 47 / 1148 / 1249 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | made [4] 16/18 |
| 82/23 82/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 47 / 1148 / 1249 / 10 \\ & 51 / 2057 / 759 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 89/4 97/10 102/11 |
| lines [5] 53/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51/20 57/7 59/12 } \\ & \text { 63/13 69/10 70/20 } \end{aligned}$ | maintenance [1] |
| 53/19 53/20 53/23 | 71/16 74/18 75/8 | 80/16 |
| 73/1 | 90/23 93/3 95/11 | major [2] 23/2 25/4 |
| lingering [1] 97/10 | 95/20 98/4 100/1 | majority [10] 28/19 |
| LISA [4] 3/20 |  | 38/18 62/12 83/12 |
| 10/12 10/15 104/8 | looked [1] 21/10 | 83/19 83/22 87/15 |
| list [3] 104/1 106/10 | looking [11] 17/8 | 93/8 93/16 94/4 |
| 106/12 | 26/12 60/6 78/5 | make [28] 11/5 |
| listed [1] 61/3 | 81/17 92/13 97 | 13/16 18/3 24/6 |
| litigate [1] 34/2 |  | 29/19 35/15 39/11 |
| litigator [1] 75/19 |  | 42/14 45/15 47/13 |
| little [34] 13/18 | Lord [1] $109 / 5$ <br> $\operatorname{lot}[11] 31 / 536 / 21$ | 49/2 50/7 54/7 |
| 13/20 17/8 19/11 | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{lot}[11] ~ 31 / 536 / 21 \\ 37 / 13 ~ 40 / 20 ~ 58 / 10 \end{gathered}$ | 56/15 59/17 60/11 |
| 21/11 24/23 26/10 | 37/13 40/20 58/10 | 62/18 70/17 71/11 |

make... [9] 79/23
83/1 85/17 87/1
91/1 92/15 97/7
97/9 102/8
makes [9] 25/17
25/18 36/11 46/5
56/4 76/9 76/10 90/13 98/2
making [9] 23/11 45/3 46/2 47/14 54/14 79/7 79/17 91/4 93/3
MALLORY [2] 3/4 8/17
Manager [1] 2/14 manual [1] 83/21 manually [2] 55/20 71/3
many [5] 36/3
36/22 42/7 84/22
106/14
market [1] 78/10 markup [2] 45/8 45/18
marriage [1] 78/4 materials [1] 70/21 math [9] 19/11
31/19 46/23 47/21 49/3 76/18 85/1
85/17 98/12
mathematical [3]

22/7 22/9 26/13
mathematically [4]
18/9 31/23 45/12
92/22
Matt [2] 9/8 9/14
matter [4] 66/11
80/1 86/10 108/7
maximum [8]
27/19 28/1 49/14
50/10 50/23 51/23
56/13 98/20
may [29] 1/4 1/20
5/20 6/23 9/22
12/19 12/21 12/22
14/22 16/13 17/2
34/1 34/5 35/23
41/17 48/15 53/16
66/6 70/6 70/9 76/2
78/6 79/3 79/17
83/5 92/2 96/15
96/21 108/12
May 13 [2] 12/21
16/13
May 13th [2] 17/2 96/15
May 21st [1] 12/19
maybe [12] 18/22
38/21 39/3 72/12
74/6 89/11 91/19
92/2 94/10 95/14 100/20 100/21
McClenney [2]

7/22 8/1
McMillan [2] 5/16
5/18
me [25] 4/16 5/19
7/1 7/11 19/5 34/18
36/18 39/7 39/23
41/13 45/8 49/1
49/19 69/12 71/18
71/19 71/23 72/16
73/7 78/20 80/15
81/4 82/13 82/20 103/18
mean [27] 25/13
29/18 31/14 31/21
32/17 34/13 36/2
54/15 58/11 60/19
69/9 74/14 76/7
77/5 77/6 77/21
80/6 84/17 85/4
86/20 87/2 89/9
94/17 94/17 97/19
98/2 105/13
meaning [1] 46/3
means [10] 20/16 21/4 28/10 28/23
50/17 51/1 64/1 65/5 98/2 100/9
means you [1]

## 100/9

meant [1] 74/1
measurements [3]
43/6 64/19 65/12
media [2] 12/12 12/15
meet [2] 65/7
105/12
meeting [10] 1/1
1/16 9/21 11/6
12/19 22/18 87/7
105/18 106/19
107/22
meetings [4] 12/14 71/14 75/16 81/3 MELODY [4] 2/21 8/4 14/1 80/23 member [1] 9/16 members [13] 2/5
15/6 15/12 15/19
18/7 18/11 35/9
104/2 107/4 107/7
108/15 108/18
108/19
memo [7] 16/13
17/3 56/15 61/4
74/19 86/9 96/16
memos [1] 21/12
mentioned [1] 29/9
mesh [1] 59/21
message [1] 87/3
messy [2] 16/23
25/18
met [1] 64/7
method [2] 44/19

## 100/19

MICHAEL [4] 2/8 5/21 14/16 35/16 middle [1] 28/11 might [16] 20/11 29/4 38/9 38/13
38/22 58/12 69/1 69/9 69/10 80/7 81/12 81/14 84/17 90/2 91/1 96/15 million [1] 47/19 mind [3] 38/9 47/3 56/14
minimize [1] 76/15 minimum [37]
19/18 22/2 23/11
27/10 29/8 29/21
30/13 30/18 31/9
47/10 47/14 51/2
60/7 60/13 62/21
63/5 63/12 63/14
67/10 67/12 67/23
68/10 68/13 69/16
72/11 75/21 76/6
76/21 76/21 77/18
78/5 78/11 79/14
79/22 79/23 81/9
82/3
Minnie [1] 36/18
minor [1] 13/18
minus [2] 49/6
82/23
minute [1] 45/12 minutes [1] 26/15 missed [4] 70/6 71/13 75/16 81/3 Missouri [4] 101/2 101/14 101/15 101/16
mistake [1] 92/15 mitigate [1] 72/7 mitigated [1] 72/2 mixed [1] 67/15 mixup [1] 106/6 Mo [1] 36/18
Mobile [3] 2/10 2/14 2/15
mock [2] 88/2 88/4 mode [1] 4/14
modification [1]
32/4
mom [1] 86/5
money [1] 25/3
Montgomery [9]
1/19 2/12 2/18 2/20
3/8 3/11 3/14 3/16 108/3
month [12] 26/22
27/9 28/8 28/9 29/5 29/12 33/9 39/1
63/16 68/12 89/12 105/13
monthly [4] 19/16
33/13 47/8 88/15
months [1] 24/15 Moore [1] 2/11 more [44] 21/17 21/20 21/23 22/14 23/6 26/10 27/7
27/9 27/22 28/9
30/2 32/20 34/11
38/15 39/15 41/12
46/5 47/21 51/10
51/22 56/4 57/12
61/7 61/11 61/14 62/3 63/4 64/15 66/18 66/21 67/5 67/6 67/7 67/8 67/17 67/18 77/9 78/5 83/6 84/14 89/19 94/3 94/11 98/3
morning [1] 9/22 most [16] 22/2 25/7
25/9 37/4 50/12
52/19 62/8 62/9
62/23 67/22 76/19
94/4 97/7 100/7 100/7 100/19
mostly [1] 67/1 mother [1] 81/11 motion [1] 14/12 move [8] 31/10 32/3 42/13 42/19 42/22 45/14 59/13 85/4
moved [1] 14/14 movement [1] 60/12
moving [1] 43/1
Ms. [5] 11/1 20/21
20/21 21/3 104/15 Ms. Wright [5]
11/1 20/21 20/21
21/3 104/15
much [9] 15/22
20/13 37/21 43/13
44/10 46/9 68/17
93/3 107/9
multiple [1] 53/6 multiply [1] 57/18 mute [2] 20/18 20/21
my [30] 16/14 16/22 31/2 31/17 35/21 39/2 47/4 48/10 53/5 58/23 60/20 75/18 75/20
76/2 76/4 76/9 77/8
77/8 77/9 77/21
80/13 80/21 84/19
92/3 101/22 106/10 106/12 106/12 106/16 109/3

N
name [2] 5/7 109/3
NATHAN [3] 3/12 9/4 9/7
nearly [1] 26/21 Nebraska [2] 94/19 94/19
necessarily [1]
75/18
necessary [2] 73/4
73/15
need [11] 19/5
35/20 35/22 41/5
41/13 61/2 70/23
72/5 92/18 93/2
97/2
needed [1] 14/5 needle [1] 32/3 needs [8] 20/18 25/5 34/12 34/13 44/14 48/13 70/9 73/5
negotiate [1] 39/17 negotiating [1] 40/6 neither [1] 108/16 net [1] 57/23
never [7] 24/20 77/1 78/3 80/7
86/20 94/20 105/4 new [27] 25/14 26/7 44/12 46/11 48/11 48/19 49/8 49/14
50/9 51/3 52/2
52/12 52/13 52/15
53/4 53/11 53/16
53/20 53/22 54/8

| $\mathbf{N}$ | 70/19 74/22 84/15 | 36/2 36/17 37/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| new... [7] 55/15 | 86/10 86/16 94/3 | 37/14 38/11 40/3 |
| 57/16 57/21 58/1 | 95/12 95/22 96/3 | 40/16 43/16 44/23 |
| 58/6 64/18 65/11 | 97/7 97/20 98/8 | 52/1 52/20 58/18 |
| news [1] 12/14 | 102/14 102/23 | 65/2 65/13 72/12 |
| next [17] 7/21 21/8 | 103/12 103/22 | 73/2 73/13 74/1 |
| 24/17 30/6 40/23 | 104/7 104/10 | 75/3 75/11 77/4 |
| 43/1 45/6 45/21 | 104/13 104/17 | 77/12 78/21 78/23 |
| 65/1 65/17 66/12 | 105/6 105/6 105/8 | 79/1 79/3 79/5 |
| 91/19 94/23 95/20 | 106/12 107/11 | 79/18 80/19 81/15 |
| 100/2 105/12 | 109/10 | 82/5 82/20 83/6 |
| 105/13 | nodding [4] 39/18 | 83/8 85/6 86/12 |
| nice [1] 94/18 | 89/1 95/16 103/7 | 90/13 92/3 96/9 |
| nil [1] 72/10 | non [5] 37/4 39/4 | 98/3 98/11 98/15 |
| nimbleness [1] | 93/17 93/20 94/11 | 98/21 98/23 104/7 |
| 71/22 | non-IV-D [5] 37/4 | 104/22 105/23 |
| ninety [3] 4/19 4/20 | 39/4 93/17 93/20 | Notary [1] 109/11 |
| 4/22 | 94/11 | note [1] 50/7 |
| ninety-five [3] 4/19 | noncustodial [2] | noted [2] 18/18 |
| 4/20 4/22 | 44/14 82/6 | 54/22 |
| no [65] 5/11 5/14 | normally [1] 67/1 | nothing [1] 85/14 |
| 5/17 6/2 6/5 6/8 | not [79] 6/23 10/6 | notice [1] 14/2 |
| 6/17 6/19 6/21 7/5 | 11/7 11/19 11/20 | notification [1] |
| 7/7 7/23 8/3 8/11 | 13/5 13/9 15/10 | 12/12 |
| 8/13 8/19 8/23 9/9 | 18/6 24/2 24/7 | now [24] 11/15 |
| 10/9 10/11 10/16 | 24/12 25/8 26/3 | 28/6 29/9 30/13 |
| 10/22 13/3 14/10 | 26/8 26/22 26/23 | 33/13 35/23 38/2 |
| 15/20 34/22 40/12 | 27/2 27/11 29/12 | 41/5 47/2 50/22 |
| 40/18 42/20 52/14 | 29/14 29/20 30/1 | 51/20 52/17 62/15 |
| 54/18 56/21 59/7 | 31/13 31/15 32/2 | 73/23 74/5 74/23 |
| 59/9 59/11 63/20 | 33/2 34/19 34/23 | 76/5 76/22 85/9 |
| 66/10 66/22 69/23 | 35/2 35/20 35/21 | 97/2 98/6 102/14 |

now... [2] 102/17 104/3
nuance [1] 90/14 number [10] 5/2 14/5 17/20 26/1 40/4 64/10 90/21 91/16 101/8 109/3 numbering [3] 21/11 53/7 53/8 numbers [8] 4/18 37/15 37/17 37/20 55/20 90/2 91/4 92/2
numeral [1] 29/4 numerals [1] 14/6 nurse [2] 38/12 38/12
O
o'clock [2] 105/16 106/4
obligated [11]
29/11 51/17 52/12
58/8 63/17 65/21
66/14 67/11 67/16 80/9 97/21
obligation [4] 47/18 49/15 50/11 51/6 obligee [3] 29/1 29/20 102/19
obligor [4] 29/20

31/7 58/13 102/19 obligor's [3] 54/9 57/22 61/19 obligor/obligee [1] 102/19 obvious [1] 45/3 obviously [8] 15/22 22/4 22/19 23/14 35/2 38/16 53/2 91/5
occur [1] 24/8 off [4] 47/20 48/4 56/2 58/3
office [5] 2/21 3/16
12/17 16/23 30/8
Officer [1] 12/16
officially [1] 9/12 offset [1] 100/9 often [2] 73/12 75/21
oh [5] 31/4 49/22
74/8 84/15 100/20 okay [47] 7/11 7/15 10/17 11/9 11/16 11/21 12/10 13/8 13/12 13/22 14/8 15/21 16/12 19/15 20/23 22/7 40/2 40/13 40/19 41/3 42/12 42/16 42/21 42/23 54/2 55/12 56/22 70/1 80/11

82/9 88/20 90/16 92/11 94/12 95/4 95/13 95/18 95/23 96/4 101/21 103/9 103/23 104/20 105/7 105/19 106/11 106/12 old [2] 23/22 26/7 once [4] 5/6 67/22 70/11 102/10 one [79] 13/18
17/12 21/16 21/18
21/21 22/12 23/2
25/15 28/9 28/19
29/23 30/1 31/11
32/4 32/12 38/19
40/21 41/7 44/9
44/21 45/11 45/23
49/12 49/20 58/4
59/16 61/7 61/10
61/13 61/16 61/21
62/11 63/7 64/7
64/17 65/10 65/13
67/1 70/5 74/12
75/22 77/11 78/13
81/5 81/18 82/3
84/3 85/9 85/18
86/8 89/6 89/10
89/21 90/7 90/9
90/20 91/2 91/14
92/6 92/12 93/9
93/14 93/19 93/20

| 0 | 62/11 62/17 62/18 | 103/10 103/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| one... [15] 94/22 | 64/13 85/12 85/15 | 108/15 108/18 |
| 95/14 95/15 97/10 | 86/15 <br> options [7] 61/1 | 108/20 <br> others [3] 24/13 |
| 98/9 98/10 98/15 | options [7] 61/1 61/2 61/3 62/6 | others [3] 24/13 34/6 71/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100/12 101/3 101/5 } \\ & \text { 102/13 102/17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 / 261 / 362 / 6 \\ & 66 / 2174 / 1285 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | ought [1] 39/10 |
| 106/1 106/13 | order [15] 12/7 | our [12] 4/4 4/12 |
| 106/21 | 17/22 50/13 50/14 | 4/14 16/1 25/12 $38 / 17$ 43/6 48/19 |
| one-child [3] 64/17 | 51/2 54/18 54/20 | 38/17 43/6 48/19 |
| 90/9 93/14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 58/19 61/5 63/8 } \\ & 86 / 3100 / 11100 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 60/4 60/6 93/22 109/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ones [2] 21/9 60/5 } \\ & \text { only [23] 23/1 } \end{aligned}$ | 86/3 100/11 100/17 | out [23] 14/4 22/21 |
| 23/22 28/1 37/19 | orders [3] 62/12 | 25/22 27/8 34/22 |
| 39/12 41/20 44/23 | 66/4 93/14 | 35/23 38/20 46/23 |
| 57/22 63/16 64/21 | Oregon [1] 101/6 | 48/2 49/23 57/15 |
| 68/17 70/23 82/2 | ORIGINAL [1] | 65/12 73/2 73/6 |
| 82/3 82/6 83/7 84/4 | 1/11 | 74/4 84/7 86/23 |
| 84/19 85/1 88/5 | other [48] 3/6 14/9 | 90/2 92/15 93/5 |
| 90/11 96/7 101/1 | 24/9 25/15 26/16 | 97/12 97/16 99/21 |
| ons [6] 46/19 47/22 | 28/18 29/22 30/1 | outcome [2] 65/17 |
| 57/1 85/3 85/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 32 / 932 / 1034 / 6 \\ & 35 / 1336 / 2040 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | 65/18 |
| 86/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 35 / 1336 / 2040 / 14 \\ & 40 / 2140 / 2244 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 18/21 22/16 49/20 |
| 34/16 42/17 | 45/23 46/9 47/19 | 64/8 67/13 69/14 |
| opportunity [3] | 50/18 54/6 58/5 | 78/22 |
| 13/14 68/21 87/8 | 58/5 59/15 67/7 | over-think [1] |
| opposed [2] 15/17 | 67/14 71/8 77/19 | 69/14 |
| 33/19 | 78/6 78/21 85/12 | overall [2] 36/17 |
| option [17] 21/15 | 86/2 86/11 93/10 | 96/19 |
| 21/21 22/1 22/11 | 93/15 94/22 95/18 | overarching [1] |
| 61/6 61/9 61/12 | 95/23 96/17 98/15 | 87/3 |
| 61/15 62/8 62/9 | 100/13 100/15 | overnights [4] |


| 0 | 75/22 80/9 81/14 | party [6] 51/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| overnights... [4] | 82/3 82/6 97/21 | 57/14 77/11 78/6 |
| 01/8 101/9 101/10 | 99/9 100/12 100/13 | 80/2 98/13 |
| 101/11 | 100/15 100/16 | party's [3] 19/16 |
| owing [1] 100/17 | parent's [7] 46/4 | 83/15 90/5 |
| own [2] 45/7 49/1 | 48/15 53/1 57/18 | passes [1] 15/22 |
| P | 65/21 65/23 70/9 | past [3] 12/22 23/8 |
| page [14] 13/19 |  |  |
| 13/19 14/4 21/8 |  |  |
| 31/10 41/7 43/1 |  |  |
| 31/10 41/7 43/1 | 98/14 98/19 99/5 | pay [7] 25/2 25/4 |
| 45/21 56/23 61/3 | 102/3 | 44/17 52/9 52/13 |
| 65/17 66/2 74/18 | parents [11] 31/8 | 86/9 86/12 |
| 101/7 | 38/4 45/5 48/22 | paycheck [4] 25/9 |
| pages [2] 101/12 | 51/4 63/10 65/7 | 25/10 27/11 29/8 |
| 108/13 | 67/9 81/9 81/10 | payer [1] 100/18 |
| pain [1] 62/14 | 82/2 | paying [1] 80/2 |
| painful [1] 62/23 | parents' [1] 83/9 | payroll [7] 17/16 |
| Palmer [4] 6/4 | part [1] 54/14 | 19/23 27/13 43/19 |
| 18/18 22/17 22/21 | partial [1] 29/5 | 61/23 63/16 94/16 |
| panel [1] 16/19 | participating [1] | peaked [1] 30/16 |
| panelist [1] 16/15 | 107/9 | pencil [1] 106/3 |
| paragraphs [1] | participation [1] | Pennsylvania [1] |
| 36/6 | 4/4 | 97/11 |
| parent [33] 23/11 | particular [3] 20/2 | PENNY [14] 2/6 |
| 29/11 30/2 33/22 | 72/8 90/20 | 5/19 6/9 11/14 |
| 37/12 38/9 44/15 | particularly [3] | 13/17 19/13 33/6 |
| 44/16 48/22 51/9 | 66/18 68/11 106/23 | 35/15 70/4 71/11 |
| 51/17 51/17 52/13 | parties [4] 40/6 | 85/11 87/13 96/8 |
| 63/17 65/6 66/14 | 77/10 102/6 103/5 | 104/19 |
| 66/15 67/5 67/11 | parties' [4] 83/13 | people [9] 32/8 34/2 |
| 67/12 67/16 67/19 | 89/20 90/5 90/18 | 50/5 50/18 56/15 |


| $\mathbf{P}$ | 36/1 | 5/7 20/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| people... [4] 69/19 | permanent at [1] | plus [2] 55/22 55/22 |
| 87/1 92/14 95/6 | person [9] 18/14 | point [16] 11/18 11/19 15/23 18/8 |
| per [24] 23/4 23/4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { person }[9] \text { 18/14 } \\ 23 / 1723 / 18 ~ 24 / 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 23/5 23/5 23/7 | $\begin{aligned} & 23 / 1723 / 1824 / 3 \\ & 31 / 1547 / 1349 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 33/6 34/4 35/7 |
| 24/4 24/4 26/22 | 61/21 78/13 | 40/17 40/23 51/18 |
| 27/9 27/19 28/8 | person's [1] 102/15 | 56/12 77/7 103/17 |
| 28/9 29/5 29/12 | persons [3] 108/15 | pointed [2] 22/21 |
| 30/17 30/19 30/23 | 108/18 108/20 | 57/15 |
| 39/1 66/13 91/13 | perspective [5] | pointing [2] 18/10 |
| 97/5 | 22/8 22/10 25/8 $\mathbf{2 5 / 1 7} 36 / 3$ | 31/1 <br> points [2] 35/2 |
| percentage [30] | phaseout [1] 28/4 | per/7 |
| 17/13 17/14 19/12 | phases [2] 25/22 | policy [10] 2/3 |
| 20/5 21/5 27/21 | $25 / 22$ | $20 / 122 / 525 / 17$ |
| 36/22 38/7 39/13 | phone [2] 16/10 | 26/11 29/15 31/15 |
| 41/19 43/8 43/23 | 16/10 | 46/21 80/5 |
| 59/11 66/4 66/11 | physically [1] 83/1 | poll [1] 17/17 |
| 70/12 81/12 89/7 | pick [1] 106/7 | popular [1] 100/8 |
| 92/7 92/21 94/16 | picked [1] 55/17 | position [2] 50/19 |
| 95/2 95/10 100/22 | place [5] 16/13 | 72/1 |
| 101/4 101/6 101/16 | 31/16 35/19 41/14 | possibility [3] |
| percentages [11] | $47 / 5$ | 83/10 87/13 87/21 |
| 4/23 59/12 60/1 | places [1] 18/10 | possible [1] 102/8 |
| 67/2 73/3 88/12 | plaintiff [4] 51/9 | possibly [2] 98/10 |
| 88/21 92/8 92/20 | 51/11 52/7 52/9 | 98/19 |
| 93/2 100/4 | play [3] 83/8 83/8 | posted [1] 97/13 |
| perception [1] | $102 / 2$ | Poverty [4] 19/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31 / 22 \\ & \text { perhaps [1] } 77 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | $51 / 19$ | practice [5] 2/19 |
| permanent [2] 24/6 | please [4] 4/17 5/5 | 3/5 75/18 77/9 |

practice... [1] 82/17 practiced [1] 39/20 precipitous [1] 63/2 predict [1] 34/15 preliminary [2] 50/13 50/14 preparing [1] 21/10 present [4] 5/8 5/22 7/2 8/5
pretty [5] 32/23
37/21 43/13 60/21 94/9
previous [2] 12/14 21/12
Previously [1] 18/21
primarily [2] 36/16 75/23
primary [2] 81/5 99/17
printed [1] 108/13 prior [1] 30/15
private [6] 2/19 3/5 37/14 75/19 77/9 94/6
pro [1] 57/19
probably [23] 21/5 26/5 27/6 31/7 32/2 33/8 37/3 39/9 40/5 42/8 45/9 47/1 $47 / 5$ 62/14 62/23 66/16

68/10 75/13 81/8 88/17 89/11 90/11 94/2
problem [1] 107/11 problems [1] 16/10 proceedings [1]
108/6
productive [1] 77/6 PROFESSOR [8] 2/6 2/6 3/1 6/9 8/6 42/13 55/1 57/15
program [2] 2/14 14/7
programmed [1] 47/16
promise [1] 7/21 proponent [1]
71/20
proportion [1]
93/14
proposal [2] 60/9 60/17
proposed [3] 46/11 56/9 86/8
Protection [1] 33/2
proven [1] 73/18
provide [2] 12/20 76/6
provision [4] 74/17 79/1 79/15 82/1
public [10] 3/18
12/16 12/20 96/14

97/14 103/18 103/21 104/2
106/23 109/11
published [1] 43/21
pull [2] 36/21 57/22 pulled [3] 30/7
97/11 97/16
pulling [1] 90/2
purposes [2] 77/14 79/11
put [29] 15/9 20/18 31/15 31/17 31/19
39/8 41/15 45/9
49/10 51/1 52/21
52/23 54/16 54/17
54/19 57/13 68/8
71/18 72/13 74/11
74/17 82/4 82/22
86/17 88/7 94/20
96/12 101/3 105/22 puts [2] 58/14 75/6 putting [14] 17/18 35/12 40/3 45/19 59/3 68/20 71/20 72/22 74/12 81/6 81/15 81/16 84/21 98/1

## Q

question [15] 32/12 34/11 37/3 42/18 55/2 70/5 76/2 76/4 76/10 77/8 77/8

| Q | rarely [1] 68/10 | 65/22 66/15 67/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| question... [4] | rata [1] 57/19 | 67/12 67/19 77/12 |
| 80/20 96/23 101/22 | rate [1] 22/6 | 80/2 |
| 102/5 | rates [3] 20/7 20/17 | recently [1] 77/23 |
| questions [11] 35/9 | 108/21 | recognize [1] 4/10 |
| 40/22 56/20 69/19 | rationally [1] 36/10 | recognizing [1] 4/8 |
| 70/2 71/8 96/1 | read [2] 20/6 104/1 | recommend [7] |
| 96/18 103/10 | reading [2] 60/20 | 26/5 97/23 98/11 |
| 103/11 103/20 | 66/3 | 100/23 101/13 |
| quick [1] 42/15 | ready [2] 4/2 42/22 | 101/14 101/15 |
| quickly [1] 19/9 | real [3] 8/15 42/15 | recommended [2] |
| quit [1] 53/13 | 76/13 | 54/17 54/19 |
| quite [3] 60/6 72/1 | reality [1] 58/10 | reconsidering [1] |
| 78/3 | realize [3] 24/9 | 72/1 |
| quorum [9] 11/17 | 27/4 42/4 | record [1] 4/14 |
| 11/22 34/19 34/23 | really [19] 4/15 | Records [1] 30/8 |
| 91/20 105/5 105/6 | 17/7 18/13 19/9 | reduce [2] 28/12 |
| 105/8 105/18 | 21/6 22/19 30/20 | 44/4 |
| R | 50/17 68/1 68/19 | refing |
| Rachel [10] 7/12 | 80/4 86/23 87/1 | refining [1] 44/22 |
| 8/14 8/15 14/23 | 87/11 95/1 105/23 | reflected [1] 31/18 |
| 39/23 40/1 74/7 | rearing [1] 43/7 | refrigerator [1] |
| 75/13 81/2 106/6 | reason [1] 97/16 | 25/6 |
| racking [2] 80/13 | reasonable [1] | refund [1] 25/1 |
| 80/21 | 92/21 | regard [2] 35/12 |
| raise [5] 15/5 40/9 | reasons [6] 41/18 | 99/13 |
| 40/16 68/10 70/3 | 44/10 44/21 81/5 | regarding [4] 16/1 |
| raising [1] 15/6 | 84/23 87/18 | 94/13 96/1 96/18 |
| range [3] 38/11 | received [4] 13/6 | regardless [1] 67/2 |
| 38/14 101/4 | 14/3 93/9 93/11 | register [1] 15/11 |
| ranges [1] 101/2 | receiving [8] 30/2 | regulations [1] |

$\mathbf{R}$
regulations... [1]
50/21
related [2] 36/10 58/7
relates [1] 36/16 relating [3] 18/20 97/4 99/14
Relations [1] 2/9 relationship [1] 102/19
relative [2] 108/17 108/19
rely [1] 21/13
remaining [1] 19/21
remember [4] 18/5 24/17 62/20 90/8 remind [1] 4/17 reminder [1] 12/11 rename [1] 14/22 replace [1] 9/16 Report [1] 30/8 reported [1] 108/6 Reporter [6] 1/17 3/7 4/13 108/4 109/2 109/10 REPORTER'S [1] 108/1
REPORTING [2] 3/8 109/1
representation [1]

39/16
representing [1] 77/9
requirement [2] 44/9 44/12
requires [3] 44/13
100/10 100/18
Rescue [1] 22/22 research [2] 2/3 25/2
reserve [52] 16/3
19/19 20/12 21/14
44/11 44/19 44/23
45/2 45/19 46/18
48/13 48/20 51/15
54/16 55/11 62/4
63/9 64/3 64/12
65/2 65/8 68/1 68/6
68/12 68/22 69/1
72/18 75/5 75/20
76/17 76/20 77/3
79/7 81/7 83/7 84/9
85/16 85/22 88/5 89/14 90/9 98/8
98/9 98/15 98/18
98/23 99/1 99/10
99/15 102/2 102/14 102/23
resigned [1] 9/12
Resources [2] 2/15 2/17
respond [2] 69/22

## 71/22

response [33] 5/11
5/14 5/17 6/2 6/5
6/8 6/17 6/19 6/21
7/5 7/7 7/23 8/3
8/11 8/13 8/19 8/23
9/9 10/9 10/11
14/10 15/20 40/12
40/18 42/20 56/21
59/9 69/23 95/12
95/22 96/3 103/12 103/22
responses [2]
105/17 106/1
rest [2] 24/16 29/6 restaurant [1]
47/13
result [5] 33/22
58/17 62/6 65/4 66/9
results [1] 108/21
return [2] 24/17 24/22
returns [1] 27/5 review [1] 13/14 revising [1] 16/2 right [52] 4/1 4/3 7/9 7/17 7/20 7/20 11/14 11/15 13/10 14/11 15/15 15/23
24/17 29/13 30/23 34/16 35/1 35/8

| $\mathbf{R}$ | 56/2 | 79/15 80/6 86/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| right... [34] 35/23 | rounded [1] 64/9 | 98/16 99 |
| 37/9 38/2 38/11 | rounding [2] 58/3 | says [3] 49/21 55/3 |
| 41/5 47/2 47/21 | 64/4 <br> rule [2] 76/12 90/4 | 90/4 |
| 49/21 50/3 52/22 | rules [2] 9/21 59/6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { scenario [10] } 37 / 23 \\ \mathbf{6 0 / 5 6 1 / 1 9 6 2 / 2 3} \end{gathered}$ |
| 56/1 56/1 70/13 | S | 63/4 63/7 6 |
| 71/6 74/5 76/22 | safe [1] 94/9 | /20 |
| 78/8 92/4 94/5 94/5 | said [6] 53/23 70/10 | scenarios [2] 60/4 |
| 94/8 98/6 99/3 99/7 | 70/16 70/19 92/6 | 65/3 <br> schedule [17] 16/5 |
| 103/9 103/13 | 93/8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { schedule [17] 16/ } \\ 20 / 1443 / 1045 / 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 103/17 105/8 | same [10] 17/21 | 47/19 49/2 56/9 |
| 106/16 106/21 | 41/7 41/18 43/13 | 56/11 66/23 74/13 |
| nd | 53/17 58/17 58/17 | 81/16 82/5 85/12 |
| right-hand | 65/5 65/16 65/18 | 96/9 97/9 97/11 |
|  | Sarah [2] 3/13 5/10 | 98/1 |
| role [1] 19/2 | save [1] 41/6 | scheduled [1] |
| roll [1] 5/5 | $\text { sav }[35] \quad 4 / 194 / 21$ | 105/21 |
| rolling [1] 92/3 | say $5 / 8 / 97 / 97 / 20$ | school [2] 2/7 38/10 |
| Roman [2] 29/3 | 13/20 17/7 19/13 | Scott [1] 12/15 screen [1] 31/1 |
| 37/15 | 20/6 24/22 28/19 | scribbled [1] 48/2 |
| rotating [1] 38/4 | 35/21 41/17 48/12 | $\text { scroll [9] } 19 / 10$ |
| Rothbarth [2] | 53/18 53/20 69/10 | $\begin{array}{ll} 28 / 2141 / 341 / 7 \end{array}$ |
| 64/19 65/11 | 70/22 70/22 72/5 | 41/10 44/7 64/23 |
| rough [1] 39/8 | 72/9 77/2 77/15 | 65/15 65/19 |
| roughly [7] 36/23 | 78/11 78/21 79/11 | second [6] 14/18 |
| 37/6 44/5 62/1 | 88/12 89/4 89/18 | 14/19 14/23 18/2 |
| 63/23 64/8 79/12 round [3] 47/20 | 89/22 90/17 90/19 | 26/18 74/16 |
| round [3] 47/20 48/4 56/2 | 93/19 94/8 | section [1] 85/5 |
| 48/4 56/2 ${ }^{\text {round-off [2] 48/4 }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { saying [9] } 4 / 19 \\ & 68 / 1678 / 2079 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | Security [2] 37/15 |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | \| 45/19 46/13 46/18 | 99/15 102/1 102/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Security... [1] | 48/13 48/20 51/15 | 102/20 102/23 |
| 93/16 | 54/15 55/11 62/4 | Senior [1] 3/12 |
| see [46] 4/9 8/2 | 63/9 64/3 64/11 | sense [4] 56/4 76/9 |
| 11/8 16/22 21/14 | 65/2 65/8 68/1 68/6 | 76/10 90/13 |
| 27/11 29/7 29/13 | 68/12 68/22 69/1 | sensitive [1] 94/17 |
| 30/15 30/21 31/2 | 72/18 75/5 75/19 | sent [3] 13/1 14/4 |
| 32/8 33/7 35/6 | 76/7 76/17 76/20 | 36/15 |
| 39/18 40/20 48/1 | 77/3 79/6 81/7 83/7 | sentence [1] 41/11 |
| 48/3 48/8 48/11 | 84/9 85/16 85/22 | separate [1] 101/19 |
| 51/9 51/21 52/8 | 88/4 89/14 90/9 | September [2] 12/9 |
| 54/9 54/21 56/5 | 98/8 98/9 98/14 | 106/8 |
| 61/19 62/5 62/10 | 98/18 99/1 99/9 | September 30th [1] |
| 63/2 63/7 64/6 | 99/15 102/1 102/14 | 12/9 |
| 64/11 64/12 65/4 | 102/20 102/23 | sequence [1] 58/19 |
| 65/9 65/16 65/17 | self-support [54] | set [2] 67/3 105/23 |
| 66/5 66/8 66/19 | 16/2 19/19 20/12 | settle [1] 92/20 |
| 69/21 84/12 90/23 | 21/13 44/11 44/19 | seven [2] 74/19 |
| 91/19 104/2 | 44/22 45/2 45/19 | 101/10 |
| seeing [2] 17/9 58/5 | 46/13 46/18 48/13 | several [1] 73/1 |
| seem [2] 74/4 81/23 | 48/20 51/15 54/15 | shading [1] 52/23 |
| seems [4] 39/22 | 55/11 62/4 63/9 | share [9] 48/10 |
| 77/5 79/1 106/15 | 64/3 64/11 65/2 | 49/14 50/10 51/6 |
| seen [7] 9/1 13/9 | 65/8 68/1 68/6 | 51/23 54/10 57/19 |
| 77/1 80/7 80/8 | 68/12 68/22 69/1 | 57/19 86/13 |
| 80/14 80/22 | 72/18 75/5 75/19 | shared [10] 24/12 |
| segment [1] 38/6 | 76/7 76/17 76/20 | 98/10 98/14 98/19 |
| select [2] 28/4 | 77/3 79/6 81/7 83/7 | 98/22 99/4 99/18 |
| 103/5 | 84/9 85/16 85/22 | 99/23 102/3 103/2 |
| self [54] 16/2 19/19 | 88/4 89/14 90/9 | sharing [3] 58/13 |
| 20/12 21/13 44/11 | 98/8 98/9 98/14 | 84/18 97/17 |
| 44/19 44/22 45/2 | 98/18 99/1 99/9 | she [21] 4/12 6/10 |


| S | 43/22 67/20 | slightly [2] 56/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6/22 6/23 | side [5] 33/18 33/19 | 93/21 |
| 8/21 17/11 27/4 | 40/15 49/21 63/13 | slipped [1] 32/5 |
| 29/12 29/21 29/22 | sided [1] 69/4 | slippery [1] 80/1 |
| 30/21 36/5 47/4 | significant [1] 37/1 | slope [1] 80/16 |
| 48/4 52/14 53/5 | significantly [1] | slowly [1] 30/5 |
| 53/11 53/18 64/1 | 82/20 | small [4] 39/13 |
| 72/13 105/1 | similar [2] 53/11 | 41/19 62/10 64/21 |
| she's [3] 9/23 47/4 | 54/11 | SMITH [3] 3/19 |
| 48/3 | simple [7] 73/23 | 10/2 104/5 |
| sheets [1] 85/10 | 83/18 87/14 91/11 | so [203] |
| SHERMAN [8] 2/8 | 91/14 91/17 100/22 | Social [2] 37/14 |
| 5/21 14/16 35/16 | simpler [3] 83/18 | 93/16 |
| 72/21 75/15 86/21 | 85/2 85/17 | sole [1] 98/7 |
| 87/5 | simplicity [1] 87/4 | some [40] 11/5 17/8 |
| short [2] 68/3 98/16 | simplified [1] 86/15 | 18/9 19/22 21/9 |
| shorten [1] 85/6 | simplify [2] 90/15 | 22/23 23/13 24/6 |
| shorter [1] 84/1 | 92/8 | 28/15 29/18 30/5 |
| should [11] 13/20 | since [2] 39/12 60/8 | 31/12 31/16 32/5 |
| 40/8 40/16 48/18 | single [2] 43/12 | 35/13 39/3 39/18 |
| 49/22 50/1 52/2 | 44/2 | 44/19 45/10 45/22 |
| 55/9 55/15 57/16 | sir [1] 104/10 | 46/7 47/4 49/10 |
| 75/14 | situation [5] 34/14 | 51/13 51/19 58/12 |
| shouldn't [1] 50/2 | 36/18 39/5 67/8 | 59/1 59/3 66/10 |
| show [5] 20/8 30/6 | 79/2 | 66/20 67/17 68/8 |
| 43/2 45/12 56/17 | situations [1] 84/2 | 69/1 72/4 72/16 |
| showed [2] 32/1 | six [6] 20/10 23/6 | 73/9 78/3 81/13 |
| 38/18 | 24/15 74/18 89/12 | 82/19 96/20 |
| showing [3] 30/9 | 89/23 | somebody [6] 19/1 |
| 64/19 90/8 | skills [1] 31/5 | 20/18 44/8 79/7 |
| shows [7] 21/9 25/2 | skip [2] 48/15 70/9 | 81/4 82/12 |
| 30/12 31/4 31/6 | slight [1] 93/21 | something [17] |


| $\mathbf{S}$ | 34/7 40/17 73/20 | 24/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| something... [17] | 87/9 96/15 104/3 <br> 104/5 104/9 104/12 | started [2] 81/17 $81 / 18$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}19 / 1 & 19 / 13 & 30 / 7 \\ 31 / 7 & 31 / 20 & 33 / 20\end{array}$ | 104/16 107/2 | starts [1] 23/19 |
| 31/7 31/20 33/20 $45 / 7$ 53/15 $60 / 20$ | 104/16 107/2 ${ }^{\text {SPEAKER [1] } 2 / 2}$ | $\text { state [17] } 1 / 31 /$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45/7 53/15 60/20 } \\ & \text { 69/7 69/9 70/14 } \end{aligned}$ | SPEAKER [1] 2/2 speaking [1] 36/2 | 2/17 4/23 25/16 |
| 73/16 89/18 90/17 | spell [1] 86/23 | 37/19 37/22 42/1 |
| 96/5 101/8 | spendable [6] 28/23 | 43/20 44/20 63/19 |
| Sometimes [1] | 32/13 34/1 34/3 | 77/2 80/8 98/13 |
| 73/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 34 / 862 / 2 \\ & \text { spent [1] } 25 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 108/2 108/5 108/8 State's [1] 44/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { somewhat [3] 72/3 } \\ & 72 / 777 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | split [2] 37/21 38/1 | State-Level [1] |
| somewhere [3] | splitting [1] 37/18 | 2/17 |
| 60/15 88/13 95/6 | spoke [1] 6/10 | statement [1] 39/19 |
| soon [2] 72/10 | sponsored [1] | statements [1] |
| 72/11 | 16/16 | 108/14 |
| sorry [14] 7/14 8/17 | spot [2] 39/8 92/14 | states [29] 25/7 |
| 16/11 22/23 34/21 | spousal [1] 80/16 | 25/14 28/15 28/18 |
| 49/23 54/23 55/9 | spouse [4] 78/22 | 36/20 44/13 45/23 |
| 64/2 74/8 75/13 | 79/3 79/10 79/17 | 46/9 46/12 50/13 |
| 91/23 105/15 | spreadsheet [4] | 51/13 52/19 58/6 |
| 106/13 | 48/10 54/5 57/4 | 58/11 67/7 76/13 |
| sort [9] 23/13 53/17 | 57/7 | 76/17 76/20 86/3 |
| 58/12 59/1 59/3 | SSR [6] 50/11 51/7 | 86/11 86/19 93/10 |
| 71/21 72/13 85/9 | 51/23 54/18 54/20 | 93/15 94/15 97/7 |
| $86 / 21$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 87 / 15 \\ \text { Staff [4] } & 2 / 113 / 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97/10 100/7 100/21 } \\ & 100 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| source [1] 73/11 | 3/12 3/15 | statewide [1] 39/1 |
| South [3] 98/4 | standpoint [2] | STEINWINDER |
| 101/16 101/18 | 75/20 85/23 | [6] 2/19 7/8 7/11 |
| speak [15] 10/5 | Starkey [1] 6/18 start [3] 4/7 16/13 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 7 / 177 / 1814 / 20 \\ \text { stems [1] 77/8 } \end{array}$ |


| S | submit [1] 107/5 | 45/19 46/13 46/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STEPHANIE [9] | subsistence [3] | 47/18 48/13 48/20 |
| 3/9 9/2 9/13 9/17 | 44/14 48/13 70/9 | 51/15 54/15 54/18 |
| 11/17 13/4 34/18 | substantially [1] | 54/19 55/11 62/4 |
| 92/6 105/4 | 28/12 | 63/9 64/3 64/11 |
| Stephen [2] 8/9 | subtract [2] 63/23 | 65/2 65/8 68/1 68/6 |
| 8/12 | 64/3 | 68/12 68/22 69/1 |
| steps [1] 47/20 | such [6] 18/11 25/5 | 72/18 73/14 75/5 |
| Stewart [2] 3/13 | 25/14 44/18 99/5 | 75/19 76/7 76/17 |
| 5/10 | 108/19 | 76/20 77/3 78/23 |
| still [16] 12/9 17/13 | sufficient [4] 51/5 | 79/6 81/7 83/7 84/9 |
| 34/19 59/23 60/12 | 65/6 65/7 79/8 | 85/16 85/22 88/4 |
| 67/8 68/19 83/17 | suggest [2] 95/5 | 89/14 90/9 96/19 |
| 83/23 87/14 87/17 | 100/2 | 97/4 98/8 98/9 |
| 90/23 91/14 91/16 | suggested [4] 18/22 | 98/14 98/18 99/1 |
| 93/18 106/2 | 49/5 53/17 85/11 | 99/9 99/15 102/1 |
| stone [1] 105/23 | suggesting [1] 68/4 | 102/14 102/20 |
| stop [7] 32/7 32/10 | suggestion [3] | 102/23 108/9 |
| 34/18 59/7 69/18 | 58/23 87/13 95/9 | suppose [1] 80/13 |
| 75/12 99/22 | suggestions [1] | Supreme [3] 3/10 |
| straw [1] 17/17 | $31 / 16$ $\text { sum [3] } 55 / 355 / 9$ | 3/13 12/6 |
| streamlined [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{sum}[3] 55 / 355 / 9 \\ & 57 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sure [17] 11/7 24/7 } \\ & 24 / 1226 / 8 ~ 32 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| strong [1] 40/20 | summer [1] 60/10 | 35/20 35/21 36/2 |
| strongly [3] 40/7 | supervisor [1] | 73/2 77/4 79/5 |
| 40/10 40/15 | 38/12 | 79/18 80/18 80/19 |
| structure [1] 88/10 | support [72] 1/2 | 85/6 90/13 96/9 |
| structured [2] 68/9 | 1/15 2/14 2/17 2/22 | surprise [1] 74/6 |
| 85/10 | 4/5 16/2 16/5 19/19 | surprised [3] 60/14 |
| stuff [1] 54/7 | 20/12 21/13 25/12 | 60/19 74/1 |
| sub [1] 37/7 | 42/2 44/3 44/11 | switch [1] 35/5 |


| S | 26/7 26/7 26/20 | 34/7 84/8 84/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| synonymous... [1] | 27/1 27/4 28/16 | 99/12 |
| 32/21 | 28/22 29/5 29/14 | Terry [1] 2/11 |
| T |  | test [1] |
| table [5] 21/9 25/19 | 35/11 36/7 37/1 | 7 |
| 31/11 45/6 101/7 | 37/19 37/21 38/1 | 29/21 31/3 32/20 |
| take [10] 16/7 | 38/5 39/17 41/8 | 35/14 51/1 51/10 |
| 18/13 49/22 57/23 | 41/16 42/4 42/10 | 51/23 52/8 57/11 |
| 63/22 68/14 82/20 | 43/3 43/5 43/9 | 62/7 66/16 67/19 |
| 84/6 93/5 102/22 | 43/17 43/19 59/19 | 76/23 83/15 84/3 |
| taken [2] 25/7 34/4 | 62/3 | 89/20 90/12 90/18 |
| takes [1] 47/17 | taxes [10] 17/16 | 93/15 94/3 94/9 |
| taking [4] 18/2 | 19/23 22/19 25/2 | thank [64] 4/3 5/23 |
| 44/10 76/1 94/14 | 28/7 44/6 61/23 | 6/12 6/15 7/3 8/6 |
| talk [9] 22/9 22/20 | 63/16 94/16 95/7 | 8/9 9/4 10/7 10/16 |
| 26/10 28/16 38/20 | taxpayer [1] 43/13 | 10/17 10/20 10/22 |
| 41/12 44/1 75/14 | teacher [1] 38/10 | 10/23 11/4 11/11 |
| 96/9 | tell [1] 66/3 | 11/13 11/16 12/3 |
| talked [1] 29/23 | temporary [7] | 12/10 12/23 13/7 |
| talking [16] 4/18 | 18/19 22/23 23/23 | 13/8 13/10 13/22 |
| 17/14 42/10 44/23 | 26/8 26/19 34/14 | 14/8 14/15 14/17 |
| 45/3 46/17 70/7 | 35/23 | 14/21 15/1 15/3 |
| 79/11 81/6 81/18 | tend [1] 39/14 | 15/8 15/9 15/15 |
| 88/22 88/23 89/7 | tends [1] 78/1 | 15/21 17/7 21/1 |
| 91/8 98/7 98/17 | Tennessee [1] | 21/2 36/13 39/6 |
| $\boldsymbol{t a x}[51]$ 18/19 20/7 | 51/13 | 40/1 42/22 53/10 |
| 20/17 22/6 22/16 | term [8] 32/14 | 56/3 71/6 82/11 |
| 22/23 23/2 23/3 | 32/18 32/21 32/23 | 87/22 87/23 103/14 |
| 23/10 23/13 23/15 | 32/23 33/7 62/2 | 104/8 104/11 |
| 23/18 23/22 24/17 | 99/5 | 104/13 104/14 |
| 24/22 25/1 25/21 | terms [5] 33/19 | 104/18 104/20 |


| T | 94/2 95/5 97/18 | 57/21 57/23 59/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| thank... [9] 105/7 | 100/10 100/19 | 59/13 59/22 61 |
| 106/16 106/21 | 103/14 104/18 | 61/12 61/15 61/17 |
| 107/8 107/9 107/13 | 105/19 106/2 | 62/9 64/2 64/23 |
| 107/16 107/17 | 106/11 106/12 | 65/9 65/15 65/17 |
| 107/19 | their [24] 23/19 | 65/19 67/3 67/14 |
| thanks [2] 9/7 | 24/22 25/6 27/11 | 75/3 76/15 77/7 |
| 104/17 | 27/12 27/13 28/13 | 77/14 77/23 78/4 |
| that [424] | 28/17 28/17 29/7 | 79/21 81/18 83/14 |
| that's [79] 7/11 | 49/1 63/11 63/15 | 84/3 85/5 85/14 |
| 7/15 7/20 9/18 | 63/15 74/23 75/1 | 85/21 86/1 86/3 |
| 11/15 16/21 16/23 | 75/4 76/20 83/21 | 86/16 87/17 88/3 |
| 18/14 19/17 20/1 | 86/19 89/22 94/20 | 89/22 91/19 91/21 |
| 21/5 21/23 26/8 | 95/7 101/11 | 92/19 92/22 94/1 |
| 29/2 32/17 32/23 | them [11] 21/13 | 98/9 98/10 98/19 |
| 33/6 34/9 37/2 37/5 | 42/3 54/7 58/8 65/4 | 99/22 100/1 100/15 |
| 38/2 38/14 44/21 | 74/5 85/5 87/1 | 101/3 101/5 101/10 |
| 46/21 47/5 47/9 | 88/18 107/5 107/5 | 102/2 102/4 102/5 |
| 48/8 49/4 50/4 | then [100] 18/17 | 102/10 102/11 |
| 50/23 52/1 54/2 | 21/16 21/19 21/22 | 102/21 107/4 |
| 54/10 55/6 55/8 | 22/11 27/5 27/21 | 107/15 |
| 56/12 57/8 58/1 | 27/22 27/23 28/3 | theoretical [3] |
| 59/14 59/22 60/21 | 30/4 30/5 36/8 37/6 | 100/11 100/13 |
| 63/10 64/6 65/10 | 37/11 38/6 38/7 | 100/17 |
| 67/13 72/12 72/13 | 38/15 40/22 42/23 | there [41] 12/18 |
| 72/23 73/1 73/4 | 43/9 46/19 47/14 | 13/1 13/15 14/23 |
| 77/4 78/10 80/5 | 47/16 48/11 48/19 | 17/3 17/22 19/1 |
| 81/17 81/22 81/22 | 49/8 49/13 50/9 | 19/11 31/20 32/6 |
| 82/7 82/7 82/18 | 50/9 51/3 52/11 | 32/7 32/11 34/12 |
| 82/18 84/16 84/19 | 52/16 53/2 54/8 | 41/11 42/7 46/8 |
| 86/8 86/14 89/4 | 54/13 54/19 56/5 | 48/9 49/3 50/2 |
| 89/16 92/18 93/4 | 57/1 57/15 57/17 | 52/23 53/1 59/7 |

there... [19] 60/9 60/12 60/19 66/21 67/17 69/18 72/4 73/1 75/12 76/16 77/10 81/13 85/7 86/7 88/7 89/7
91/11 96/22 99/22 there's [38] 17/4
18/18 21/9 25/13
25/15 28/4 29/10
31/21 32/2 32/22
38/22 40/20 41/7 43/14 44/12 45/17 51/2 51/19 54/3
54/6 54/21 59/11 59/15 61/5 62/1 62/14 63/20 64/1 64/3 66/2 66/8 66/19 69/15 83/10 89/21 96/20 97/20 99/3
thereof [1] 108/21 these [11] 22/15 36/23 46/12 60/4 60/22 61/1 62/5 65/3 67/19 71/16 73/19
they [93] 16/18 17/21 20/11 20/12 24/5 24/22 26/16 26/19 27/5 27/7

27/10 27/12 27/16 28/6 28/16 29/4 29/7 29/8 32/8 33/1 33/3 33/4 33/14 37/18 37/21 38/1 38/3 38/13 38/15 38/23 39/17 42/2 42/6 46/12 46/12 46/15 51/13 51/16 52/20 52/21 52/22 52/23 56/16 57/7 58/12 59/21 62/13 63/14 65/16 67/15 70/16 70/21 70/22 73/14 73/15 73/17 73/19 74/3 74/22 74/23 75/2 75/4 76/8 76/14 76/16 77/15 77/21 77/22 78/1 78/2 78/2 78/17 78/18 79/8 79/23 80/1 84/4 84/5 85/21 92/15 94/15 95/9 97/8 97/12 97/13 97/16 97/17 98/5 101/1 101/17 102/8 102/10 102/11 thing [16] 24/9 27/15 30/6 47/2 48/21 53/11 55/16 58/4 71/5 79/21

82/8 84/13 94/17 94/18 94/22 96/8 things [5] 45/11 46/1 86/23 103/16 105/9
think [87] 5/19
9/20 11/15 13/13
13/21 16/9 17/9
18/6 19/4 20/18
20/19 22/7 24/16
25/15 26/6 26/16
32/9 32/16 33/16 34/10 37/3 38/7 39/10 39/14 40/2 40/23 41/1 41/4 41/13 42/13 42/21 47/1 50/1 50/4 50/18 50/22 56/11 68/18 68/22 68/23 69/5 69/8 69/14 69/15 72/2 73/2 73/5 73/17 73/22 74/10 76/11 77/20 78/8 78/19 80/14 80/21 81/4 81/16 81/20 81/21 82/21 83/10 84/16 84/21 87/2 90/2 91/18 91/22 92/5 92/18 92/21 93/13 95/9 96/7 97/12 97/15 98/5 98/12 99/12

| Think... [8] 101/17 |
| :--- | 101/21 103/17

104/21 105/2 105/9 105/20 107/4
thinking [8] 38/21
41/19 42/6 53/14
59/2 68/18 80/3 80/16
third [6] 49/20
59/23 84/17 98/10
102/4 102/21
this [132]
Thompson [2] 5/13 9/11
those [26] 14/13
15/8 15/10 17/4
23/1 28/2 28/20
31/8 36/6 36/7
37/11 38/4 39/15
39/19 41/21 45/14
47/22 48/2 60/1
64/20 66/4 71/2 83/2 86/18 98/8 107/6
though [10] 7/12 7/16 24/5 31/23 68/4 76/16 77/6
79/3 98/17 107/1 thought [8] 16/20 19/14 31/16 50/16 68/8 83/5 93/5

96/20
thoughts [2] 71/13
106/12
three [23] 4/19 4/20
4/21 17/23 21/19
21/20 21/22 22/14
36/6 61/11 61/14
61/17 62/15 64/13
66/19 81/19 91/4
94/11 98/5 98/21
101/1 101/9 101/10
three-child [3]
62/15 64/13 66/19
threshold [1] 95/3
through [3] 12/6
19/8 26/15
Thursday [3] 12/21 total [3] 53/15 105/21 106/4
Tiffany [3] 10/7 10/10 104/21
time [28] 5/4 7/21
11/23 13/12 16/6 19/18 41/6 44/8
44/10 58/13 63/14 68/17 78/3 84/5
84/18 88/7 91/19
94/23 95/20 96/12
97/17 97/21 99/6
100/14 101/2
103/23 104/6
106/22
time-sharing [3]

58/13 84/18 97/17 times [1] 73/10
TINA [3] 3/22 10/23 104/15 tires [1] 25/5 title [2] 29/3 93/16 today [4] 12/19
17/5 59/16 107/2 together [2] 59/22
76/22
told [1] 52/3
too [7] 31/8 42/3
46/4 46/8 54/7 93/5 101/4
top [3] 17/3 98/15 99/10

## 53/22 100/3

towards [1] 40/3
track [1] 60/21
traditional [1]
102/18
transcript [4] 13/13
13/15 14/12 108/14 transparency [1]
72/23
transparent [1] 45/3
treatment [1] 79/20
treats [1] 80/8
trial [6] 36/2 36/4
73/12 73/16 75/17
trial... [1] 77/14 tricky [1] 46/5 tried [1] 24/5 tripled [1] 26/21 trouble [1] 50/12 true [4] 13/4 21/6 93/10 108/13 truly [2] 17/11 50/17
try [1] 102/7
trying [7] 4/13
33/10 34/22 46/22
73/11 99/12 99/14 tune [1] 19/6 turn [3] 16/5
103/18 103/21
Tuscaloosa [2] 2/7 3/3
two [31] 17/22
21/16 21/18 21/22
22/13 27/22 59/19
61/3 61/7 61/10
61/13 61/16 63/8
64/7 64/21 66/18
67/1 74/11 75/16
81/18 83/11 85/10
91/1 91/3 93/19
94/3 99/13 99/14 100/10 101/7
101/23
two-child [1] 64/21
two-page [1] 101/7 type [4] 36/18 79/2 99/18 99/23
typical [1] 67/8 typo [1] 55/8
typos [3] 17/8 47/4 82/19
uncommon [1] 98/4 under [1] 55/22 underneath [1] 19/7
understand [6] 36/7 39/7 49/7 50/23 76/7 82/10 understood [2] 79/6 79/19
University [2] 2/7 3/3
unless [6] 14/2 27/12 40/21 42/14 69/7 72/6
unlikely [1] $62 / 21$
unmute [8] 5/7 6/23 15/11 15/18 16/7 40/10 40/17 70/3
unmuting [1] 16/9
until [7] 12/9 23/19
24/21 27/4 48/17
73/14 95/1
unusual [1] 24/19
up [32] 16/15 16/22

20/9 22/18 28/8 30/3 32/11 34/17 42/17 43/3 43/10 46/21 55/17 58/16 59/16 60/14 60/18 70/15 70/16 72/12 84/22 90/4 91/2
91/4 91/11 93/23
95/2 95/3 97/13
99/23 102/22 106/2 updated [1] 56/10 updating [3] 16/2 16/4 45/1
us [16] 9/22 11/11
12/1 12/8 16/18 35/5 36/5 38/18 40/10 41/2 71/22 95/11 96/6 105/3 106/18 106/23
use [45] 20/2 21/14
33/1 33/3 33/7 33/8
33/23 43/10 43/11
43/16 50/16 51/12
51/13 53/14 57/6
61/6 61/9 61/12
61/15 62/2 66/11
68/11 74/19 76/13
76/20 83/11 83/14
84/4 84/5 84/8 87/1
88/6 88/8 88/22
89/21 90/3 90/6
90/19 95/5 95/10
use... [5] 99/5 100/7
100/22 102/9
102/12
used [6] 49/19
74/22 75/2 79/2 100/19 100/20
user [1] 87/1
using [10] 18/14
32/20 32/21 33/2
48/4 53/3 56/10
65/23 83/23 91/12 usual [1] 108/21 usually [7] 25/3 25/3 25/10 28/2 67/11 67/13 100/4 V
variable [4] 21/15 22/6 49/12 97/18 varies [1] 26/1
vary [1] 17/19
vast [2] 62/12 93/8
vehicle [1] 25/6
VENOHR [11] 2/3
9/23 16/6 35/22 41/1 72/3 72/9 73/8 74/8 96/4 97/1 verify [4] 9/13 10/1 12/4 12/12
Vermont [1] 25/14 versus [3] 29/16

34/8 81/15
very [23] 15/21 17/10 25/21 26/3
28/4 28/21 39/11
41/1 46/13 50/8
62/20 65/13 73/23
76/22 76/22 83/17
83/23 85/3 89/15
89/15 101/18
101/18 103/14 via [2] 1/18 108/15 video [2] 3/8 12/5 videoconference [1] 1/19
view [2] 35/6 69/21
Virginia [1] 70/20
Virtual [1] 1/19
visible [2] 15/10 15/16
vote [4] 15/11 91/20 wanted [8] 13/9
105/5 105/8
voted [1] 15/16
voting [1] 35/2
W
wage [36] 19/18 23/11 27/10 29/8 29/22 30/13 30/18 31/9 47/10 47/15 60/7 60/13 60/13
62/21 63/5 63/12 63/14 67/10 67/12 67/23 68/10 68/13

69/17 72/11 75/21 76/6 76/21 76/21
77/18 78/5 78/12
79/14 79/22 80/1
81/9 82/3
wait [1] 96/10
want [37] 5/8 10/4
14/22 17/6 19/13
21/5 21/6 26/2
26/15 29/18 35/3
41/6 42/17 44/1
44/4 45/9 53/17
54/7 54/13 56/15
56/17 59/10 59/12
59/17 64/16 68/9
69/2 69/14 76/14
76/16 85/6 87/8
88/7 96/10 96/21
105/22 106/3
18/20 22/16 31/19
41/15 84/10 91/12 96/5
wants [5] 42/14 57/6 69/22 75/7 84/12
was [52] 1/16 8/21
12/15 14/2 14/4
15/16 16/15 17/16
17/17 23/22 27/23
27/23 31/17 33/9
34/22 37/20 39/6

| W | Wednesday [1] | 43/18 46/10 46/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| was... [35] 41/1 | 12/22 | 47/12 47/12 48/17 |
| 46/1 46/2 46/7 | week [1] 105/12 | 48/17 54/9 57/1 |
| 47/20 49/12 52/4 | weekend [1] 107/18 | 57/12 63/6 66/3 |
| 55/16 57/12 60/9 | weigh [1] 100/14 | 66/10 66/11 67/4 |
| 60/17 70/15 71/19 | weird [1] 21/11 | 68/16 68/19 70/22 |
| 72/4 72/21 80/3 | welcome [2] 11/13 | 73/17 73/22 75/6 |
| 81/13 81/23 84/3 | 106/19 | 75/21 76/4 76/12 |
| 86/21 87/2 90/8 | well [18] 9/22 13/10 | 76/19 77/4 78/1 |
| 92/5 92/12 92/13 | 16/3 16/21 30/22 | 78/6 78/20 80/5 |
| 92/14 93/3 93/9 | 34/4 40/19 77/17 | 85/19 86/10 86/21 |
| 93/11 97/17 103/4 | 77/20 81/13 81/20 | 88/8 96/1 98/2 |
| 104/21 105/1 105/3 | 87/5 93/7 93/10 | 98/16 99/1 99/5 |
| 106/13 | 96/11 103/13 105/8 | 99/12 100/6 103/3 |
| wash [2] 29/16 | 105/21 | what's [2] 34/3 |
| 29/19 | Weller [1] 8/22 | 77/6 |
| wasn't [2] 23/11 | went [2] 60/19 89/5 | whatever [4] 5/8 |
| 81/11 | were [12] 13/1 | 82/23 88/6 91/5 |
| wave [1] 4/9 | 17/22 29/8 35/17 | when [37] 4/17 |
| Waving [1] 4/11 | 36/14 36/15 44/5 | 11/22 16/20 17/22 |
| way [22] 4/21 4/23 | 58/3 70/7 78/1 | 21/10 22/20 25/11 |
| 27/18 35/13 37/1 | 78/17 81/6 | 28/16 31/1 33/3 |
| 40/21 52/20 56/18 | weren't [1] 23/9 | 33/9 40/6 42/10 |
| 59/1 60/8 71/19 | West [1] 70/20 | 43/2 43/18 45/12 |
| 72/5 72/13 76/18 | what [65] 5/2 17/4 | 47/17 48/1 51/20 |
| 80/3 85/1 86/7 | 17/14 18/12 20/1 | 54/8 61/22 63/4 |
| 90/19 92/18 97/2 | 20/16 20/19 21/4 | 64/9 64/11 66/12 |
| 97/20 101/17 | 22/8 23/21 23/21 | 67/4 67/15 68/18 |
| ways [1] 54/17 | 24/20 25/7 28/10 | 70/7 71/16 72/8 |
| we [207] | 28/22 32/8 32/16 | 73/10 76/5 77/13 |
| we'll [1] 99/16 | 33/17 36/7 36/16 | 84/18 92/13 92/15 |
| we've [1] 60/6 | 36/22 38/3 43/2 | where [45] 17/16 |


| W | while [1] 97/2 | 27/13 43/11 43/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| where... [44] 18/3 | Whitmire [1] 6/16 | 43/20 63/18 6 |
| 18/10 19/11 30/10 | who [9] 9/15 15/10 | within [1] 75/18 |
| 30/18 31/8 31/16 | 15/17 34/14 39/20 | without [4] 34/1 |
| 36/20 37/11 38/1 | 44/16 70/16 75/23 | 45/8 55/10 69/11 |
| 38/9 38/11 45/9 | 83/2 | won't [3] 60/14 |
| 46/17 47/8 49/21 | whoa [1] 24/23 <br> whoever [1] 75/7 | 68/1 71/5 <br> wonder [1] 93/2 |
| 52/16 52/21 53/20 | whoever [1] 75/7 <br> whole [9] 24/1 | wonder [1] 93/2 wonderful [1] |
| 57/4 57/7 57/8 58/13 60/21 62/14 | 25/20 31/21 68/14 | 107/10 |
| 63/1 65/21 66/5 | 82/7 82/8 93/6 93/6 | WOOD [3] 3/21 |
| 66/13 67/15 67/17 | 96/12 | 10/18 104/11 |
| 77/10 81/22 82/2 | why [4] 48/8 64/6 69/20 81/17 | word [2] 33/23 48/14 |
| 82/7 82/7 84/3 | wife [1] 79/13 | wording [2] 50 |
| 87/15 87/20 88/4 89/16 90/2 101/7 | will [33] 4/9 7/13 | 51/12 |
| 102/18 | 11/8 11/9 24/1 24/3 | work [14] 17/15 |
| whether [12] 19/4 | 24/3 24/8 24/13 | 18/17 20/3 21/6 |
| 29/17 34/11 49/13 | 24/15 24/16 26/10 | 45/16 46/23 48/18 |
| 51/4 51/14 59/17 | 28/7 32/10 35/2 | 49/3 49/4 54/4 58/7 |
| 84/8 88/22 91/15 | 35/15 40/23 51/21 | 77/22 85/10 92/22 |
| 102/1 102/9 | 62/5 63/6 71/10 | work-related [1] |
| which [27] 19/19 | 72/17 88/6 91/20 | 58/7 |
| 20/9 22/8 29/3 32/4 | 92/22 97/15 101/23 102/17 103/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { worked [2] 27/18 } \\ & 78 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43/13 43/16 51/16 | 104/2 105/12 | worker [2] 30 |
| 53/7 58/10 60/7 62/12 63/4 64/15 | 105/18 107/6 | 30/18 |
| 62/12 63/4 64/15 69/5 | William [1] 5/12 | workgroup [2] 59/2 |
| 70/21 74/13 76/19 | WILSON [2] 3/12 | 59/4 |
| 79/20 81/2 83/12 | $9 / 5$ | working [5] 37/7 63/14 77/11 78/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83/20 93/11 100/9 } \\ & 106 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | windfall [1] 27/7 withholding [6] | 63/14 77/11 78/17 102/17 |

works [3] 17/9 52/1 75/23
worksheet [55]
17/6 17/18 45/13
45/20 46/6 47/3
47/8 54/11 56/18
57/11 58/20 59/3
59/5 59/20 60/3
68/7 68/8 68/20
70/8 70/20 71/20
72/19 72/22 74/11
74/18 74/23 75/1
75/4 75/11 81/7
81/15 82/5 82/18
83/1 84/18 84/21
85/9 85/14 85/18
86/8 86/20 87/18
88/3 89/21 90/3
90/6 90/12 92/9
94/20 94/23 97/8
98/3 98/7 101/11 101/20
worksheets [9]
71/17 73/20 73/23
74/4 85/21 95/21
98/5 98/18 98/21 world [1] 37/4
worry [1] 72/5
worth [2] 26/6 26/9 would [173]
wouldn't [3] 17/21

80/1 87/15
wound [1] 99/23 WRIGHT [8] 3/22
11/1 11/1 20/21
20/21 21/3 104/15
104/15
write [2] 33/20 107/5
written [2] 12/20 13/1
wrong [4] 52/3 81/5 107/8
82/13 106/14
X
XXX [3] 48/16 48/17 70/10
yea [1] 15/16
yeah [15] 16/11
32/19 33/16 34/10
50/6 51/11 55/13
56/3 73/5 76/11
77/5 78/16 79/6 89/8 89/8
year [21] 23/2 23/4
23/5 23/7 23/12
24/2 24/4 24/5
24/14 28/14 29/6
30/17 30/19 30/23
33/11 38/5 60/17
79/8 97/14 97/15 109/4
years [1] 38/13
yellow [2] 57/3 57/8 yes [9] 5/6 9/18
11/12 12/2 12/13
20/20 52/9 92/10

## 104/4

you [441]
you're [3] 91/6 91/7 98/17
you-all [2] 105/22
your [34] 4/4 5/2 5/7 9/10 15/5 15/9
15/11 18/23 26/11 32/4 32/4 36/19 37/6 39/7 40/9 40/16 41/20 45/7 50/21 57/11 59/5 59/18 59/21 66/16 68/5 70/3 80/20 84/18 87/13 99/21 102/18 105/22 106/22 107/10
yourself [3] 5/7
20/22 41/13
Z
zero [5] 14/5 65/23
66/15 67/19 101/9
Zoom [4] 4/14 12/22 107/10 108/15

