1	MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	
2	ON CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT	
3	FOR THE STATE OF ALABAMA	
4	THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2020	
5	10:00 A.M.	
6		
7		
8		
9	* * * * * * * * * * * *	
10	COPY	
11	* * * * * * * * * * * *	
12		
13		
14	THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD SUPPORT	
15	GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT MEETING was held before	
16	Jeana S. Boggs, Certified Court Reporter and	
17	Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large, via	
18	Zoom videoconference, Montgomery, Alabama,	
19	commencing at 10:11 A.M., Thursday, September 17,	
20	2020.	
21		
22		
23		

1		APPEARANCES
2	GUEST SPEA	AKER:
3		DR. JANE VENOHR Center for Policy Research
4		Denver, Colorado
5	COMMITTEE	MEMBERS:
6		PROFESSOR PENNY DAVIS, Chair Adjunct Professor of Law
7		University of Alabama School of Law Tuscaloosa, Alabama
8		AMANDA COV. Eggai no
9		AMANDA COX, Esquire Staff Attorney, The Honorable Terry Moore Judge, Alabama Court of Civil Appeals
10		Montgomery, Alabama
11		THE HONORABLE DON MCMILLAN Circuit Judge
12		4th Judicial Circuit Marion, Alabama
13 14		JENNIFER BUSH, Esquire State-level Child Support Attorney
15		Alabama Department of Human Resources Montgomery, Alabama
16		THE HONORABLE JULIE PALMER
17		Private Practice Attorney and Part-time Referee, Shelby County Hoover, Alabama
18		
19		KATIE STEINWINDER, Esquire Private Practice Attorney
20		Montgomery, Alabama
21		MS. LATHESIA MCCLENNEY Director
22		Child Support Enforcement Division Alabama Department of Human Resources
23		Montgomery, Alabama
		Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

1	GREG STARKEY, Esquire Private Practice Attorney Birmingham, Alabama
3	PROFESSOR BRIAN GRAY
4	Associate Dean Culverhouse College of Commerce
5	The University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Alabama
6	STEPHANIE BLACKBURN, Esquire
7	Legal Services Alabama Montgomery, Alabama
8	STEPHEN ARNOLD, Esquire
9	Private Practice Attorney Birmingham, Alabama
10	MELODY BALDWIN, Esquire
11	District Attorney's Office Child Support Division
12	Dadeville, Alabama
13	RACHEL KING, Esquire Private Practice Attorney
	Birmingham, Alabama
14 15	THE HONORABLE KAREN DUNN BURKS Deputy Clerk, Jefferson County
16	Bessemer Division Bessemer, Alabama
17	OTHER APPEARANCES:
18	BRAD MEDARIS, Esquire Central Staff Attorney
19	Supreme Court of Alabama Montgomery, Alabama
20	THE HONORABLE JULIA J. WELLER
	Clerk, Supreme Court of Alabama
21	Montgomery, Alabama
22	BOB MADDOX, Esquire Staff Attorney, Legal Division
23	Alabama Administrative Office of Courts Montgomery, Alabama
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

1	NATHAN WILSON, Esquire
2	Senior Staff Attorney The Honorable Sarah Stewart, Associate
3	Justice, Supreme Court of Alabama Montgomery, Alabama
4	
5	APPEARANCES FOR THE PUBLIC:
6	KENNETH PASCHAL
7	JEREMY BRUECKNER
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. First, I want to thank Bob Maddox. He has had to pull the heavy load today learning the process of Zooming as a host. And so, he's done a great job, and I certainly wanted to recognize that, and I appreciate that. And I appreciate everyone being patient as we sort of all learn this process.

2.2.

First, let me introduce you to Jeana Boggs. Jeana, if you want to wave. She is our Court Reporter. We appreciate her serving in that capacity.

And I would like to remind you that it would certainly help her if each one would identify yourself if you speak. At times, we may have something on the screen.

So, all the little pictures may not show up with the names. And I would encourage Jeana to stop us at any point during the meeting if we fail to identify ourselves. And I've already said that would probably be me first. But if she

has any problems in identifying us, then we need to do that. And, of course, that's one reason as people come on, if they come on with iPhones or something else, then we ask you to identify who you are so that our Reporter can identify you for the transcript.

2.2.

Let me also mention that, as you come on, you were noted that you were muted, and the — unmute yourself as you speak. The public — the Committee will be able to unmute themselves during the Committee portion of the meeting, and then at noon or right around noon when we begin the public portion, then the public will be able to unmute themselves.

If you have to make a point and need to speak, if you would, just wave.

And some of you may have the physical capability of using the little hand where you wave your hand, feel free to use that too, and we will try to watch that. I will also try to watch my other computer

1 that's got the email. So, if you can't 2 get in by waving or using your hand or 3 chatting, if you want to use an email, then we will try to do it that way. 4 5 So, at this point, I would like 6 ask Bob to call the roll first with the 7 Committee, if you would do that, Bob, 8 first. 9 MR. MADDOX: All right. We are 10 going to do this to save time. I will just 11 read your name off and then just raise your 12 hand, once I read your name off, just so we 13 have it for the record. First of all, I 14 will name all the Committee members. 15 Obviously, Penny Davis is on as the chair. 16 You just heard from her. 17 Melody Baldwin? Stephanie 18 Blackburn? Rachel King? Amanda Cox? 19 Judge McMillan? Stephen Arnold? Judge 20 Julie Palmer? Brian Gray, Professor 21 Brian Gray? Greg Starkey? MR. STARKEY: I'm here. 2.2. 23 MR. MADDOX: Lathesia McClenney.

1 Say "here" since you are not on the video. 2 She is showing. Okay. Jennifer Bush. 3 MS. BUSH: Here. MR. MADDOX: Karen Dunn Burks. 4 5 HON. DUNN BURKS: Here. 6 MR. MADDOX: Also, for the record, 7 we have, of course, our Court Reporter 8 Jeana Boggs. Thank you, Jeana, for 9 agreeing to report today. 10 Brad Medaris from the Supreme 11 Court Clerk's Office. He does a great 12 job helping us out with the Committee. 13 We have got Honorable Julia 14 Weller. She's the Clerk of the Supreme 15 Court of Alabama on with us. Thanks for 16 being on. 17 We have Nathan Wilson, Senior 18 Staff Attorney for Justice Sarah Stewart, 19 who is the Supreme Court Justice liaison 20 for the Committee. He is on today. 21 And I see, as the members of the 2.2. public who have joined today, Mr. Kenneth 23 Paschal.

1	Mr. Paschal, could you tell me
2	real quick whether or not you want to
3	make some comments at the end so we will
4	have a record of that.
5	MR. PASCHAL: Yes, I have just one
6	question at the end.
7	MR. MADDOX: Okay. We will let
8	you have some time for that.
9	And Jeremy is it Brueckner?
10	Would you like time to speak at the end,
11	Mr. Brueckner? I hope I am pronouncing
12	that correctly. Can you unmute yourself.
13	There you go.
14	MR. BRUECKNER: Sorry about that.
15	Yes. Jeremy Brueckner.
16	MR. MADDOX: Okay.
17	MR. BRUECKNER: I would like to
18	say a word at the end.
19	MR. MADDOX: All right. We will
20	have enough time for you to make some
21	comments. Thank you, sir.
22	MR. BRUECKNER: Thank you.
23	MS. KING: And I don't mean to

1	interrupt. This is Committee Member Rachel
2	King. I have had some audio issues, but I
3	am here, and I don't know if you called me
4	or not.
5	MR. MADDOX: I did. Thank you,
6	Rachel.
7	MS. KING: Thank you.
8	MR. MADDOX: All right. Did I
9	miss anyone? I think I have called
10	everyone out that I see on my screen at
11	least. Did I miss anyone?
12	(No response).
13	MR. MADDOX: All right. I am
14	going to call these other members of the
15	public's names who had registered just to
16	make sure they are not on the line or on
17	the screen. Carrie Bilyou? Carrie?
18	(No response).
19	MR. MADDOX: Kenny Yarbrough?
20	(No response).
21	MR. MADDOX: Seth Wright?
22	(No response).
23	MR. MADDOX: Michael Jones?

1 (No response). 2 MR. MADDOX: K. Hall? 3 (No response). I didn't hear any 4 MR. MADDOX: 5 responses, so I assume they have not joined 6 yet or may not be able to because of the 7 storm yesterday. I'm not sure. That's hampering a lot of people, I'm sure, today. 8 9 All right. I think that's it, 10 Penny. 11 MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Bob. 12 Brad, would you check and see what our 13 quorum status is? I know a couple of 14 members that couldn't join. 15 MR. MEDARIS: Yeah. It looks like 16 we have got 13 voting members here. So, we 17 are good on quorum. And I was also going 18 to note that the Supreme Court issued an 19 order -- I believe it was back in August --20 authorizing the Committee to meet remotely 21 via Zoom for the rest of the calendar year. 2.2. So, I just wanted to put that on the 23 record.

1 MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Brad. 2 appreciate that. 3 Bob, would you like to speak to the media aspect of it? You or Cary? 4 5 MR. MADDOX: Yes. Like we have in 6 the past meetings, we sent notice of 7 today's web meeting to all the media 8 outlets statewide via email. Actually 9 Scott Hoyem, our Public Information Officer 10 here at the Administrative Office of 11 Courts, sent it by email dated August 26th. 12 And it provided in the media notice that 13 the public may be able to provide written 14 comments via U.S. Mail postmarked no later 15 than Friday, September 11. The Supreme 16 Court Clerk's Office, Brad, I understand we 17 did not receive any written comments; is 18 that correct? 19 That is correct. MR. MEDARIS: 20 MR. MADDOX: Great. And also as 21 we have stated in the previous media 2.2. notices, we allow the public to submit an email no later than 5:00 p.m. Central Time, 23

on Tuesday, September 15th, for them to be on the Zoom meetings. So, those were provided in the media notice that went out on August 26th.

2.2.

MS. DAVIS: Okay, Bob. Thank you very much. We appreciate that. And we do encourage the public to try to use the opportunity to present in writing.

Sometimes we don't have a lot of time to present orally, but we do, as Committee members, we really value the public input.

So, we like to receive information. And, particularly, if we receive it ahead of time, then that would give us time to think about it and perhaps have some questions that we can follow up with the person who submitted the comments.

The next thing on our agenda is the approval of the transcript from the prior meeting on August 6th, 2020. Does anyone have any corrections or changes?

That was sent out a little late. Has

1	everybody received that yet, Julie?
2	HON. PALMER: I received it, and I
3	have got two corrections.
4	MS. DAVIS: Okay.
5	HON. PALMER: It's on page 20. I
6	apologize. I didn't write down what line.
7	You referred to Steve Wright as Judge
8	Wright. I don't remember that. Maybe you
9	did.
10	MS. DAVIS: I don't remember that
11	either. So
12	HON. PALMER: I mean, that's just
13	a little thing.
14	MS. DAVIS: Right.
15	HON. PALMER: Then he spells his
16	name S-T-E-P-H-E-N. And in the transcript,
17	it's S-T-E-V-E-N. And, again, another
18	small thing. But to honor him, I'm just
19	going to be sure that's correct.
20	MS. DAVIS: Thank you, Judge. I
21	appreciate that.
22	MR. MADDOX: Judge Palmer, is the
23	second correction on the same page, page

1	20?
2	HON. PALMER: Yes, sir.
3	MR. MADDOX: Great.
4	MS. DAVIS: Anybody else have
5	other corrections that you see needs to be
6	made?
7	(No response).
8	MS. DAVIS: If not, could I hear a
9	motion or see a person that we can identify
10	to wave to make a motion to approve?
11	(Ms. Blackburn waving hand).
12	MS. DAVIS: Stephanie Blackburn.
13	Thank you. I see you have waved your hand
14	as a motion to approve.
15	Can we see a second hand to
16	serve as a second?
17	(Ms. King waving hand).
18	MS. DAVIS: Rachel King. Thank
19	you for seconding that.
20	Now, all in favor, if you would,
21	raise your hands.
22	(Committee members raising
23	hands).

1 MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Anyone 2 oppose, would you also raise your hand. 3 (No response). 4 MS. DAVIS: The motion passes. Ι 5 saw no one negatively. 6 At this time, unless -- let me 7 ask first. Is there anyone that has any 8 other housekeeping business that we need 9 to attend to before we begin the 10 substantive part of our meeting? 11 (No response). 12 MS. DAVIS: Okay. 13 MR. MEDARIS: Penny, I did have 14 one thing that I think that needs to be on 15 the record. 16 Okay, Brad. MS. DAVIS: 17 MR. MEDARIS: We received the last 18 document from Dr. Venohr early this morning 19 and emailed it out to everybody. It may 20 not be on the Child Support website yet, so 21 the public may not have seen it. But my 2.2. understanding is he is working on getting 23 that up there. So, it will be available

for all to see.

2.2.

MS. DAVIS: Yes. Thank you, Brad.

I had intended to mention that, so I

appreciate your bringing that to everyone's attention.

And some of you that are on the Committee may or may not have looked at your emails to see that, but you have received a copy of it. It's rather lengthy, so you obviously won't have time to review all of it.

But fortunately we have Dr.

Venohr with us, Jane Venohr, and she is
the economist research associate there
with the Center of Public Research in
Denver, Colorado. And we appreciate her
joining us via Zoom.

So, I will now turn over the meeting to you, Jane. But before I do, let me ask you, if you would, do you prefer people if they have questions ask the questions or wave their hands to get attention during your presentation, or

1 would you prefer that people hold their 2 questions to the end? 3 DR. VENOHR: You know, what I 4 would like to do is I'll pause. 5 going to do is walk through the materials, 6 and I will pause now and then just to see 7 if there's questions because there's some 8 natural breaking points. MS. DAVIS: Okay. All right. 9 10 Venohr, the podium is yours, so to speak. 11 DR. VENOHR: Well, thank you so 12 much. 13 So, what I am going to do is 14 that there are two documents that were 15 posted on the Alabama Court website, and 16 I am going to walk through them to 17 explain how they are relevant to the 18 Child Support Guidelines review. 19 Can everybody hear me okay? 20 Sometimes I use my phone, but I am using 21 my computer today. I am going to look to 2.2. make sure we are -- the volume is good. 23 Okay. I don't see any concerns.

2.2.

So, what I am going to do is, the two documents that were posted was this three-page infographic that has a lot of graphs and charts on it. I am going to walk through that one first.

And the second one is more of a report on the economic data that the Executive Summary was posted, but I failed to provide the whole report. Just one of those weaknesses when you are printing with PDF. So, that was what was emailed earlier.

But this is the one that was on the website, so the general public, you should be able to find it, too, right now.

And what this is, is it's the findings of analysis of case file data and labor market data. And that first row explains that this is a federal requirement that states as part of their guidelines review are supposed to review on the application on deviation from the

Child Support Guidelines. And then the intent is to keep guideline deviations at a minimum. And when we scroll down later, you will see that Alabama's deviation rate is in line with other states.

2.2.

The other concerns of the federal government — and these are new ones — is that they want states to look at the rates of default, income imputation, and application of the low—income adjustment, and that complements what the Alabama — this Committee has already addressed, that now states are required to have a self—support reserve adjustment for low income. Alabama was ahead of the game and was already fulfilling that federal requirement.

But beginning in 2016, the federal government says states must do something like that, and states have until — the wording is a little

awkward -- it said the year after the next review. So, Alabama is ahead of the game.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

The other things that the federal government wanted states to do that were new rules beginning in 2016 and then applicable to the state a year after next review commencing after December 2016 and then after that review a year after that, so Alabama is on top of that -- is to have provisions for income imputations so that it's more nuanced that they consider the individual circumstances of the parent when imputing income, which I understand the Committee has already addressed. And incarceration is not considered to be involuntary unemployment. And I understand that you have already addressed that.

So, some of these things that we are looking at in the case file data complements this. And as you get to the cases selected for analysis, I want to

1 thank the ALECS team at the agency, the 2 child support agency. I mean, they 3 worked miracles getting us this data. 4 It's very difficult to pull this data 5 because it's used to track child support 6 payments. It's used in child support 7 It's not used for -- to actions. 8 research. So, it's not in total 9 alignment, but I am sure over time 10 Alabama and most states will modify some 11 of those fields to make it easier to meet 12 these federal requirements for the Child 13 Support Guidelines. 14 So, what we selected was, we 15 asked them to select all new and modified 16 orders that took in effect between -- in 17 the calendar year 2018. And so, we went 18 back a year because we have to analyze 19 payment data, too, as part of this 20 federal requirement. And so, we wanted 21 to look at payment data in 2019. 2.2. So, when we do the analysis, we

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

limit it to those that still have open

23

orders because obviously, you know, if we don't have the open orders, it's going to skew our payment behavior in 2019.

2.2.

And with this said, we recognize that not everybody in the State of Alabama with the child support order is on the ALECS system, but this is the best source of the data that we can get. We can't — I would guestimate that half of the orders in Alabama are not on the system, and they are privately paid. And obviously we would never be able to get that information without, you know, a huge consent process because, you know, there are some privacy issues.

And I will say that, when we get this data, it's stripped of all personal identifiers, so we have no idea. We can't attribute it to anybody. And when we record it, we aggregate the numbers.

So, there is no way that any of this information on ALECS violates any

1 confidentiality issues. And there are 2 federal regulations that permit the use 3 of child support data from an automated 4 system for research purposes. And the Agency also double-checked all of that. 5 6 So, attached to ALECS is a 7 quidelines calculator, but it is not 8 always used. And so, that last cluster 9 in the second bullet, it says that we are 10 only able to attain quidelines 11 information for 2,000 -- a little over 12 2,000 cases. And that's where we get

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

The only other source of income that we know of on the automated system, at least in most states, is there are some matching with quarterly wage data. So, we were also able to get that and analyze that to a certain extent.

information about the income that was

used in the quidelines calculation.

So, a basic thing in the third column, if you see that first circle, that first pie diagram, is out of that

1 8,333 orders, 92% were one child, which 2 is a little high. We are not sure what 3 the reason is in Alabama. We asked some 4 questions. Sometimes if there's some 5 modifications for children that are 6 emancipating -- Massachusetts, they will 7 order two orders, one for one kid and one 8 for the second kid. In most states, it's 9 closer to 60% or 70%. 10 I am going to pause there just 11 to see if there's any comments on with 12 that 92% is any idea why we are a little 13 bit higher than most states than Alabama. 14

Anybody want to comment on that?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

(No response).

DR. VENOHR: I don't hear any comments, but you are certainly welcome to make some later. But the important context of this is, when we start talking about the schedule update is, you probably don't want to concentrate on six children when you are pulling out case examples and trying to

understand the impact, because there are few cases with six children, and you mainly want to focus on one and two children.

2.2.

And then the other cluster, the other pie chart next to the characteristic, is the receiving parent's relationship to the children. So, 82% are mothers, 6% are fathers, and then rest are foster care and non-parent caretaker/relatives. And this is going to be really important when we talk about minimum orders and the low-income adjustment.

And it looks like in Alabama
that — and a lot of states do this — is
that they are ordering support when the
child is removed from the home. You
know, sometimes a child might be removed
from the mother's home or the father's
home. The parent that had custody, you
know, for some sort of abuse and neglect
reason, usually it's economic hardship is
what the national data tells us. And

then the child support order will be issued against that parent.

2.2.

And sometimes some states, what they do is, if the plan, the permanency plan, is to reunite that primary custodial parent with the child, they might give that parent a break on the order. And it looks like that is happening to a certain degree in Alabama. We have not analyzed it all fully yet. But that's one thing to think about as far as whether you want to develop a guideline provision to create greater consistency when that's the case or, you know, if you want to address that differently.

So, that's one of the reasons I just want to highlight that. It is not an overwhelming percentage of the cases. It's foster care is 3% and 12% for the non-parent caretaker. And not all of those are child protective service cases where, you know, it might — on that, the

plan is to reunite the child. It could be that it truly is that grandma now is the major custodial parent of the child.

2.2.

So, when I talk about that subset, it's probably even a much smaller proportion of those cases, but still we did notice some things that are happening there that you might want to consider in your guidelines provision, particularly when you talk about updating your low-income adjustment, which I will talk about more later.

So, that second to the last cluster on the first page is the deviations. It's 9%, which is about in line with other states. So, that's not a concern.

With regard to the incarcerated, we were able to get some data from ALECS. It's not perfect. It probably understates it. Most states only do periodic matches with their incarcerated data, or they, you know,

are a data field that the case workers populate it. But we found that 45% of orders involve the party who had been arrested, and that just underscores, when you are imputing income, how important it is to consider the individual circumstances of the obligated parent as federally required. And, of course, arrest records and history of incarceration affect employment opportunities.

2.2.

So, you know, Alabama's swift adoption of that to meet the federal reg is — underscores the importance of that by this data.

The 3% of orders involve a party who was ever incarcerated that — and other states we're usually seeing about 7% or 8%, and that just might be an issue with the data match or the field isn't being populated as much. But it is still an indication that it is a real issue in Alabama as it is in other

1 states. 2 So, again, it just some --3 reconfirms that you are doing the right 4 thing by adopting the federal 5 legislation -- I mean, the federal 6 regulation to not consider incarcerated 7 parents to be voluntarily unemployed. 8 So, the next part, the second 9 page, is the income imputation, and we 10 measured it two ways: There is a data 11 field on noting income imputation on 12 ALECS. It is not that's populated. 13 There are only so many data fields in 14 automated systems that are monitored. 15 And there's a lot of -- used to be it 16 was -- and it is still is -- some of it 17 is highly federally regulated. So, what 18 we find in every state is those that are 19 highly federally monitored, those are the 20 ones that are more likely to be 21 populated. 2.2. So, we don't think this was 23 totally populated. So, we also consider

1 the incomes and the guidelines 2 calculations. So, that's going to be 3 limited to those 2,000 or so cases where 4 we had quidelines calculations. 5 specifically we look for those that have 6 full-time minimum wage earnings. And, 7 again, they might be really employed at 8 full-time minimum wage or income is 9 imputed, but what we are trying to do is 10 to get some sort of measurement of income 11 imputation. And, obviously, you know, 12 income is going to be imputed less now 13 that Alabama is adopting the new federal 14 provisions to consider the individual 15 circumstances of the parent when imputing 16 income. 17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, based on ALECS, the income imputation rate was 5% for both mothers and fathers. And that's pretty low compared to other states. We are finding percentages more to 20% to 50%. So — and then when it was noted, it was usually imputed at minimum wage. So, 88%

of fathers and 89% of mothers had income imputed that minimum wage.

2.2.

Now, when we looked at the recorded guidelines calculations on ALECS — and keep in mind that this isn't going to be representative of the state because we are only getting those that are in on ALECS and then we are only getting those with guidelines calculations. So, we are thinking that this is probably over-representative of the percent that have minimum wage income.

And what we use are income ranges because we don't have a field on the guidelines calculator that shows whether income has been imputed. And so, we use income of \$1,160 to \$1,260 just because sometimes decision-makers or judges might round. The \$1,160 is the \$7.25 an hour which is the full-time -- I mean, federal minimum wage that is applicable in Alabama -- times 40 hours a

1 week, times four weeks. And then \$1,260 2 would be, if we took 4.33 weeks and 40 3 hours a week and then -- which is actually \$1,256.67 a month, and we 4 5 rounded it up. 6 So, when we do that, nearly a 7 third of fathers have income equivalent 8 to full-time minimum wage, and we haven't 9 converted this to obligated parents and 10 obligated mothers yet. We are still --11 We are just using it from the worksheet. 12 It's been a lot of work to merge the 22 13 files that we have gotten from ALECS. 14 So -- and then with mothers, we 15 find that 40% of mothers have income 16 equivalent to that full-time minimum 17 wage. And when we limited it to \$1,256 18 to \$1,257, which is really the pure 19 definition, it's more like 4%. 20 So, this suggests that there is 21 some -- probably some considerable income 2.2. imputation going on, and that might

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

change once Alabama starts using that new

23

provision. So, when we look at the quarterly wage data, which is the second to the last bullet, 20% of those had quarterly wage data. And that isn't surprising a small proportion have it, and that's why income was imputed was because they didn't have a history of wages, and so they had to input income.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

But when we looked at the wages, it was actually \$895 a month on average, and that could be that they only worked part-time, that they lost their They might have become -- their car might have broken down. They had an accident, hurt their back and didn't have insurance. And they had to -- something happened with child care. There's -- It could have been they became incarcerated or spent time in the jail for a couple of weeks. It could have been that they voluntarily quit. It could be that they worked under the table. There's over a dozen reasons why that might be lower.

So, with regard to the exhibit, what it shows you is that the percent with income imputed is 5%. It shows you those where the guidelines income is zero. And we did notice what did happen in quite a few cases among the ones where we had a guidelines calculation. The last cluster shows those that had minimum wage.

2.2.

So, the other thing that the federal regulation requires is the consideration of labor market data, and that's the last cluster there. Okay. It came up on the next page for you. And it requires the consideration of the unemployment rate. And this obviously affects income imputation, too. This is one of the factors that the feds want states to consider is: What are the job opportunities in the area? And obviously it looks a lot different due to COVID pandemic.

But Alabama still has an

1 official unemployment rate that's 2 slightly lower than the national. A year 3 ago where this type of data we had to 4 pull July even though August is now 5 available. But Alabama's unemployment 6 rate was 3.3%, where nationally it was 7 3.7%. And now nationally it's closer to 8 10%, and Alabama is closer to 8%. And, 9 of course, that's statewide. There are 10 pockets of Alabama that's much higher. 11 It's in double digits, particularly on 12 The two industries that were the coast. 13 really hard hit by the pandemic has been 14 the restaurant, retail, as well as the 15 hospitality. So, obviously, that's 16 really affected the Alabama coast. 17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Another thing that the federal requirement says is to look at how many of those — what's the average hours worked because, you know, as I mentioned earlier, we are looking at imputing at 40 hours a week. And if you look at the Alabama Department of Labor, they

actually have great data on their site.

As of July 2020, all private sector

employees in Alabama were working 35.7

hours on average. So, that speaks to

maybe there shouldn't be the income

imputation of 40 hours a week.

2.2.

Some states are suggesting that courts might want to use less and to consider the typical hours for an industry. For instance, in leisure and hospitality in Alabama in July 2020, the average hours were 27.3, so that would suggest income imputation maybe at 27.3 hours.

South Dakota was a state that used to use 40 hours for their income imputation when, as a last resort, once they examined everything that they could about the parents' earnings, is his or her ability to earn, his or her experience. They would impute — They would have a presumption of a 40-hour, minimum-wage employment, and they went

down to 37 hours -- I think it was 37, it might have been 37-and-a-half -- as their -- under other last resort presumptives. So, again, that is something that, you know, you might want to consider.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

I also pulled the median wage of food preparation workers, because that's a job that usually requires low skills, and there's a lot of openings usually. And I do that just to see if it's above -- how close it is to the minimum wage. And that tells me -- I am an economist. It tells me how effective that minimum wage is. If it's much higher, if it's \$10 or \$12 or even in Alabama's case, \$9.23, that minimum wage is ineffective. That means that it's not a cap -- I mean, it's not a floor, that people are not -- employers are not hiring people at \$7.25. And what that means is that, if judges are imputing above minimum wage, it probably makes

sense because there are jobs — when there are jobs, I mean, that unemployment rate of 10% is high. But when they are, it's even imputing at \$7.25 as okay. Imputing at 40 hours doesn't quite match the data.

2.2.

Just to underscore that, that last bullet on there says a 33% drop in Alabama's leisure and hospitality industry since the COVID epidemic — pandemic. So, that just — again, it just reassures you that the changes you made to meet the Federal requirements are just.

So, federal regulations also require the analysis of the application of the low-income adjustment. And what that — just looking for something I realized that didn't make it on here — that the shaded area is where the low-income adjustment applies now. This is where the self-support reserve is.

And then it's gradually phased out. When

we took the incomes of the guidelines calculations, so that's only the 2,300 orders — and, again, it's a selection bias — only 5% of those orders fell into the shaded area. And we think that because there's a lot of income imputation going on.

2.2.

And when we looked at all orders, only 1% were set at that minimum order of \$50. So, that suggests that there aren't a lot of minimum orders.

Less than 1% were set at zero. And this is that statement 3% of orders set between \$1 and \$50, that is where we think that there were a lot of non-parent caretakers. Actually we know. 73% of those orders were non-parent caretakers.

So, as you notice on the top of this, this is all preliminary analysis, so we will take a deeper dive on that.

But what it might mean is that you might want to make a recommendation about what to do or provide a little bit more

guidance to how to set orders with their non-parent caretakers.

2.2.

I am going to just quickly finish the rest of this. And is there more after that? I hope. Okay.

And then it requires the analysis of payment. So, these are the orders that were greater than zero because those are the ones that are going to have some sort of need for payment is that first cluster shows the average monthly order, that first bar. The second bar shows the median order. So, if it's lower than the average — if the median is lower than the average, it means that it's skewed to the lower end.

And then the third bar shows the average paid in 2019 and that's divided by 12. So, we took the annual amount. And they don't pay every month. There's not a lot of consistency in payment. But you will see there's a big gap between what is expected and what's

1 actually paid.

2.2.

And then that last bar in the cluster is the median amount. And, again, that's lower, and so that reflects that there's — that's skewed more to paying lower when the median is less that. There's a bunch of them that pay lower.

So, that first cluster shows the cases for which we have zero orders — I mean, greater than zero orders. The second cluster is those where we show income imputed to the father in ALECS. And the federal — or the national research shows that these usually have the less payments, and this is why they want — they are encouraging states to spend more time and gain more information so they could better get an idea of what these guys have on the ability to pay.

And then the last cluster — the third cluster is the minimum wage.

And then the fourth cluster is the shaded area. And then the last one is those minimum orders — I am sorry, the orders set below \$50. So, again, I think those are the third-party caretakers.

2.2.

and then, as I mentioned earlier, that this is the paid over the year divided by 12 months. And — but what really happens is that there are some payments in some months and then there is not so many payments. And remember that we have a lot of parents that are — they have income at minimum wage. Whether it's imputed or it's actually minimum wage, we really don't know.

But what we do know -- and this is the verified or based on some research by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is that those at lower occupations, lower-paying occupations, they may not have those consistent hours. So -- and also that there's more likely to turnover in those

1 jobs that could be -- it could be 2 initiated by the parent. You know, like 3 I said, the car could have broken down. There could have been a childcare issue 4 5 that caused them to quit their job. 6 could have been that they got fired for 7 some variation reason. They could have 8 gotten laid off. And these are the 9 employment places that also don't offer a 10 lot of benefits: Sick leave or options. 11 You know, if something happens, sometimes 12 it's a job loss. It's not: We will give 13 you a couple of weeks off. 14 So, I think this adds a lot of 15 context to what we are going to talk 16 about next, which is updating the 17 schedule. So, I am going to pause there, 18 and then I am going to move -- let you 19 offer comments and ask questions. And 20 then we will go to the Executive Summary, 21 which is the other document that's on the 2.2. Court website.

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

MS. DAVIS: Dr. Venohr, I have one

23

question relating to these last charts that you see up here. Is Alabama's payment level, like, for example, the first chart is the 6.7 and the 8, are those fairly consistent with the United States, or this Southern Region, or did you all look at that?

2.2.

DR. VENOHR: Based on the other states that I have examined, I would say you are consistent with the Southern Region. If I was to look at Oklahoma and Kentucky, which are the only southern states I have that information for, and I will pull it later and double check, but it looks very similar.

A state that is extraordinary is Pennsylvania. And they are one of the highest performing states. But they have the provision that — I mean, they have lots of things that — their number of months with payments are close to 11. And they have provisions where they could modify an order if they find out he has

no ability to pay. And they have a provision in their court rules that enables them to do that. And then they have the automation that if they find out, like, if he becomes incarcerated, it's an automated link and then they can modify it without him or her making a request for modification. And in Pennsylvania, the agency can make the modification.

2.2.

So, you know, the plus side on that is that they have better performance. The negative side on that is — and they give notice to the custodial parent when they are doing this — is, are they really — the question that other people in the states ask, or in other states ask: Are they serving the best interest of the child, you know, because they are so swift at modifying those orders.

MS. DAVIS: Does the child — the children, the family get virtually the

same? They — it sounds like, for example, in Alabama, if a parent pays eight months, and they — the reason they do is because they have lost their job for a period of time. In Pennsylvania, they just adjust the payment, but the child doesn't get any more or less in those two states. Is that fairly accurate?

2.2.

DR. VENOHR: I would say that's pretty accurate.

MS. DAVIS: Okay.

DR. VENOHR: And that is one thing that I would like to look at the edge, if I ever had the research ability to do that, because, you know, as you know it takes — I mean, it sounds like it happens immediate, but there's always a little lag, and you kind of wonder, and, you know, some people have a little bit of savings or reserves. You know, people have savings, but they have a mortgage payment. So, some people also have savings that they — for the child support.

1 So, the data that we have now I 2 would agree with that, but I would like 3 to take a deeper dive on that issue some 4 day, if I ever get the right data, if 5 that made any sense. 6 MS. DAVIS: Yes. Thank you. 7 Any other questions DR. VENOHR: 8 or comments before we move to the --9 (No response). 10 DR. VENOHR: Okay. Let's move to 11 the executive summary. Penny, how much 12 time do I have? I know I only asked for an 13 hour, and I have already -- I went a little slower than I thought. 14 15 That's okay. We have MS. DAVIS: 16 you scheduled through 11:15. And then -- I 17 am sorry. Yeah, and we want to have 18 discussion time from 11:15 to 11:30. 19 as we are asking questions during the 20 presentation, we can certainly, you know, 21 alter that and go all the way to 11:30 if 2.2. we need to. 23 DR. VENOHR: Okay. Excellent.

So, what I want to do is just take a look at the Executive Summary, and then I am going to look at the larger report and just do a walk-through of that.

2.2.

So, the Executive Summary, if you look at the Executive Summary of -- and this is the one on the website -- there's a one-page document. And what it says is that we are looking at the economic data of a child-rearing cost, which is a federal requirement, and essentially the existing schedule is based on economic data from 2007.

And so, if you look at that next page — on the very bottom of that page of the Executive Summary, what it recommends is that the Committee reviews the economic studies and decides whether it is in the best interest of Alabama children and families to update the schedule. And as an economist, I am going to say "yes," that it is — always

good to update and use the most current economic study.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

The issue why it's a policy decision -- and you get to be make the decision and think about what's best for Alabama families and children -- is that there are more than one economic study of child rearing costs. And when I show you some diagrams -- hopefully Bob can bring them up -- is that the current Alabama schedule is in mid-range of those studies. And some of those studies are known to overstate child-rearing costs; some are known to understate. And what the issue is, is economists don't agree on the methodology to separate the child's share of expenditures from the total household expenditures.

So, what economists do agree on is that anything between the highest and the lowest is an appropriate amount for a state's guidelines. And the existing Alabama guidelines is in between the

highest and the lowest, but I would still, as an economist, recommend that you update it and update it for other factors. And we are going to look at that in a minute.

2.2.

And that's, again, I think I said this last time, that economists are like weather forecasters. You know, we say something, like, three to five inches of snow. We don't ever just say 4.2 inches of snow.

So, that's where the policy or the Committee comes in and has to think about, well, what's — just what makes sense for the population that we are serving.

The second recommended next step is that there are other factors considered in the schedule such as, you know, the federal and state tax rates, because the schedule is based on gross income. The current Alabama schedule is 2007 federal and state tax rate, and

there's actually a typo in this report.

It's 2007 price levels. And 2007

self-support reserve; that's based on the federal poverty level guidelines in 2007.

2.2.

So, all of these things can be updated. And these are other things to talk about. There's a few little nuances, but I think we got it pretty right. As I looked at the schedule, I took a deeper dive in this report.

The one thing that -- you are going to see some decreases which seems counterintuitive because prices increase over time. Federal taxes have been lowered, so families have more after-tax income to spend. And we do see increases at the high end.

But one of the reasons — one of the major reasons we see decreases is there are two reasons, is that there's been some change in the assumptions, and the Betson-Rothbarth measurements are the underlying data — the expenditures data

1 that we are using. That's one reason, 2 and that I am going to explain more 3 fully. 4 And the second reason is that we have a better way to adjust for Alabama's 5 6 lower cost of living than we did when we 7 did it in 2007. And I am going to 8 explain that, but the better data results 9 in a much more bigger drop. 10 So, I don't know, Bob. Can you 11 pull up the report, or is it possible to 12 get it up, the big one, the big document 13 that was emailed this morning? 14 MR. MADDOX: Yes. I am just 15 pulling it up. It's on the screen. Do you 16 see it? 17 DR. VENOHR: No. It's not coming 18 up on my screen. I am just going to keep 19 talking. 20 So, if you look at page one --21 and that's Arabic number one -- of that 2.2. report, there's a line at the very bottom 23 that talks about the Betson-Rothbarth

studies and the current Alabama schedule is based on the second Betson-Rothbarth study. And there's been four Betson-Rothbarth studies, and there's just about to be a fifth one that's released.

2.2.

And most states used the

Betson-Rothbarth measurements. There's

27 states, Guam and the District of

Columbia that use them. That includes

Alabama uses the Betson-Rothbarth study.

So, if you look at that one -oh, thank you. Keep going, yeah. Keep
going. Keep going. Keep going. And
there -- oh, went too far. Go up just a
tad bit. Bob is doing it. One more page
go up.

So, if you look at the bottom of that page, yeah, if you get to that last paragraph, you see all those footnotes.

You see those years, and that will tell you — give you all the full references to all those studies. And you will see

that they use data -- different data years. And the study that you are on right now is based on expenditures data collected in '97 to -- '96 to '98.

2.2.

And the one that I would, as an economist that I think is the best, is the 2020 study; and that is based on expenditures data collected in nineteen -- I mean, in 2014 through 2019. So, it's more current.

And that expenditures data comes from the Consumer Expenditure Survey, which is referenced in this report. And it surveys about 6,000 households per year nationally on hundreds and hundreds of items. And that is what all economists use to measure out — measure child-rearing expenditures. And, again, they have to have some sort of methodology to separate the child share from the adult share. So, I am going to talk about those methodologies in a minute.

So, if you flip to page three, and it's going to say "Section 2" on it — there you go. I am going to concentrate on the BR measurements first, because I want you to understand why there's some decreases to the schedule, and then why there are some high increases when you go to more current expenditures data.

2.2.

So, if you go down one more page, you are going to see a chart -- perfect. That's the chart.

So, this is on page four. And then each bar, the bar furthest to your left is the oldest study of Betson-Rothbarth. And the one to — furthest to the right is the newest. And then the first cluster is the lowest income, and the last cluster is the highest income.

So, we look at different income ranges, and this is approximate, because, you know, we have to adjust for changes in income and so forth. And you will

see — I mean, there's two things that you should know, is that when you look at it, it's actually fairly stable. For an economist that, you know, this first cluster is 23% to 27% of total after—tax income, or total expenditures goes to raising the child. And I will talk about why we use after net income in a minute.

2.2.

But, so, that's pretty good. I mean, you have to remember that there's always a margin of error, you know.

Usually 2%, just like, you know, when we look at the presidential polls, there's always a, you know, plus or minus 2%.

So, for somebody that, you know, works with statistics, it doesn't bother me or I don't assume that there's been a change over time. But I do know that there's been a couple of changes in the consumer expenditure survey that caused that drop at low incomes.

And one is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics, who does measure the

consumer expenditure survey, they have gotten better at getting income information. They noticed that for the lowest incomes, particularly those with incomes of about \$45,000 a year or less, that they were spending more of their income. So, that prompted the Bureau of Labor Statistics to say, you know, we have got to do a better job of getting income information.

2.2.

So, they did. And what they found was that some of those families that they thought were low income, they were actually higher income. And so, that is why you see some of those decreases in — when you look at the fourth and fifth Betson study, and it looks like the — and for that low income.

Now, when you get to the highest cluster, what you see is some increases for the fourth and the fifth Betson study. And the reason for that is that

another change that was made in the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their Consumer Expenditure Survey is that they made two changes: One, beginning with BR4 is they used to measure expenditures and now they measure outlays. Also, you can still use expenditures. Expenditures doesn't include mortgage principal payments. Outlays includes installment And the reason that payments. expenditures didn't include mortgage principal payments was that it tracked closer to the way we measure gross domestic product in our country, where we think of a building as an -- as an investment.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

But it did — for consumers it did track mortgage interest payments. It tracked rents. It tracked electricity. It tracked HOA fees. Those were all included in the expenditures measurements, which were the first three BR.

And then beginning with the BR4, there was a switch to outlays. And that's more than likely to affect higher incomes, because they are the ones that have higher mortgage payments. They are the more likely to have installment payments or HELOCs or mortgage payments that are now included there. So, their expenditures went up.

2.2.

And then another thing that happened, and this just happened with the BR5, is that the Consumer Expenditure Survey now, instead of — they used to ask families how much taxes they paid, and families actually don't do a good job remembering their taxes. So, now they calculate it using something like a TurboTax.

And what they found was that they were understating their taxes. So, they have less after-tax income than they thought. So -- and that squeezes that percent, because, remember, we are

looking at the percent of income — after-tax income spent on children. And this is the way Betson actually measures it as a percent of total expenditures, and then we convert it back to gross income.

2.2.

So, the next two diagrams show the same sort of patterns for two to three children. I'm going to skip to page five. And on page five, there's another chart at the bottom of page five that — it's called Exhibit Three. So, you keep — oh, it's not on your page five. Your pages are a little bit different than mine. There it is.

So, this just is another visual to help understand why we see those decreases at low income. And if you notice that first cluster, we are looking at low income — low-to-middle incomes, and I am using the definition of \$45,000 a month — I mean, \$45,000 a year or less in gross income as low-to-middle income,

and that's just because that's the incomes where we see families that are spending more of their income. It's not any other reason other than that. I mean, the definition of that is really pretty arbitrary. But what we do is, we cap it to that line that says, orange, after-tax income.

2.

2.2.

So, we cap child rearing expenditures, so it's actually a smaller percent of their total expenditures, and that sort of artificially also exaggerates those decreases at lower income. And you are going to see this in the schedule. And one option that you have is, if you don't think these are right is, we can take out that orange line and just take expenditures all the way up to that line. The reason we do that and the reason most states do that is, they don't think that families should be required to spend more than their income.

1 Now, when you look at the other 2 cluster, which is the upper-to-middle 3 income, and I was talked about that 4 change, how the Consumer Expenditure 5 Survey now is an improved measure of 6 after-tax income. So, what you can see 7 is that green box of taxes getting larger 8 and squeezing that after-tax income, but 9 expenditures of children is the same. 10 So, it sort of balloons out. So, that 11 contributes to some of those increases 12 that we are going to see at higher 13 incomes. 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, I am going to skip now to Section 3, which is on my page seven.

And these are the other studies. Of course, you know, there's — I am going to show you some other studies. And it looks like you have to go to the next page to see what those other studies are.

And, remember, the federal requirement is to consider economic data on the cost of raising children. And

there's different methodologies for 1 2. measuring child-rearing costs, and we 3 think that the Betson-Rothbarth are the 4 best. Betson thinks they are. And in 5 his first study, he analyzed five 6 different methodologies, and he concluded 7 that the Rothbarth methodology is the 8 best methodology, or the most 9 appropriate. And the Rothbarth 10 methodology starts with families with 11 children and without children, both with 12 child-rearing expend -- of child --13 rearing age, examines their expenditures, and then uses a barometer to consider 14 15 whether they are equally well off. 16 In the case for the Rothbarth, 17 in Betson's application, it's a percent 18 spent on clothing. And then he looks at 19 the differences in their expenditures, 20 and that difference is deemed to be 21 child-rearing expenditures. 2.2. Now, there's a whole bunch of

calculus behind this, and the measurement

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

23

"clothing" is known to understate actual child-rearing costs, because of the substitution effect that is going on that, you know, families without children might be spending more on clothing than those without.

2.

2.2.

The counter-methodology, which
I'll show you that's still used in
Florida, is called the Engel, and they
use food shares. But they do the same
thing. They look at families with
children, without children. It's a very,
very old study. And then they consider
them equally well off based on food
shares. That overstates, but it does so
because children are more food intensive.
But you will see that in the comparisons
when we talk about Florida.

So, the studies that we are going to talk about are these three current studies; they are the most current: The Betson-Rothbarth that's coming out right now; it will be out

probably this fall in Arizona. And we are working with Arizona. They financed it, but they are gracious in letting other states use it. So, and that is what we would encourage Alabama to use.

2.

2.2.

The other three studies, none of them are used by any state. And the first one in that bullet is the Rogers-Rothbarth. Rogers is an economist at Rutgers. He uses a Rothbarth methodology, but it is a slightly different interpretation. And he uses data from 2000 to 2015.

I'm not fond of him combining all that data. He believes it's important because of the business cycles. I think it's important to use the most current; that there is just too many changes that are happening constantly. Cell phone usage now. Ownership of cell phones now is close to over 90%. Back in 2000, that wasn't the case. That's one of the reasons I am not fond of combining

1 it.

2.2.

Also, he is combining different years where the Bureau of Labor
Statistics have change their tax
assumption. I am not fond of that,
either.

He tried to replicate Betson's work, his BR4 study, and he couldn't do quite this quadratic form, but he came up with close to the Betson amounts, 2% less for each of the income categories. So, it was pretty close. Again, you know, as an economist and, you know, somebody that teaches business statistics, you know, a 2% margin of error is pretty comfortable for that — somebody with that type of background.

There's also the USDA study.

This is the U.S. Department of

Agriculture. They used data from 2011,

2015. For the last decade or so, USDA

was considered the upper bound, and I am

going to show you graphics in a minute.

1 The only state to use the USDA is 2 Minnesota. They use a very old study 3 from USDA 2002. They are trying to 4 update their schedule right now. 5 have legislative guidelines that failed 6 in legislation. 7 There's another economist, 8 Professor Comanor, who is at the 9 University of California, Santa Barbara. 10 He developed his own methodology, and he 11 uses data from 2004 to 2009 mainly 12 because he was trying to compare it to 13 Betson's fourth study. 14 So, we are going to skip to my 15 page 12 -- or I am sorry, my page 10, and it will be Exhibit Four. Oh, perfect. 16 17 You anticipated where I was going to go. 18 So, this shows you the

So, this shows you the differences of all these studies. The aqua, the kind of big heavy line in the middle is the existing Alabama, and you can see it stops right at about \$20,000. And this has been converted to gross

19

20

21

2.2.

23

income. And all these schedules have been updated to 2020 price levels.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

And then you see that line that makes a slight, quick angle. It's the top line at the very low income. that's USDA. And that's known to overstate child rearing expenditures, just because for some of their -- they start with seven different categories of expenditures: Food, housing, transportation, entertainment -- or miscellaneous. I am sorry. And for some of these categories, they use a per diem approach, which means that they would take the transportation for the family and divide it by four, and we know that adults are usually more expensive or spend more than the children. usually about .4 to .7, 40% to 70% of what is needed for a child. So, we know that per capita approach doesn't really work.

But what you see is that it

bumps. It only goes up to about \$16- to \$17,000, the information is only credible. We don't know how it keeps decreasing or expands to higher incomes. You see, it bumps to the BR5, which is what I would recommend as an economist for Alabama. And that's the BR5 using USA prices.

2.2.

As I mentioned, Alabama has lower prices and lower incomes. And I — there's a chart in here later that will show that. And if I use the price parity measured, which is published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, and I think is the best measure out there for adjusting for state differences, Alabama prices are 14% less than average.

Now, when we did Alabama's schedule before, the price parity wasn't available. So, we took census data from 2005 on incomes. We looked at the income distribution for Alabama, and we compared it to the US, and we looked at the gap

between those income distributions, and we pushed down the US numbers for child rearing schedule by that same percentage.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, this time what we are using is the price parity. And when I get -and that explains some of the differences in decreases. Because if I am making that adjustment for differences in income, it's taken off the top. And if we are making that difference based on prices, it's taken off on the bottom. Sort of, you know, like with your taxes, if you get a credit against your income or if you get a deduction from your income versus a tax credit, it has sort of a -- so, that change in using price parity, even though I think it's a much better approach, it's going to contribute to some of those decreases.

And you can see the BR5 that is adjusted for Alabama prices — it's that dotted blue line that runs right almost on top of the existing schedule at middle

incomes. It's a little bit lower at low incomes. And this is partly because of that improved measure of income that the Consumer Expenditure Survey has. And you can see it's a lot higher at higher incomes, and that's because of three reasons -- is it three reasons or two reasons? Yeah, two reasons. I am sorry. It's the switch to outlays, which you know, the higher incomes are more leveraged, and they are going to be -and we found that they spend more, and also because of that tax impact that they now -- particularly at higher incomes, they have a much more bigger bundle of after-tax income to spend. And we have improved that measure.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, we can look at the two and the three children, the patterns are similar. And if the line stops, it's because the data don't go that far. You can see that Comanor is that bottom line, and it is the lowest. It really

approaches poverty levels. I think -- I don't -- I am not fond of the Comanor approach. Professor Comanor and I debated in Minnesota. They were really interested in using Comanor's approach. They eventually rejected it. They have a few committee members that still like it, but it's not used by any state.

2.2.

The second to the bottom line is the Rogers-Rothbarth. That's the economist that combines over a decade of years. You can see that it's a little bit lower than the existing Alabama schedule. I am not fond of that, again, because of the combination of years, and it doesn't go to higher incomes.

There — in my opinion as an economist, there's really no compelling reason for Alabama to switch away from the Betson-Rothbarth.

So, my two recommendations, just as an economist as looking at what data are the best, would be to either stick to

1 your existing, because it's within a 2 range of credible measurement to child 3 rearing, or to adopt BR5 based on Alabama 4 prices. 5 So, I am going to open it up for 6 questions, and then Bob is going to 7 move -- he has been doing a great job 8 moving here, moving along. And I think 9 the biggest concerns are the impacts. On 10 page -- my page 13, there is cluster that 11 says, "one, two, three kids." Let's see. 12 Does anybody have any questions or 13 comments so far? 14 (No response). 15 DR. VENOHR: Let's see. Yeah, 16 keep going down, Bob. It will be my page 17 13. Yeah, you are almost there. Go down a 18 little bit further. Let's see if I can 19 find it. I don't know where it is. If you 20 go back up a little bit, it might be right 21 under Exhibit Six. 2.2. MS. DAVIS: Are you looking for 23 Exhibit Seven?

1	DR. VENOHR: No. It's more
2	there's is a bunch of bullets. Keep going
3	down. And then this is close enough.
4	Let's see. Let me find where you are.
5	MS. DAVIS: Right there, there is
6	some on the page it shows, one child
7	income of \$1,100 to \$1,350; is that where
8	
9	DR. VENOHR: Yeah. That's it.
10	Yeah. That's the area that is affected by
11	the self-support reserves. It's just a
12	little bit above there. Oh, it didn't
13	the bullets didn't come out.
14	MS. DAVIS: It shows differently
15	on that page if you look at the way it
16	shows on the document. It has the bullets.
17	DR. VENOHR: Okay. That's what
18	that is.
19	So, that one that says, one
20	child from income of \$1,100 to \$1,350,
21	that's if we increase the self-support
22	reserve. The current self-support
23	reserve is based on the 2007 federal

poverty level, and we increased it to the 2020 federal poverty level. So, that shows how that shaded area would expand, and we will talk about that more in detail later. But that is also a factor that contributes to the decreases.

2.2.

And the rest of these bullets just talk about the decreases. And if you keep going down, there should be another set of bullets that — let's see. I don't know what happened to the bullets, but we'll figure it out.

Okay. Summary of increases and decreases. So, yeah, there it is.

So, when we look at — there are decreases of at least 10% under the proposed BR5 adjusted for Alabama prices. And I used 10% — we used 10% just because that's the modification threshold, even though a change in the guidelines isn't a change in circumstances. And that's going to incur for monthly combined incomes of \$3,800

per month or less for one child; \$3,550 per month for two children; and \$2,400 per month for three or four children.

2.2.

So, this is going to affect the lower — income families. Like, if we had two parents that each was making \$14 an hour or less, this would be where it would hit, in these incomes.

And, then, if you go to the long chart on the next page, this just shows you where there's increases, and how much, and the different income ranges, you know. And, you know, that's something you probably would want to study on your own for the next meeting.

And then, again, I am just going to say that there are a lot of large increases, but we are going to talk about that more when we do the state comparisons.

I am going to switch to Section 3, and there's another chart on Section 3 that shows our other considerations. And

the other considerations are, one, the guidelines model, which is a big deal to change. I mean, that takes several years. And there is not any — most states are based on income shares. It doesn't mean that the Committee can't consider it. I mean, this is a policy decision. There's a paper that I have that's referenced somewhere in here that is in the section that is published in the Journal of — it's the matrimonial lawyers' journal.

2.2.

And it says that the guidelines models don't really matter for middle incomes as much as that low-income adjustment. And then what you do at high income and whether you've updated your schedule over time. So, I don't want to waste a lot of time on the different guidelines models, but we certainly could do that. I wouldn't encourage you to do that. I think it's much more important to get the economic data right as far as

what you think is appropriate for Alabama families and children.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

The second line is just talking about adjusting for price levels. And there's really no options or alternatives there.

Third is what the -- as I mentioned earlier, we adjust for Alabama's cost for living. We use the price parity measure; and that, of course exacerbates some of those decreases you see at lower income, and then those increases that are not so much exacerbates it at high income. And I do think it's a better measure; but if you wanted to, you could stick to using the income realignment. We would have to get Betson to do that, which we could do. I'm sure he would do it. He is still teaching, and he's a little overwhelmed with the combination of online classroom. So, I'm not sure how timely it could happen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

The fourth consideration is the federal and state income tax. The FICA, as you notice, the Betson-Rothbarth measurements relate to expenditures, not gross income. So, we convert it. And we use the income withholding tax formulas for the state and the federal government. We assume a single taxpayer. A single taxpayer faces the same tax rates as a head of household. As we were used -family income, which would be a married person, and we would consider the child tax credit that we could consider the earned income tax credit. That makes more after-tax income available. would push the schedule up. But that would be certainly an option that the Committee could direct us to do to change that assumption.

Fifth is that the schedule, the existing Alabama schedule and the proposed one that we developed, excludes child care, the child's health insurance,

and the first \$250 per child, per year, and out of pocket medical expenses. And those are add-ons in the worksheet, so we take the actual amount of childcare in calculating the support. If we had both in the schedule and the actual amount was in the worksheet, there would be double accounting. The same with the health insurance premium.

2.2.

With regard to the \$250 per child, per year that is included in the schedule, that's to cover some sort of ordinary medical expenses that every child is going to have. And that's to minimize the sharing of receipts.

What most states do in practice is that if the — if there's more than \$250 in receipts, then the primary custodial parent will send those receipts to the other parent, and then they will pay their share. You know, if they have equal income, it would be 50%. Let's say there is an emergency room visit that

wasn't covered by any health insurance premium, so the obligated parent would be responsible for half.

2.2.

We don't -- the newest data still shows that \$250 amount is appropriate. The newest data says that \$270 is the amount, but there is such a wider variation between Medicaid, and those are privately held insurance, that some states are just taking out all the health expenses out of the schedule, and they are doing it as an add-on, like childcare. And that -- what it does is, it allows it to be a lower amount in Medicaid cases and a higher amount in private cases where they have high deductibles.

I mean, it's — the advantage of it is, it better reflects what those situations are and the nuanced difference between Medicaid and those with private insurance. The disadvantage is that tracking whether the kid is on Medicaid

1 and what their private health insurance 2 is, I mean, it's very difficult, 3 especially, it used to be -- they have 4 gotten better since Obamacare and the 5 expansion of Medicaid. But it used to be 6 that children went on and off Medicaid 7 very quickly. And I am going to stop 8 after these assumptions. 9 And then the sixth is, consider 10 expenditures to net income ratio. And 11 this, again, relates to those diagrams I 12 showed you later -- or earlier that show 13 that families spend more than their 14 income. And we just take the same data 15 that Betson uses from the same families 16 he pulls data from to make that 17 conversion. And, then, finally, there's 18 a self-support reserve. 19 Any questions or clarifying 20 comments? 21 (No response). 2.2. So, I probably -- of DR. VENOHR: 23 all these that I think the Committee -- if

there was anything you would change, it would be the method of adjusting for the lower income, even though as an economist, I think price parity is a better measure. I get that it changes that schedule a lot and contributes to some of those decreases at low income.

2.

2.2.

The other consideration that I think is probably the most just is considering whether you want to take out all the healthcare expenses and doing that add on that's much more burdensome to implement. But it is certainly a trend the way that states are doing. If you wanted to use an amount other than \$250, again, we would have to go back to Betson. Most states are either using nothing in their schedule or the \$250.

And, then, of course, probably the biggest one on this page that I will talk about a little bit more is the self-support reserve. And on that one is a big one, too.

1	Penny, how much time did I do
2	I have? I am sorry.
3	MS. DAVIS: What my thought was
4	that we would let you go to about 11:40.
5	DR. VENOHR: Okay. Sweet.
6	MS. DAVIS: And then a little bit
7	longer, and then we will let this the
8	we are going to take a subtract a little
9	time away from the Cox report, because it's
10	going to it is not as complicated as I
11	thought it might be.
12	DR. VENOHR: Okay.
13	MS. DAVIS: So, just letting
14	Amanda know that.
15	DR. VENOHR: Okay. I am sorry.
16	It's been a whirlwind. We just I, yeah.
10	it s been a whiliwing. We just 1, years.
17	Thank you for
18	MS. DAVIS: That's fine. We will
19	give you a five-minute warning, Jane, so
20	you will know you can wind it down in five
21	minutes.
22	DR. VENOHR: I am on page 20. I'm
23	not sure where it lands on your page. It's

just before Exhibit Nine. Perfect.

There's it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

Okay. So, this is the existing Alabama schedule, that shaded area, and what most states do is that, like, for -assume that we have two parents that their income is -- let's say -- \$700 month. So, if we were to use this schedule, and there's one child, the basic obligation is \$299, because their combined income is \$1,400. So, the order amount would be \$150. You know, it would be half of that schedule amount. And what most states -- or a lot of states do is that, if the obligated parent falls in the shaded area, that you only use his or So, then, using that method, her income. the order amount would only be that \$50 instead.

So, that's part of the low-income adjustment. And the other parts of the low-income adjustment are the amount of the self-support reserve;

that's a policy decision. Of course, you know, there's some economics because updating it to the current poverty level makes sense. The minimum order, which is \$50 in Alabama. And then the method for adjusting, which I am talking about leaving it in the schedule but doing something that, if you flip to the next page, there's a chart that, like, Missouri does. It just went all over the place.

2.2.

But, yeah, if you look at North Carolina's, it explains that language of using the shaded area.

So, that's something that I would like to see the Committee consider. And, of course, there's other adjustments that could be made. The other consideration, I think your self-support reserve. I adjusted it when I developed that schedule. I took the federal poverty level, right now \$1,067 and I — or \$1,063, and I multiplied it by

Alabama's price parity, because if we are doing that to the whole schedule, you probably want to do that to the self-support reserve. So, I would multiply that by 86, but you could use the full amount.

2.2.

Illinois uses 75% of the federal poverty. (Inaudible) -- uses 135% of the Federal poverty. So, there's no rules that say you have to stick to 100% of the federal poverty.

In Arizona, they use minimum wage. They have a high minimum wage, so their self-support reserve ends up being about \$1,600 a month. And I actually like to use the minimum wage in those states that have a higher state minimum wage, but Alabama doesn't.

With regard to the minimum order, \$50 is still the mode. We are not seeing that used very much in Alabama, so I don't want to waste too much time talking about it. There are some states

1 that have been considering going to \$60, 2 just because there's some evidence that 3 says that that's what families will 4 voluntarily pay at low income. So, I am 5 not very fond of going much below that. 6 I think -- I heard a compelling argument 7 by a judge once that having a minimum 8 order in the state of \$10 wasn't worth 9 dragging both the parties into court, and 10 I do agree with that. I do think \$50 11 makes a difference. But my home state of 12 Colorado just adopted a minimum order of 13 They have two-tier minimum order. 14 That \$10 applies to those that are \$800 15 or less, so incarcerated. And then when 16 they get to the higher incomes --17 actually it's \$1,500 that -- then it gets 18 to a \$50 minimum order. 19 So, you can make it as

So, you can make it as complicated as you want. And probably, the bottom line there is, do you want to retain a minimum order? What the amount should be? There's been a few states

20

21

2.2.

23

that have moved away from a minimum order. North Dakota, when they adopted their version of a self-support reserve, they had nothing if the obligated's parents income is below the — what I call their self-support reserve — it's about \$800 — there's a zero order. And North Dakota uses a percent of obligor income. And they — so, incarcerated parents would end up with zero income.

2.

2.2.

In this chart, there's also some language from states — Illinois, a couple of other states — about when to make a deviation from the minimum order. You know, earlier I mentioned those in third-party care; incarcerated, those involuntary unemployed. Some states have the presumptive zero order for those situations. Some states have a rebuttable — that's a reason for a deviation. That's stuff that when you meet next time, I mean, spend some time and look at what some states are making.

I can certainly give you more language, and that's something for the Committee to consider.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

I am going to move to be next Exhibit 10. Those are things that you can talk without me. You know, I think those are largely policy decisions. These are the states I am comparing. There are states that are bordering, or nearby. Most of them are income shares. Florida uses a very old study, Espenshade '91, and that's the Engel estimate that I used. Georgia uses the combination of Betson-Engel estimate from 2006. rest of the states use a BR study, except for Mississippi. And if you see that Arkansas and Alabama are the only ones to adjust for their lower income or their price parity, and you can see the price parity at the bottom of this chart. But it will just give you an idea of what the cost of living differences are in these states.

And then, Exhibit 11 shows these case examples. They are the same case examples that we used in the materials we gave you in August.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

And Exhibit 12, which is the graph, we compare -- so, this is the first cluster. This is -- these are each parent earned state minimum wage. second cluster is, we used the minimum earnings of Alabama workers that did not complete high school. Case three, we used parents that their highest educational attainment or -- is equal to Alabama workers that their highest education attainment is a high school The fourth case scenario are degree. parents with some college. So, we used the minimum earnings of Alabama workers that their highest educational attainment is some college, and then, so forth. can go read the case scenarios on your own.

And then on seven and eight, we

looked at the highest. We looked at \$15,000 to \$20,000, and we just made up those case scenarios, so you can see the impact at the higher incomes.

2.2.

And what we did was, so that first bar is existing Alabama. And then the second bar is BR5, and that's adjusted for the new self-support reserve. So, you can see that kicking in to the minimum order, and then so is BR5, and we just adjust it for US prices.

Now, Florida, they haven't updated their schedule be since '91. So, they don't have a very current self-support reserve. And that's why it's so much higher. And you can see most of the states surrounding you don't have a high self-support reserve.

Arkansas is the state that most recently updated their child support schedule, but their self-support reserve is pretty low. They — this is new to them. They just met the federal

requirements, so this is the first time
they went with us, so -- or adopted a
self-support reserve, and they went a
little bit -- they went a little
conservative on what they are doing. So,
that's why you see so much differences in
case one.

2.2.

In case two, you can see that there's a decrease. If we were to adopt — or if Alabama were to adopt BR5, there would be a decrease in the amount, but it's in align with neighboring states. And you can see for one child that case one, two and three and four would all result in decreases, and even case five for the one child amount. But, then, when you get to the higher incomes ones, there's increases. And if we go to two children, we don't see as many decreases.

So, if you go to the next chart, again, you see that first-case scenario there's a decrease due to the increase in

1 the self-support reserve. And, again, 2 that's a policy decision that I hope the 3 Committee talks about more. And you can 4 see a decrease for case two, but then you 5 start seeing case increases -- very small 6 increases for case three, four, five, 7 six; and then cases seven and eight, they 8 are more substantial. 9 And then the next exhibit is the 10 same case scenarios for three children, 11 and you see similar patterns to two 12 children. 13 So, the point of this is that 14 you are still in line, even if you were 15 to retain the existing, you are in line 16 with what other neighboring states do 17 and, then, as well as if you were to 18 adopt what I think is the most 19 economically sound, which is the BR5. 20 So, I am flipping to my page 30, 21 which is an unnumbered. 2.2. MS. DAVIS: Okay. And we are

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

going to give you a five-minute warning

23

1 here.

2.2.

DR. VENOHR: Okay. Perfect timing. So, keep going. And there's a -- there it is.

So, the blue area shows the area of the schedule that has a self-support reserve, and you can't really see it, but there's — it's a staircase, and there is a little bit of a green strip between the blue and the green. And that's where the expansion of the self-support reserve would happen. And the red is where there's decreases of at least 10%.

Now, if we just look at those cases where we only had guidelines calculations from ALECS, so, again, it's biased. It's going to be over representative of low income. We did find a high percentage in that red area, about 49%. And then we didn't find that many in the blue area. But as Alabama adopts the new provisions on income imputation, and so forth, we are

expecting that there might be more in the blue area, at least those in the ALECS caseload, and less in the red area.

2.2.

Now, when you look at the yellow area, that's where there was substantial increases. And, of course, we are looking at ALECS, which isn't representative of the whole state, but less than only a few cases fell into that lower area.

So, again, I am ready to conclude. The next steps, what we would recommend for the Committee is that this is on the very last, page three, is to look at those economic studies and make a decision what's in the best interest of Alabama children and families as far as whether you should update the schedule per a new study. Which one? You have to direct us to develop a schedule, and then look — review those seven factors. I don't really see any that my two cents as an economist, that really should be

1 changed up for Alabama, other than the 2 self-support reserve, and the low-income 3 I'd like -- I would love the adjustment. 4 Committee to look at that section on the 5 low income very carefully and think about 6 what's appropriate for Alabama families. 7 With regard to CPR, what we will 8 be doing is, our next step would be to 9 give you an actual physical schedule and 10 have some placeholders for any of these 11 things that you want to tweak, such as 12 the low-income adjustment and a 13 side-by-side. In addition, we will be 14 completing the analysis of the case file 15 data. 16 So, thank you. That was very 17 dense. I will stop. Thank you for 18 letting me go longer than I needed to. 19 MS. DAVIS: All right. Thank you, 20 Jane. I think that was very helpful to all 21 of us. 2.2. So, Bob, if you can take the 23 document down so we can see everybody,

1 and then I want to open it up to the 2 Committee to see if they have any 3 questions of Jane. 4 I guess the first question that 5 I think is sort of the overriding 6 question is the issue that Jane has 7 mentioned several times is, do we want to 8 update the schedules; and if so, then we 9 would pick the methodology recommendation 10 from her group as the BR5, with the 11 Alabama price adjustment. 12 So, let's start with just a 13 general show of hands of those people 14 who -- on the Committee, who feel like we 15 should update the schedules. 16 Those that cannot show us Okay. 17 by hand, if you want to unmute yourself 18 and comment. 19 HON. DUNN BURKS: I do. Karen 20 Dunn Burks. 21 Thank you. All right. MS. DAVIS: 2.2. Let me ask anyone who thinks we should stay 23 with the current schedule amounts based on

1 the data from the -- I forgot the years. 2 Jane, what's the data on now, currently? 3 2007. DR. VENOHR: MS. DAVIS: 2007 data. 4 5 anyone think we should retain our schedules 6 based on the 2007 data? If you would, 7 raise your hand. Judge Palmer thinks we should 8 9 stay with the 2007. Anyone else who is 10 not able to visually speak to the issue? 11 (No response). 12 MS. DAVIS: Okay. Judge Palmer, 13 do you want to give a brief explanation for 14 your thoughts? 15 HON. PALMER: Well, Jane mentioned 16 that even our current schedule, we are not 17 on the high end. We are not on the low 18 end. We are midway. And so, I -- just to 19 me, that seems like just a very practical 20 thing to do, is to just leave it where it 21 If we were high, I would say adjust is. 2.2. it. If we were low, I would say adjust it. 23 But since we are midway when, I believe she

said there are several other states that we will just stay where we are since we are, like I said, not high and not low, just midway.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

2.2.

Anybody want to comment who indicated, at least preliminarily, that they wanted to update the schedule?

Melody, I see your hand.

MS. BALDWIN: Okay. I don't know if she is available for questions at this point. I just did have one question, though, because I was remembering from the last review, but I don't remember if it was — at the time it wouldn't have been BR5, I'm sure. But it was the BR that we were looking at. And when she said that the low is lower, it's more than a 10% decrease. Do we know how much of a decrease? Is it 30, 40, 50, or are we looking at the minimum, 50, most of the time, if you can answer that?

1 DR. VENOHR: If you go to the 2 percent -- the percentage decrease is 3 varied; and when you look at the report 4 that you just got, the full report today --5 that's the Executive Summary Exhibit Seven, 6 which is on my page 14 -- it's going to 7 show you the decreases. And there it's as 8 high as 19%, and that occurs right at 9 the -- right where the self-support reserve 10 ends for one child. Mostly, they are less 11 than that, the decreases. And the 12 increases are as much as 19%, and that's at 13 the highest income of \$20,000 for three or 14 more kids. 15 So, it's going to be variable 16 depending on what the number of children 17 you are talking about and the income. MS. BALDWIN: Okay. And I just 18 19 remembered the example that we had the last 20 time was that -- well, the one that we were 21 looking at to analyze the most effect,

not a private practitioner. And so we were

because I do the Title IV-D cases.

2.2.

23

looking at -- we do impute minimum wage a
lot of times, or maybe that's what they are
making the majority of the time. And we
were looking at a 50% decrease on the
lowest end, and that was my greatest

6 concern.

2.2.

I don't want to -- I honestly don't want to be in a position to where we are actually cutting their child support by 50%, that -- given that with are that much further along in the cost of items are a lot higher. So, that was my greatest concern.

DR. VENOHR: What I would say to that is that that's the area of the schedule on case one when we look at the case comparisons. So, it's affected by the self-support reserve and the minimum order. So, you could still adopt BR5, update the whole schedule, and then use a different self-support reserve minimum order that wouldn't give you those results that you see in that case one comparison.

1	So, what I would recommend is,
2	first, make a decision on whether you
3	want to update the schedule. Second, is
4	if that you don't want to use
5	Betson-Rothbarth 5, or whatever. You
6	know, we can do two or three two
7	schedules, I would say. And then, third,
8	once you figure out the schedule, which
9	applies to the middle and higher incomes,
10	then let's go back and look at that
11	self-support reserve, because it sounds
12	like you are most concerned about case
13	one.
14	MS. BALDWIN: Right.
15	DR. VENOHR: And that because
16	that's driven by the increase in the
17	self-support reserve.
18	MS. BALDWIN: Right.
19	DR. VENOHR: You could make a
20	policy decision and change that.
21	MS. DAVIS: I think Stephanie has
22	a question.
23	MS. BLACKBURN: I was just going

1 to ask, is it possible to get what that --2 the lower end would be without the 3 self-support reserve? 4 DR. VENOHR: Yes. 5 MS. BALDWIN: And if Jennifer is 6 okay in commenting, I would like to say --7 because she is our local, federal expert, I 8 guess you might say, is it mandatory, 9 Jennifer, that we increase that 10 self-support reserve? And isn't there 11 already -- I mean, there's already one in 12 the schedule, I assume, but it's just 13 based -- there's not? Okay. 14 And it's not mandatory to 15 include it? 16 DR. VENOHR: It's mandatory to 17 have a low-income adjustment. 18 MS. BALDWIN: Right. 19 DR. VENOHR: But, you know, you 20 don't have -- you can -- how you do that is 21 that state's discretion. State discretion 2.2. means how you do it, the amount of the 23 self-support reserve, whether they have a

1 minimum order. 2 MS. BALDWIN: Okay. Thank you. 3 MS. DAVIS: Anyone else on the Committee have a question? 4 5 Dr. Gray? 6 PROFESSOR GRAY: Just a quick 7 comment and question I guess. 8 That last graphic that you 9 showed, that heat method, sort of giving 10 a sense where the changes were, if you 11 could maybe give a little finer detail in 12 that, like, the grids, if you could show 13 what percentage change was actually 14 happening, maybe have, you know, a little 15 bit more of a range so you could really 16 see where the differences were. And then 17 you made one other comment, I thought, 18 was really important; and that was, it 19 would also good to know how many people 20 are in each of those cells throughout 21 that table. 2.2. DR. VENOHR: Yeah, we can do that, 23 but I do want to say that its biased

because, you know, ALECS isn't representative of the statewide caseload. And then when you start implementing those changes to income imputation that are federally required, they are now going to fall into those cells that, you know, that they do now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

And the third thing is that, you know, to keep in mind that they are not being paid. And I am not saying that that's a justification for lowering those amounts, but it should make you realize that just because you lower those order amounts. And I can give you some data show you about what is being paid within a range maybe, you know, like, 90% are -you know, like, let's say there's a 10% decrease from \$500 to \$400, and it might make you feel more comfortable if you knew that there was nobody receiving the I am just throwing those numbers \$400. out. So, like, if the order amount was \$500, and we are suggesting \$400 and

1 nobody is receiving more than \$400 now, 2 you know, it's kind of a wash. 3 So, we will try our best. It's hard to get that type of nuances in a 4 5 graph just because of income shares. 6 Because, you know, it's combined income. 7 You know, there could be a combined 8 income of \$4,000, but it could be he has 9 \$3,000, she has \$1,000. He has \$2,000, 10 she has \$2,000. But we will try to get 11 it a little bit more nuanced. 12 PROFESSOR GRAY: Okay. Thank you. 13 MS. DAVIS: Anyone else have a 14 question, a quick question? 15 (No response). 16 MS. DAVIS: Anybody on the 17 Committee? 18 MS. BLACKBURN: I have another 19 In the lower income area, especially one. 20 where there are -- I guess would be the 21 self-support reserve if we did increase, I 2.2. mean, does the data show that the custodial 23 parent is paying less money to raise their

children, or do we have data of where their income is compared to the non-custodial parent compared to the custodial parent if the non-custodial parent is within that self-support reserve, especially if we increase it?

2.

2.2.

DR. VENOHR: We could look at how often the CP's income is more than the NCP at low income. But because of the large amount of income imputation at minimum wage, I doubt if we are going to get to the detail that you are hoping for. I could see why you would think that's important. But because of — I mean, income is imputed to this mother. I mean, we haven't converted it to CP and NCP out yet, but the majority of CPs are mothers. And it might look a little bit different, but I don't think it will.

But the, you know, mothers —
for some reason — and we see this in
other states. Income is imputed more to
CP than it is to the NCP, which is

ironic, because the federal regulation requires that the provision or the consideration of the individual circumstances of the NCP when imputing income and then give states the option to also consider the CP. But income imputations actually happening more often to CPs in Alabama and in most states that we work with.

2.2.

MS. BLACKBURN: I guess I am just a little concerned that, if we increase a self-support reserve for the non-custodial parent, then the entire burden is just going to then lay on the custodial parent and their incomes could be pretty much the same. As a custodial parent, you don't get the option of saying, I'm sorry, this is mine, it's not going to be, you know, for the child.

DR. VENOHR: Right. And, you know, it's part of -- you know, it's just part of those federal rules where there really -- their premise is that they

1 think -- and they have researched that. 2 You know, if you look at the proposed rule 3 making, which was published in 2014 -- so, 4 not a final role -- they have more 5 research. And they say, look, they are not 6 paying, especially if income is imputed and 7 there is a default. Let's do a better job 8 engaging them, bringing them in, and 9 hopefully if we bring them in the system, 10 they are not going to work in the 11 underground economy in which they cite some 12 research on that. Then, in the formal 13 economy, they become taxpayers. They get 14 job promotions. And in the long-run, they 15 are more engaged with their children. 16 in the long-run, they take -- the research 17 that they are using to say that's in the 18 better interest of the child than to set a 19 higher order now that isn't going to pay --20 be paid particularly even though it's --21 you know, children are expensive. And if 2.2. you can get it, it certainly will make a 23 difference, you know, to get the full

amount of the order amounts.

2.2.

So, you know, some of it is just going with what the federal rule policy premises with it. But, again, you know, it's — all you have to do is meet the federal requirements or provide a low—income adjustment. And that's why you have a Committee to decide what's the most appropriate thing for Alabama's families and children.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you. I think these are all helpful questions. It appears that the self-support reserve is going to be the item we are going to need to focus on maybe at the next meeting. I think there's be a lot of interest and obviously potential for change there.

Just as a matter of giving guidance or assisting Jane and her team, I think obviously that's something we will focus on.

The next question I want to ask for a show hands -- and this is not a

1 determination as to what we are doing. 2 It's just kind of helping direction wise. 3 If we decide -- if the Committee decides 4 to update the charts, the recommendation 5 has been to use the BR5 with Alabama 6 price adjustments. Just, preliminary, 7 how many think that if we do decide to do 8 that type of update, if you prefer that 9 methodology as opposed to others which is 10 essentially keeping the methodology that 11 Alabama uses but now goes forward to 12 updating it. So, if you will, raise your 13 hand if you are in favor of that, if we 14 wind up doing that. Rachel, Judge 15 Palmer, Melody, Stephanie. Several 16 people seems to be favoring that. 17 you. You can put your hands down. 18 Is there anybody that would 19 oppose that? You know, again, this is 20 our preliminary that thinks that would 21 not be the direction you would want to 2.2. go?

(No response).

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

23

1 MS. DAVIS: Okay. I don't see any 2 hands there. 3 Certainly anyone who can't be seen, feel free to unmute yourself and 4 speak to the issue. 5 6 And then my follow-up question 7 is, if we try to decide to change, is 8 there anybody that would favor something 9 other than a BR5 plan right now at this moment? If you would, raise your hand 10 11 and then you can tell us what it would be 12 that, that would also help Jane maybe, or 13 anybody on the phone? 14 DR. VENOHR: Just like the USDA or 15 16 MS. DAVIS: Yeah. Or any of the 17 others. 18 I don't see any movement Okay. 19 in that direction. So, I think it may be 20 helpful to think in terms of either we 21 will probably keep what we have, or we 2.2. will go forward using the BR5 with the 23 Alabama prices. Again, not a final

determination.

2.2.

At this point, what I would like to do is ask Amanda to speak to the issue that your subcommittee has worked on.

Maybe if you can give an overview, I think there's two choices. We won't vote on anything. So, just give the Committee your thoughts.

And, Jane, let me ask you this:

If you can stay, we have the public comments, and I know that Jeremy had indicated he had some questions for you.

He might want to use some of his time for that question. So, if you can, we would appreciate that.

And so, Amanda, if you would, give us a quick overview on yours. Do you want Bob to pull up your report or just want to speak?

MS. COX: It's not necessary I don't think. We really don't have a whole lot. I am not going to go into the proposals from Judge Moore's memo, that we

did not recommend as a subcommittee. But if anybody wants me to speak to that, I will.

2.2.

We ended up kind of settling on two options. The first option — I am not going to read it to you. But, basically, when, within two years of the final child support order, a child will become ineligible. Then we put that the Court shall or may — that's up for discussion, the "shall" or "may" — allow for the separate worksheets. And so, basically, it will divide out, enter an order for one child, two child, basically like that.

And the second option is basically the same as option two, except for the two-year time limit is removed. Both of the options include a requirement that the trial court include language notifying parents that when one child rolls off, basically they would have to move for modification for it to change.

I don't think that language would be
necessary if option two is chosen with
the "shall". But, otherwise, that
language would be helpful.

So, basically the "shall" or
"may," you know, the pros and cons are

2.2.

"may," you know, the pros and cons are basically the trial court gets more discretion with the "may," and then that could be a con, as well. In some of those discussions with the subcommittee members in our meetings, without the two-year time limits, some of the members were concerned about remoteness and about the burden of a trial judge having to complete so many worksheets. And, also, there is the income withholding order issue.

The other viewpoint was that, whatever changes occur after the two years, which change regardless, and you can always file a petition for modification either way.

So, I am trying to see who else

1 is on here. I see Ms. Steinwinder or 2 Judge Palmer. Would anybody else on the 3 Committee like to speak to either of those? 4 5 MS. STEINWINDER: I am here, 6 I might can answer any questions, 7 I don't have anything else to say. 8 MS. DAVIS: Amanda, you might just 9 mention who is on your subcommittee so 10 everybody will recall that. You said Katie 11 was on and Judge Palmer. Was anybody else 12 on your subcommittee? I had forgotten. 13 HON. PALMER: It was Judge 14 Sherman, Jim Jeffries, Steve Arnold. 15 That's the one I remember off the top of my 16 head. 17 MS. DAVIS: Okay. Jim could not 18 and the Judge could not participate because 19 of their being in the Mobile area. 20 Anybody -- any of the Committee 21 members have any questions for Amanda or 2.2. any points that you would like for the 23 whole Committee to consider? We won't

vote on this today, but just want to let you be aware of the subcommittee's report. Melody has raised her hand.

2.2.

MS. BALDWIN: Thank you, Penny.

If some of the judges — and I think we only have maybe two left on there — can they discuss how they — what they think or what they might have thought about "shall" in option one? I don't have a problem with it, but I am just curious as to how the judges feel about that as to option one, not two.

HON. PALMER: Well, for me, I believe it should be "shall". We are having enough issues as it is even though it's been part of case law 20, if not, 30 years, the "shall". But have the CS form shall be part of the record, but yet they are not. So, I think if we put a "may" in there, it is just too inconsistent. Julie Palmer might do it, but Judge Sherman might not do it.

So, I think if there is a

1 "shall" in there, that would just make it 2 more consistent across the board to have 3 it done or not. And always with the 4 exception, if you are not going to do it 5 because maybe it appears that this is a 6 Brewington child; or maybe if you don't 7 do the two years, the judge will just 8 have to explain in their order why they 9 didn't do the second set of, like, a 10 CS-42, an income withholding order. 11 MS. DAVIS: So, are you suggesting 12 to have something like "they shall" unless 13 they indicated on the record why they are 14 not going to do it, or something like that; 15 is that what you are indicating? 16 HON. PALMER: Just like the child 17 support quidelines where you can deviate, 18 but the Court just has to explain why they 19 are deviating. Just something simple like 20 that. 21 MS. DAVIS: Rachel King has her 2.2. hand up. 23 MS. KING: Judge Palmer, I had a

question about that, and I think it was answered, but I just wanted some clarification.

2.

2.2.

Even that language is "shall,"

if there is not a circumstance that has

been explained like Brewington, would the

custodial parent still have the option

and ability to come in and file a

petition to modify during those two

years, or at the time when the one child

is supposed to drop off if they believe

there's been a significant change in

income?

HON. PALMER: Well, I believe any time there's a material change of circumstances: The child is 17; the child support is to 19; I now have a job with Microsoft where I used to have a job at Wal-Mart. I think any time in there you can come back and ask for material changes in circumstances.

MS. KING: I was just making sure that wasn't going to prohibit that during

1 those two years. 2 In my opinion, it HON. PALMER: 3 would not as long as you can prove the 10% 4 change or another circumstance. 5 Anyone else have a MS. DAVIS: 6 question or comment? 7 (No response). 8 MS. DAVIS: Okay. I would like to 9 thank the subcommittee for their hard work 10 and if I know there were other matters that 11 Judge Moore had suggested, but we will get 12 back to the subcommittee or anybody else 13 who wants to get back to those issues, they 14 can circle be back. 15 Amanda, you were kind of off for 16 a minute. Did you lose Internet service? 17 MS. COX: I did lose Internet 18 service. Sorry. I got hooked up through 19 my hotspot on my phone now. 20 MS. DAVIS: I certainly 21 understand. What I was saying was, we 2.2. appreciate the work of the subcommittee, 23 and I know there were other issues that

Judge Moore had other suggestions, and we will get back to those later after we get through the bulk of the work that relates to the child support update. But we appreciate the subcommittee working on that, and the Committee can continue to think about that. And we can either vote on it next week, or we can delay that and give you more time if the Committee wants to do that.

2.2.

So, y'all can just — as

Committee members, you can let us know,
and the subcommittee, if you want to go
ahead and vote on it at the next meeting
or if we want to delay and have
additional discussions. So, it will be
whatever y'all want to do on that.

So, at this point, we are a few minutes into the public's time. So, we had several members of the public that had indicated they were going to join us. When Bob called the roll, there were two; that was Jeremy and Kenneth. Is there

1 anybody else on the public that has 2 joined us or wants to join us? 3 Bob, anybody in the waiting room or anybody else that was not identified 4 5 as a member of the public? 6 MR. MADDOX: Bob Maddox here. 7 I don't see anybody else in the waiting 8 room --9 MS. DAVIS: Okay. 10 MR. MADDOX: -- other than Jeremy 11 and Kenneth Paschal. 12 MS. DAVIS: Okay. So, we have two 13 members of the public. And both 14 alphabetically, Jeremy, you are listed 15 first. We will give five minutes to -- I 16 think both of you indicated you wanted to 17 speak, to both of you, so that we will have 18 time for questions from the Committee to 19 the speakers. 20 So, Jeremy, if you will unmute 21 yourself, Bob will help unmute you if you 2.2. need to, and if you want to direct your 23 comments to the Committee, that's fine,

1	or if you want to ask Dr. Venohr, she has
2	agreed to stay on, and she can answer
3	your questions perhaps.
4	MR. BRUECKNER: Yes. Thank you.
5	I just I have one direct question to Dr.
6	Venohr.
7	Where do disabled folks fall
8	into the calculations and the data with
9	CPR? Disabled?
10	DR. VENOHR: I had to unmute
11	myself.
12	Well, you talk about the data,
13	the economic data, and I think that's
14	different than the Child Support
15	Guidelines.
16	MR. BRUECKNER: Right.
17	DR. VENOHR: As far as disabled
18	people, you know, it depends on if they
19	have SSI, income supplemental, security
20	income, whether they have Social Security
21	disability income, whether they have the
22	ability to work. So, with the
23	MR. JEFFRIES: What about disabled

veterans; do they fall into that same category?

2.2.

DR. VENOHR: That would -- I don't know the Alabama provisions well enough.

But in some states as far as the disability -- and I don't know if the disabled veterans' benefit goes directly to the child like the SSDI does.

MR. BRUECKNER: Not without an apportionment.

DR. VENOHR: Oh, okay. Because that I don't know. But with regard to the economic data, when we — income is income, and it's not divided by source. So, when we — if somebody has income of — I'm going to just make up this amount — \$2,000, if it's from Social Security or Veterans or from wages, it's still considered income in our development of the schedule. Because, you know, again, that schedule is based on, when we look at the economic data, thousands and thousands of households, and it's how much they spend

relative to their income.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

But for the calculation of support in all states, disability is a consideration. You know, like, we were talking a lot about imputing income at minimum wage earnings. Obviously, if somebody is permanently disabled and they can't work, I mean, there are some studies out there that says that SSI -those that receive SSI, like, 12% to 14% of them can actually work, then you wouldn't input income. Most states will not impute income of somebody who is incapacitated that way. I'm not -- am I -- I just want to make clear the distinction. Is that --

MR. BRUECKNER: Well, on basically, yes, because it's kind of like Alabama has their way of doing things, and I know other states have their way of doing things. And as far as CPR, as a collective, do they impute that in their data?

1 DR. VENOHR: We don't impute. 2 Uh-uh (negative response). No. 3 not -- We are using actual incomes and the 4 raw data. 5 MR. BRUECKNER: Right. 6 DR. VENOHR: So, the raw data that 7 I am talking about is, you know, aggregated 8 up to come up with the schedule amount. 9 But for somebody that's a disabled person, 10 that should on a case-by-case basis. 11 MR. BRUECKNER: Right. And then I 12 kind of prepared a little bit here outside 13 of that. And let's see. I will skip over 14 it because we touched base on some of the 15 things that I was going to bring up. 16 So, in Alabama State Code, Code 17 of Alabama 1975, as amended, in 18 Subsection 38-10-7, allows DHR to take 19 appropriate action under Federal and 20 State laws to assure that children are 21 fully and fairly supported. 2.2. includes review and adjustment of child 23 support orders and guidelines.

That statement is found within the Alabama Child Support Policy and Procedures Manual to 9.14.2.a. and raises one main question. Is that to assure that only children of Alabama are fully and fairly supported, or is that for all children, as millions of parents find recovery and life after divorce by starting new families, shouldn't those same children be entitled to that same fair and full support?

2.

2.2.

Which leads me to my first question: Does your current child support formula take into account that some parents have other children that they support? To answer that by my findings, according Alabama Form CS-42, the answer would be, no, because there's no space to indicate such information.

Second question: If the calculator is going to have a factor of how much time is spent with children, then shouldn't child support have a

better way of determining that variable besides a court order? Millions of parents go without seeing their children, some by choice, some by force, and others because they are casted outside by an opposing parent or alienated. If there were some form of measuring means in place say an annual or biannual questionnaire or statement, request of parents involved, this could aid in the determining of that variable for adjustments in hearings.

2.

2.2.

And third and finally, there's a strong misinterpretation of the law when it comes to VA disability and the use for child support; even more so a challenge of constitutionality. As it is said, VA benefits are designed for the use of veterans and their dependents to help with the loss of income due to injury. However, that is not saying that it is designated to only children or dependents within litigating parents. That's set

1	for all dependents. A few different
2	approaches to establishing that set
3	amount would be an apportionment. A
4	request of number of dependents
5	MS. DAVIS: Jeremy, I am afraid
6	your time is up.
7	MR. BRUECKNER: It is?
8	MS. DAVIS: But if you would like
9	15 or 20 more seconds to summarize
10	MR. BRUECKNER: Yes, I am about
11	done here to determine the amount of
12	award that a veteran can go ahead and give
13	to that dependent.
14	So, it's just basically I am
15	raising the question of VA disability,
16	like me personally, I am accounted as a
17	disabled veteran with spouse with
18	dependent, and then I receive an
19	additional dependent's pay for my other
20	children. So, now, that's not spouse
21	that I am divorced from, that's the
22	spouse I am married to here in Arizona.
23	So, this needs to be taken into

1 account because that's taking away from 2 my spouse and dependents, the three in 3 which I care for on a daily basis here. 4 MS. DAVIS: Okay. Jeremy? 5 MR. BRUECKNER: Yes? 6 MS. DAVIS: What I am going to 7 suggest, I know you have some additional 8 comments that you would like to make, if 9 you would, if you would put those in 10 writing and send that -- the information in 11 writing to the Committee, then we will look 12 at it and obviously you can join us at the 13 next time. But we want to be fair to the 14 other members of the public and make sure 15 they have their time. 16 But, again, I appreciate your 17 comments, and we certainly are very 18 mindful of the service that our veterans 19 provide for everybody in Alabama, as well 20 as the United States. And we are 21 especially thankful to you for your 2.2. service.

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

So, our second speaker for the

23

1 public if Kenneth. Kenneth actually 2 happens to be a veteran also. 3 So, Kenneth, would you like to -- you will have five minutes to 4 5 address. If you do have any questions to 6 Dr. Venohr, if you will do those first so 7 she would not have to -- don't want to 8 take up her time if there are no 9 questions for her. So, Kenneth, if you 10 would unmute yourself and if you have any 11 questions, first, of Dr. Venohr. 12 MR. PASCHAL: Yes. Thank you, 13 I don't have any questions for Dr. Penny. 14 Venohr. I would like say -- I appreciate 15 your presentation. I really enjoyed it. 16 And so, I will look at that later on and 17 see it's uploaded to the website there. 18 So, I definitely thank you for being a part 19 of making a difference for our kids here in 20 Alabama. 21 To the Committee Chair, I just 2.2. have a couple of questions. First, as I

mentioned, I am a veteran. I had the

23

opportunity to serve our country for 21-and-a-half years and spent the last ten years in Alabama trying to advocate for another important thing besides our country, which is country, our kids.

2.2.

So, once again, I appreciate all the Committee members of what you all do also.

I am a president for the Alabama Family Rights Association. Many of you already know that we've been advocating since 2011 to change our child custody laws. When there's a divorce or separation, many circuits do what they call standard visitation every other weekend, and we try to create more of a balance based on the scientific data that says it's best interest of a child is to have better outcomes if they have anywhere from 35% to 50% time with the both parents. So, that's in the best interest of a child is what we are trying to do.

But with that, in 2016, we went to our Supreme Court at that time was Chief Justice Roy Moore and asked if he would help facilitate feedback from the judges as far as how do you do child support calculations. And the survey results indicated that 35% of our judges admitted they do not have a specific way they do child support when there's joint custody.

2.2.

And so, also, the feedback would begin the last several years is some circuits they still struggle for some reason where there's more of a joint custody, how do you calculate child support. Rule 32, to me, is clear. It gives the judges direction and a discretion to do that.

The last meeting this Committee had -- I saw on the website -- I think, someone did a written request or question to this Committee stating they had, like, 48% or 50% -- I'm sorry, 48%, 52% parent

time, but yet that one parent was still — the child support calculated that person was still having to provide financially for both households.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

So, my question to you regarding the child support calculations -- and several legislators asked me this, to They will ask me this: Kenneth. said, Kenneth, when we update the law, do we have any way to make it easier for the judges to calculate child support when there's joint physical custody. So, my question to the Chair on this Committee is as far as training. Are there any upcoming training for our judges for maybe some type of CLE to help them? Some judges are doing well. For example, Madison County -- I'm pretty sure everyone is aware -- on July the 31st, there's the first county circuit to do a standard equal share parenting. So, they know what they are doing up there when it comes to doing child support

1 calculations.

2.

2.2.

So, back to the question to the Chair or the Committee, are you aware of any upcoming training that would help the judges in these situations?

MS. DAVIS: I guess with regard to the training, maybe Nathan or Bob might — or Brad might talk about training. I know that there is annual training historically for domestic relations judges. And I think they normally have a mid-winter meeting. Maybe some of the other judges that have been on the bench for awhile can speak to your normal rotation as far as training is concerned.

We do have, with regard to the joint custody in the computations for time-sharing, we had a subcommittee that's been work on that for several years. The Rule 32 Committee did submit a suggested change to the Rule 32 with regard to joint custody calculations to the Supreme Court, and they chose not to

1 approve that. And so, we have been 2 looking at that topic again. 3 So, it is an important topic, 4 Kenneth, and you and I have discussed 5 that before, and it's certainly a topic 6 that's on the minds of the Committee. 7 And because of the federal regulations 8 that require the four-year review of the 9 schedules, that's the primary focus at 10 this point. But we certainly do intend 11 to circle back to those issues that you 12 raised. 13 Any of the judges or staff 14 members have any comments about his 15 direct question relating to training? 16 (No response). 17 MR. PASCHAL: Okay. The second 18 question --19 MS. DAVIS: We are a little bit 20 over five minutes, but we spent some of 21 your time on the five minutes. So, let's 2.2. give it another minute and a half. 23 MR. PASCHAL: All right. Okay.

The second question regarding just I would like to ask the Committee, the Chair, just please consider as you look at the possible suggestion in the Child Support Guidelines. If you haven't received feedback from the black belt community, please do. A lot of people are struggling already, as you already know. But just please consider the black belt community, community of color. It seems like they are at a lower income. And those communities are struggling already on both sides. So, just please be aware of that.

2.2.

And speaking of struggling,

Committee members, are there any

non-custodial Committee members assigned

to this committee?

(No response).

MS. DAVIS: I don't know if the Committee members want to speak to their personal family arrangements. If they want to, they can. They may not want to speak to their personal custodial relationship.

1 MR. PASCHAL: Well, I'll tell you 2 what, I also have a written request to the 3 Chair. But can you respond whether members 4 are non-custodial parents, but thanks for 5 your time and allowing me to speak. 6 you. 7 MS. DAVIS: Sure. Thank you, 8 Kenneth. We always appreciate your 9 interest. We understand you represent a 10 number of fathers that have -- fathers that 11 have -- that you help communicate, and we 12 appreciate that. 13 We are close to our ending time 14

We are close to our ending time frame. And certainly want to, again, thank Dr. Venohr for her great job that she has done providing information to the Committee and her willingness to participate via Zoom, which she means she gets up a lot earlier perhaps than she would ordinarily have to do. And so, we certainly appreciate that.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

And we will get back with you,

Jane. If you have any questions that you

1 want to direct to the Committee in the 2 interim, we have a couple of dates in 3 mind. 4 Bob, do you want to speak to 5 those for just a minute? 6 MR. MADDOX: Yes. We have 7 tentatively set the next few dates for the 8 meetings. I think Brad -- for the 9 Committee meetings. Brad sent those out 10 yesterday to save the dates emailed. 11 are Thursday, October 8th from 10:00 to 12 12:30, and Thursday, November 5th, from 10:00 to 12:30. 13 14 Thank you, Bob. MS. DAVIS: 15 we do appreciate all the staff, the people 16 in the background, that make this happen 17 They are sort of the unsung for us. 18 heroes, and they do a great job of helping 19 us to help the kids in the State of 20 Alabama. 21 So, any other questions or 2.2. comments from Committee members before we 23 adjourn?

(No response).

2.2.

MS. DAVIS: Dr. Venohr, do you have any questions of the Committee before we adjourn?

DR. VENOHR: No. I do have some notes and all on some follow-up information to get a side-by-side schedule without the self-support reserve and the existing and then also the proposed right now. And I will put out a couple of our options with the self-support reserve just — that might make sense to get you — you know, to grease the lube to get you talking about it, doing some sort now and doing some more analysis of how many CPs have more income than the NCP at that low end, and just some more information on that.

And we will get into a little
bit more prompter. Like I say, it's just
been crazy with COVID. It's been
impossible to schedule our time. But
it's getting a little better, and I hope
it is on your end too, but you have the

1 added issues of the hurricane. 2 apologize for that. 3 Is there anything else that I missed as far as we have to prepare? 4 5 MS. DAVIS: Let's start with our 6 judges first. Any of our judges have any 7 questions or comments that you would like 8 to make to -- to get Jane to focus on? 9 (No response). 10 MS. DAVIS: Any. Practitioners? 11 (No response). 12 MS. DAVIS: If anyone thinks of 13 something after the meeting, sometimes that 14 does happen, if you would communicate 15 through Bob and myself, then we will pass 16 along the information to Dr. Venohr. 17 again, the members who joined us from the 18 public, if you have follow-up comments that 19 you would like to do, we would appreciate 20 it if you would send that to the Committee 21 in writing so that we can disperse it to 2.2. the Committee. 23 If there is nothing else, then

1	we will be stand adjourned. Thank you
2	all.
3	MR. MADDOX: Thank you. Stay
4	safe.
5	(Conclusion of Advisory
6	Committee Meeting at 12:29
7	P.M.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF ALABAMA,
3	MONTGOMERY COUNTY,
4	I, Jeana S. Boggs, Certified Court Reporter
5	and Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large,
6	do certify that I reported the proceedings in the
7	matter of:
8	BEFORE THE STATE OF ALABAMA
9	ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILD SUPPORT
10	GUIDELINES AND ENFORCEMENT
11	* * * * * * * * * * * *
12	on Thursday, September 17, 2020, the foregoing 144
13	computer-printed pages contain a true and correct
14	transcript of the statements by the Committee
15	members and other persons via Zoom.
16	I further certify that I am neither of
17	relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of
18	the Committee members and other persons, nor am I a
19	relative or employee of such Committee members and
20	other persons, nor am I financially interested in
21	the results thereof. All rates charged are usual
22	and customary.
23	I further certify that I am duly licensed

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

1	by the Alabama Board of Court Reporting as a
2	Certified Court Reporter as evidenced by the ACCR
3	number following my name found below.
4	This 29th day of September, in the year
5	of our Lord, 2020.
6	
7	
8	_
9	/S/Qeana S. Boggs Jeana S. Boggs, CCR
10	ACCR NO. 7 Exp 9/30/21 Certified Court Reporter and
11	Notary Public Commission expires: 8/9/2022
12	Continues for Caption Con 3, 2022
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	December 2007 Land
	Boggs Reporting & Video LLC

Boggs Reporting & Video LLC 800.397.5590 www.boggsreporters.com

DR. VENOHR: [39] 18/3 18/11 25/17 45/8 47/9 47/12 48/7 48/10 48/23 53/17 74/15 75/1 75/9 75/17 83/22 85/5 85/12 85/15 85/22 96/2 100/3 102/1 103/14 104/15 104/19 105/4 105/16 105/19 106/22 109/7 110/20 114/14 125/10 125/17 126/3 126/11 128/1 128/6 142/5 HON. DUNN **BURKS: [2] 8/5** 99/19 **HON. PALMER:** [11] 14/2 14/5 14/12 14/15 15/2 100/15 118/13 119/13 120/16 121/14 122/2 MR. **BRUECKNER:** [12] 9/14 9/17 9/22 125/4 125/16 126/9 127/17 128/5

128/11 131/7 131/10 132/5 MR. JEFFRIES: [1] 125/23 MR. MADDOX: [24] 7/9 7/23 8/4 8/6 9/7 9/16 9/19 10/5 10/8 10/13 10/19 10/21 10/23 11/2 11/4 12/5 12/20 14/22 15/3 53/14 124/6 124/10 141/6 144/3 MR. MEDARIS: [4] 11/15 12/19 16/13 16/17 MR. PASCHAL: [5] 9/5 133/12 138/17 138/23 140/1 MR. STARKEY: [1] 7/22 MS. BALDWIN: [8] 101/11 102/18 104/14 104/18 105/5 105/18 106/2 119/4 MS. BLACKBURN: [3] 143/12 104/23 108/18 110/10 MS. BUSH: [1]

8/3 MS. COX: [2] 115/20 122/17 **MS. DAVIS: [65]** 4/8 11/11 12/1 13/5 14/4 14/10 14/14 14/20 15/4 15/8 15/12 15/18 16/1 16/4 16/12 16/16 17/2 18/9 44/23 46/22 47/11 48/6 48/15 74/22 75/5 75/14 85/3 85/6 85/13 85/18 95/22 98/19 99/21 100/4 100/12 101/5 104/21 106/3 108/13 108/16 112/11 114/1 114/16 118/8 118/17 120/11 120/21 122/5 122/8 122/20 124/9 124/12 131/5 131/8 132/4 132/6 137/6 138/19 139/19 140/7 141/14 142/2 143/5 143/10 **MS. KING: [4]** 9/23 10/7 120/23 121/22

MS. STEINWINDER: [1] 118/5 PROFESSOR GRAY: [2] 106/6 108/12 \$ \$1 [1] 40/14 \$1,000 [1] 108/9 \$1,063 [1] 87/23 \$1,067 [1] 87/22 \$1,100 [2] 75/7 75/20 \$1,160 [2] 32/18 32/20 \$1,256 [1] 33/17 \$1,256.67 [1] 33/4 \$1,257 [1] 33/18 \$1,260 [2] 32/18 33/1 \$1,350 [2] 75/7 75/20 \$1,400 [1] 86/11 \$1,500 [1] 89/17 \$1,600 [1] 88/15 \$10 [4] 38/16 89/8 \$9/13 89/14 \$12 [1] 38/16 \$14 [1] 77/6	6150 [1] 86/12 616 [1] 70/1 617,000 [1] 70/2 62,000 [3] 108/9 108/10 126/17 62,400 [1] 77/2 620,000 [3] 68/22 93/2 102/13 6250 [6] 81/1 81/10 81/18 82/5 84/16 84/18 6270 [1] 82/7 6299 [1] 86/10 63,000 [1] 108/9 63,550 [1] 77/1 63,800 [1] 76/23 64,000 [1] 108/8 6400 [4] 107/18 107/21 107/23 108/1 645,000 [3] 58/5 61/21 61/22 650 [8] 40/10 40/14 43/4 86/18 87/5 88/20 89/10 89/18 6500 [2] 107/18 107/23 660 [1] 89/1 67.25 [3] 32/21 38/21 39/4 6700 [1] 86/7 6800 [2] 89/14 90/7	\$895 [1] 34/10 \$9.23 [1] 38/17 ' '91 [2] 91/12 93/13 '96 [1] 55/4 '97 [1] 55/4 '98 [1] 55/4 '98 [1] 55/4 4 [1] 69/19 .7 [1] 69/19 .7 [1] 69/19 .1 10 [11] 36/8 39/3 68/15 76/16 76/18 76/18 91/5 96/13 101/19 107/17 122/3 100 [1] 88/10 10:00 [3] 1/5 141/11 141/13 10:11 [1] 1/19 11 [3] 12/15 45/21 92/1 11:15 [2] 48/16 48/18 11:30 [2] 48/18 48/21 11:40 [1] 85/4 12 [6] 27/20 41/19 43/8 68/15 92/5 127/10 12:29 [1] 144/6
--	---	--

1 12:30 [2] 141/12 141/13 13 [3] 11/16 74/10 74/17 135 [1] 88/8 14 [3] 70/17 102/6 127/10 144 [1] 145/12 15 [1] 13/9 15th [1] 13/1 17 [4] 1/4 1/19 121/16 145/12 19 [3] 102/8 102/12 121/17 1975 [1] 128/17 2 2,000 [3] 24/11 24/12 31/3 2,300 [1] 40/2 20 [7] 14/5 15/1 31/21 34/3 85/22 119/16 131/9 2000 [2] 66/13 66/22 2002 [1] 68/3 2004 [1] 68/11 2005 [1] 70/21 2006 [1] 91/14 2007 [11] 49/14 51/23 52/2 52/2	52/4 53/7 75/23 100/3 100/4 100/6 100/9 2009 [1] 68/11 2011 [2] 67/20 134/12 2014 [2] 55/9 111/3 2015 [2] 66/13 67/21 2016 [4] 20/20 21/6 21/9 135/1 2018 [1] 22/17 2019 [4] 22/21 23/3 41/18 55/9 2020 [10] 1/4 1/20 13/21 37/2 37/11 55/7 69/2 76/2 145/12 146/5 2022 [1] 146/11 21 [1] 146/10 22 [1] 33/12 23 [1] 57/5 26th [2] 12/11 13/4 27 [2] 54/9 57/5 27.3 [2] 37/12 37/13 29th [1] 146/4 3 3.3 [1] 36/6 3.7 [1] 36/7 30 [3] 95/20 101/21 119/16 31st [1] 136/19	4.2 inches [1] 51/11 4.33 [1] 33/2 40 [9] 32/23 33/2 33/15 36/21 37/6 37/16 39/5 69/19 101/21 40-hour [1] 37/22 42 [2] 120/10 129/17 45 [1] 29/2 48 [2] 135/23 135/23 49 [1] 96/20 4th [1] 2/12 5
--	---	---

6	about [60] 9/14	131/16
	13/15 24/13 25/20	accounting [1] 81/8
6.7 [1] 45/4	26/11 27/11 28/4	ACCR [2] 146/2
60 [1] 25/9	28/10 28/12 28/15	146/10
6th [1] 13/21	29/19 37/19 40/22	accurate [2] 47/8
7	44/16 50/5 51/14	47/10
70 [2] 25/9 69/19	52/7 53/23 54/5	across [1] 120/2
73 [1] 40/16	55/14 55/22 57/7	action [1] 128/19
75 [1] 88/7	58/5 63/3 65/18	actions [1] 22/7
8	65/20 68/22 69/19	actual [5] 65/1 81/4
	70/1 76/4 76/8	81/6 98/9 128/3
8,333 [1] 25/1	77/18 79/4 84/21	actually [20] 12/8
8/9/2022 [1] 146/11	85/4 87/6 88/15	33/4 34/10 37/1
82 [1] 26/7	88/23 90/7 90/13	40/16 42/1 43/15
86 [1] 88/5	95/3 96/20 98/5	52/1 57/3 58/14
88 [1] 31/23	102/17 104/12	60/15 61/3 62/10
89 [1] 32/1	107/15 117/13	88/15 89/17 103/9
8th [1] 141/11	117/13 119/8	106/13 110/7
9	119/11 121/1 123/7	127/11 133/1
9.14.2.a [1] 129/3	125/12 125/23	add [3] 81/3 82/12
9/30/21 [1] 146/10	127/5 128/7 131/10	84/12
90 [2] 66/21 107/16	137/8 138/14	add-on [1] 82/12
92 [2] 25/1 25/12	142/13	add-ons [1] 81/3
	above [3] 38/12	added [1] 143/1
A 25 523 4 /5 4 /40	38/23 75/12	addition [1] 98/13
A.M [2] 1/5 1/19	abuse [1] 26/21	additional [3]
ability [6] 37/20	accident [1] 34/15	123/16 131/19
42/21 46/1 47/14	according [1]	132/7
121/8 125/22	129/17	address [2] 27/15
able [10] 6/12 6/16	account [2] 129/14	133/5
11/6 12/13 19/15	132/1	addressed [3] 20/14
23/12 24/10 24/19	accounted [1]	21/16 21/19
28/19 100/10		

\mathbf{A}
adds [1] 44/14
adjourn [2] 141/23
142/4
adjourned [1]
144/1 Adjunct [1] 2/6
Adjunct [1] 2/6 adjust [8] 47/5 53/5
56/22 79/8 91/18
93/11 100/21
100/22
adjusted [4] 71/21
76/17 87/20 93/8
adjusting [4] 70/16
79/4 84/2 87/6
adjustment [16] 20/12 20/16 26/13
28/11 39/17 39/21
71/8 78/16 86/21
86/22 98/3 98/12
99/11 105/17 112/7
128/22
adjustments [3]
87/17 113/6 130/12
Administrative [2]
3/23 12/10 admitted [1] 135/8
adopt [5] 74/3
94/10 94/10 95/18
103/19
adopted [3] 89/12
90/2 94/2

adopting [2] 30/4 31/13 adoption [1] 29/13 adopts [1] 96/22 adult [1] 55/21 adults [1] 69/17 advantage [1] 82/18 **ADVISORY [4]** 1/1 1/14 144/5 145/9 advocate [1] 134/3 advocating [1] 134/11 affect [3] 29/10 60/3 77/4 affected [3] 36/16 75/10 103/17 affects [1] 35/17 afraid [1] 131/5 after [21] 21/1 21/8 21/8 21/9 21/10 41/5 52/15 57/5 57/8 60/21 61/2 62/8 63/6 63/8 72/16 80/15 83/8 117/19 123/2 129/8 143/13 after next [1] 21/8 after-tax [9] 52/15 57/5 60/21 61/2 62/8 63/6 63/8

72/16 80/15 again [28] 14/17 30/2 31/7 38/4 39/11 40/3 42/4 43/4 51/6 55/18 67/12 73/14 77/16 83/11 84/16 94/22 95/1 96/16 97/11 112/4 113/19 114/23 126/20 132/16 134/6 138/2 140/14 143/17 against [2] 27/2 71/13 age [1] 64/13 agency [4] 22/1 22/2 24/5 46/9 agenda [1] 13/19 aggregate [1] 23/20 aggregated [1] 128/7 ago [1] 36/3 agree [4] 48/2 50/15 50/19 89/10 agreed [1] 125/2 agreeing [1] 8/9 Agriculture [1] 67/20 ahead [5] 13/14 20/17 21/2 123/14 131/12 aid [1] 130/10

A ALABAMA [111] 1/3 1/17 1/18 2/7 2/7 2/9 2/10 2/12 2/14 2/15 2/17 2/19 2/22 2/22 3/2 3/4 3/5 3/6 3/7 3/9 3/11 3/13 3/16 3/18 3/19 3/20 3/21 3/23 3/23 4/2 4/3 8/15 18/15 20/13 20/17 21/2 21/10 22/10 23/6 23/10 25/3 25/13 26/14 27/9 29/23 31/13 32/23 33/23 35/23 36/8 36/10 36/16 36/23 37/3 37/11 47/2 49/20 50/6 50/10 50/23 51/22 54/1 54/11 66/5 68/21 70/7 70/9 70/16 70/22 71/21 73/13 73/19 74/3 76/17 79/1 80/21 86/4 87/5 88/18 88/21 91/17 92/10 92/14 92/18 93/6 94/10 96/21 97/17 98/1 98/6 99/11 110/8 113/5 113/11 114/23 126/4 127/19

128/16 128/17 129/2 129/5 129/17 132/19 133/20 134/3 134/9 141/20 145/2 145/5 145/8 146/1 Alabama's [11] 20/4 29/12 36/5 38/17 39/9 45/2 53/5 70/18 79/9 88/1 112/9 ALECS [15] 22/1 23/7 23/23 24/6 28/20 30/12 31/17 32/5 32/8 33/13 42/14 96/16 97/2 97/7 107/1 alienated [1] 130/6 align [1] 94/12 alignment [1] 22/9 all [54] 5/8 5/18 7/9 7/13 7/14 9/19 10/8 10/13 11/9 12/7 15/20 17/1 17/11 18/9 22/15 23/17 24/5 27/10 27/21 37/2 40/8 40/19 45/6 48/21 52/5 54/20 54/22 54/23 55/16 59/20 62/18 66/15 68/19 69/1 82/10 83/23 84/11

87/10 94/15 98/19 98/20 99/21 112/5 112/12 127/3 129/6 131/1 134/6 134/7 138/23 141/15 142/6 144/2 145/21 allow [2] 12/22 116/11 allowing [1] 140/5 allows [2] 82/14 128/18 almost [2] 71/22 74/17 along [3] 74/8 103/11 143/16 alphabetically [1] 124/14 already [12] 5/22 20/14 20/18 21/16 21/19 48/13 105/11 105/11 134/11 139/7 139/8 139/12 also [30] 6/8 6/23 8/6 11/17 12/20 16/2 24/5 24/19 30/23 38/7 39/15 43/22 44/9 47/22 59/6 62/12 67/2 67/18 72/13 76/5 90/11 106/19 110/6 114/12 117/15 133/2 134/8 135/11

\mathbf{A}
also [2] 140/2
142/9
alter [1] 48/21
alternatives [1]
79/5
always [8] 24/8
47/17 49/23 57/11
57/14 117/21 120/3
140/8 am [74] 9/11 10/3
10/13 18/13 18/16
18/20 18/21 19/1
19/4 22/9 25/10
38/13 41/3 43/3
44/17 44/18 48/17
49/3 49/22 53/2
53/7 53/14 53/18
55/21 56/3 61/21
63/14 63/17 66/23
67/5 67/22 68/15
69/12 71/7 72/8
73/2 73/14 74/5
77/16 77/21 83/7
85/2 85/15 85/22
87/6 89/4 91/4 91/8
95/20 97/11 102/22 107/10 107/21
110/10 10//21
116/5 117/23 118/5
119/10 127/14
128/7 131/5 131/10

131/14 131/16 131/21 131/22 132/6 133/23 134/9 145/16 145/18 145/20 145/23 **AMANDA** [9] 2/8 7/18 85/14 115/3 115/16 118/6 118/8 118/21 122/15 amended [1] 128/17 among [1] 35/6 amount [26] 41/20 42/3 50/21 81/4 81/6 82/5 82/7 82/14 82/15 84/15 86/12 86/13 86/18 86/23 88/6 89/22 94/11 94/16 105/22 107/22 109/10 112/1 126/16 128/8 131/3 131/11 amounts [5] 67/10 99/23 107/12 107/14 112/1 analysis [9] 19/18 21/23 22/22 39/16 40/19 41/7 70/14 98/14 142/15 analyze [3] 22/18 24/20 102/21 analyzed [2] 27/10

64/5 angle [1] 69/4 annual [3] 41/19 130/8 137/9 another [13] 14/17 36/17 59/1 60/10 61/11 61/16 68/7 76/10 77/22 108/18 122/4 134/4 138/22 answer [5] 101/23 118/6 125/2 129/16 129/18 answered [1] 121/2 anticipated [1] 68/17 any [50] 5/20 6/1 11/4 12/17 13/22 16/7 18/23 23/22 23/23 25/11 25/12 25/17 47/6 48/5 48/7 62/4 66/7 73/8 74/12 78/4 82/1 83/19 97/22 98/10 99/2 114/1 114/16 114/18 118/6 118/20 118/21 118/22 121/14 121/19 133/5 133/10 133/13 136/10 136/14 137/4 138/13 138/14 139/15

\mathbf{A}
any [7] 140/23
141/21 142/3 143/6
143/6 143/10
145/17
anybody [18] 15/4
23/19 25/14 74/12 101/7 108/16
113/18 114/8
114/13 116/2 118/2
118/11 118/20
122/12 124/1 124/3
124/4 124/7
anyone [13] 10/9
10/11 13/22 16/1
16/7 99/22 100/5
100/9 106/3 108/13
114/3 122/5 143/12
anything [5] 50/20 84/1 115/7 118/7
143/3
anywhere [1]
134/20
apologize [2] 14/6
143/2
Appeals [1] 2/9
APPEARANCES
[3] 1/22 3/17 4/5
appears [2] 112/13
120/5
applicable [2] 21/7 32/23

application [4] 19/23 20/11 39/16 64/17 applies [3] 39/21 89/14 104/9 apportionment [2] 126/10 131/3 appreciate [19] 5/6 5/7 5/11 12/2 13/6 14/21 17/4 17/16 115/15 122/22 123/5 132/16 133/14 134/6 140/8 140/12 140/21 141/15 143/19 approach [5] 69/14 69/21 71/18 73/3 73/5 approaches [2] 73/1 131/2 appropriate [7] 50/21 64/9 79/1 82/6 98/6 112/9 128/19 approval [1] 13/20 approve [3] 15/10 15/14 138/1 approximate [1] 56/21 aqua [1] 68/20 Arabic [1] 53/21 **arbitrary** [1] **62/6**

are [240] are a [1] 29/1 area [20] 35/20 39/20 40/5 43/2 75/10 76/3 86/4 86/16 87/14 96/5 96/5 96/19 96/21 97/2 97/3 97/5 97/10 103/15 108/19 118/19 aren't [1] 40/11 argument [1] 89/6 **Arizona [4] 66/1** 66/2 88/12 131/22 **Arkansas [2] 91/17** 93/19 **ARNOLD [3] 3/8** 7/19 118/14 around [1] 6/14 arrangements [1] 139/21 arrest [1] 29/9 arrested [1] 29/4 artificially [1] 62/12 as [113] 5/4 5/7 6/3 6/8 6/10 7/15 8/21 12/20 13/10 14/7 15/14 15/16 19/21 21/22 22/19 27/11 27/12 29/7 29/21 29/23 36/14 36/14

\mathbf{A}	137/14 137/14	attainment [3]
as [91] 36/20 37/2	139/3 139/7 143/4	92/13 92/15 92/19
37/17 38/2 39/4	143/4 146/1 146/2	attend [1] 16/9
40/18 43/6 47/15	ask [18] 6/5 7/6	attention [2] 17/5
48/19 49/22 51/2	16/7 17/20 17/21	17/23
51/19 52/9 55/5	44/19 46/18 46/18	attorney [12] 2/9
59/15 59/15 61/4	60/14 99/22 105/1	2/14 2/16 2/19 3/1
61/23 67/12 70/6	112/22 115/3 115/9	3/8 3/13 3/18 3/22
70/9 73/17 73/22	121/20 125/1 136/8	4/1 8/18 145/17
73/22 78/15 78/15	139/2	Attorney's [1] 3/10
78/23 78/23 79/7	asked [5] 22/15	attribute [1] 23/19
80/3 80/9 80/10	25/3 48/12 135/3	audio [1] 10/2
82/12 84/3 85/10	136/7	August [6] 11/19
85/10 89/19 89/20	asking [1] 48/19	12/11 13/4 13/21
94/19 95/17 95/17	aspect [1] 12/4	36/4 92/4
96/21 97/17 97/17	assigned [1] 139/16	August 26th [2]
97/22 98/11 99/10	assisting [1] 112/19	12/11 13/4
102/7 102/8 102/12	associate [3] 3/3 4/2	August 6th [1]
102/7 102/8 102/12 102/12 110/16	17/14	13/21
112/18 113/1 113/9	Association [1]	authorizing [1]
116/1 116/17 117/9	134/10	11/20
119/10 119/11	assume [5] 11/5	automated [4] 24/3
119/10 119/11	57/17 80/8 86/6	24/16 30/14 46/6
123/11 124/5	105/12	automation [1]
125/11 124/3	assumption [2]	46/4
126/5 126/5 127/21	67/5 80/19	available [5] 16/23
120/5 120/5 12//21	assumptions [2]	36/5 70/20 80/15
12//21 12//21 128/17 129/7	52/21 83/8	101/12
	assure [2] 128/20	average [9] 34/11
130/17 131/16	129/4	36/19 37/4 37/12
132/19 132/20	attached [1] 24/6	41/11 41/14 41/15
133/22 135/5 135/5	attain [1] 24/10	41/18 70/17
136/14 136/14	[-] - "-"	

A	43/18 45/8 49/14	80/17 81/7 81/22
	51/21 52/3 54/2	82/2 82/14 83/3
award [1] 131/12	55/3 55/7 65/14	83/5 84/2 85/11
aware [4] 119/2	71/10 74/3 75/23	86/12 86/13 86/18
136/19 137/3	78/5 99/23 100/6	87/18 89/23 91/4
139/13	105/12 12//21	93/13 94/11 96/17
away [4] 73/19 85/9	134/17	97/1 97/23 98/8
90/1 132/1	basic [2] 24/21	98/8 98/13 102/15
awhile [1] 137/13	86/10	103/8 105/2 108/7
awkward [1] 21/1	basically [9] 116/7	108/8 108/20
В	116/13 116/14	110/15 110/18
back [16] 11/19	116/17 116/22	111/20 112/14
22/18 34/15 61/5	110/1/110/22	111/20 112/14
66/21 74/20 84/16	131/14	113/21 114/3
104/10 121/20		113/21 114/3
122/12 122/13	basis [2] 128/10 132/3	117/1 117/4 117/9
122/12 122/13		
138/11 140/22	be [103] 5/23 6/12	119/2 119/14
	6/16 11/6 12/13	119/18 122/14
background [2]	13/1 14/19 15/5	123/16 129/10
67/17 141/16	16/14 16/20 16/23	129/18 131/3
balance [1] 134/17	19/15 21/17 23/12	131/23 132/13
BALDWIN [2]	26/11 26/18 27/1	133/2 139/12 144/1
3/10 7/17	28/2 29/19 30/7	became [1] 34/18
balloons [1] 63/10	30/15 30/20 31/2	because [66] 11/6
bar [8] 41/12 41/13	31/7 31/12 32/6	18/7 22/5 22/18
41/17 42/2 56/14	33/2 34/11 34/21	23/1 23/14 26/1
56/14 93/6 93/7	34/23 37/5 44/1	32/7 32/15 32/19
Barbara [1] 68/9	44/1 50/4 52/5 54/5	34/7 36/20 38/8
barometer [1]	62/22 64/20 65/5	39/1 40/6 41/9
64/14	65/23 68/16 72/11	46/20 47/3 47/15
base [1] 128/14	73/23 74/16 74/20	51/21 52/13 56/5
based [19] 31/17	76/9 77/7 80/11	56/21 60/4 60/23
	I	

because [41] 62/1 65/2 65/16 66/16 68/12 69/8 71/7 72/2 72/6 72/13 72/21 73/15 74/1 76/19 85/9 86/10 87/2 88/1 89/2 101/14 102/22 104/11 104/15 105/7 107/1 107/13 108/5 108/6 109/9 109/14 110/1 118/18 120/5 126/11 126/20 127/18 128/14	138/1 142/20 142/20 before [10] 1/15 16/9 17/19 48/8 70/19 86/1 138/5 141/22 142/3 145/8 begin [3] 6/15 16/9 135/12 beginning [4] 20/20 21/6 59/4 60/1 behavior [1] 23/3 behind [1] 64/23 being [8] 5/7 8/16 29/21 88/14 107/10 107/15 118/19 133/18 believe [5] 11/19	49/20 50/5 55/6 64/4 64/8 70/15 73/23 97/16 108/3 134/18 134/21 Betson [21] 52/22 53/23 54/2 54/4 54/8 54/11 56/15 58/17 58/22 61/3 64/3 64/4 65/22 67/10 73/20 79/18 80/3 83/15 84/17 91/14 104/5 Betson's [3] 64/17 67/7 68/13 Betson-Engel [1] 91/14 Betson-Rothbarth
129/18 130/3 132/1 138/7 become [3] 34/13 111/13 116/9 becomes [1] 46/5 been [31] 29/3 32/17 33/12 34/18 34/20 36/13 38/2 44/4 44/6 52/14 52/21 54/3 57/17 57/19 68/23 69/2 74/7 85/16 89/1 89/23 101/16 113/5 119/16 121/6 121/12 134/11	100/23 119/14 121/11 121/14 believes [1] 66/15 below [4] 43/4 89/5 90/5 146/3 belt [2] 139/6 139/9 bench [1] 137/13 benefit [1] 126/7 benefits [2] 44/10 130/18 besides [2] 130/2 134/4 Bessemer [2] 3/15 3/16 best [13] 23/8 46/19	[11] 52/22 53/23 54/2 54/4 54/8 54/11 64/3 65/22 73/20 80/3 104/5 better [16] 42/19 46/12 53/5 53/8 58/2 58/9 71/18 79/15 82/19 83/4 84/4 111/7 111/18 130/1 134/19 142/22 between [9] 22/16 40/14 41/23 50/20 50/23 71/1 82/8

В
biannual [1] 130/8
bias [1] 40/4
biased [2] 96/17
106/23
big [6] 41/22 53/12
53/12 68/20 78/2
84/23
bigger [2] 53/9
72/15
biggest [2] 74/9
84/20
Bilyou [1] 10/17
Birmingham [3]
3/2 3/9 3/13
bit [20] 25/13 40/23
47/19 54/16 61/14
72/1 73/13 74/18 74/20 75/12 84/21
85/6 94/4 96/9
106/15 108/11
100/13 108/11 109/18 128/12
138/19 142/19
black [2] 139/6
139/9
BLACKBURN [4]
3/6 7/18 15/11
15/12
blue [5] 71/22 96/5
96/10 96/21 97/2
board [2] 120/2
146/1

BOB [22] 3/22 5/2 7/6 7/7 11/11 12/3 13/5 50/9 53/10 54/16 74/6 74/16 98/22 115/18 123/22 124/3 124/6 124/21 137/7 141/4 141/14 143/15 Boggs [5] 1/16 5/10 8/8 145/4 146/9 bordering [1] 91/9 both [11] 31/18 64/11 81/5 89/9 116/19 124/13 124/16 124/17 134/21 136/4 139/12 bother [1] 57/16 bottom [9] 49/16 53/22 54/18 61/11 71/11 72/22 73/9 89/21 91/20 bound [1] 67/22 box [1] 63/7 BR [4] 56/4 59/23 91/15 101/17 BR4 [3] 59/5 60/1 67/8 BR5 [16] 60/12 70/5 70/7 71/20 74/3 76/17 93/7 93/10 94/10 95/19

99/10 101/17 103/19 113/5 114/9 114/22 BRAD [10] 3/17 8/10 11/12 12/1 12/16 16/16 17/2 137/8 141/8 141/9 break [1] 27/7 **breaking** [1] 18/8 **Brewington** [2] 120/6 121/6 BRIAN [3] 3/3 7/20 7/21 brief [1] 100/13 bring [3] 50/9 111/9 128/15 bringing [2] 17/4 111/8 broken [2] 34/14 44/3 **BRUECKNER [4]** 4/7 9/9 9/11 9/15 building [1] 59/15 bulk [1] 123/3 bullet [4] 24/9 34/3 39/8 66/8 bullets [6] 75/2 75/13 75/16 76/7 76/10 76/12 bumps [2] 70/1 70/5 bunch [3] 42/7

B bunch [2] 64/22 75/2 bundle [1] 72/15 burden [2] 110/13 117/14 burdensome [1] 84/12 Bureau [6] 43/19 57/22 58/7 59/2 67/3 70/14 BURKS [3] 3/14 8/4 99/20 BUSH [2] 2/13 8/2 business [3] 16/8 66/16 67/14	calculus [1] 64/23 calendar [2] 11/21 22/17 California [1] 68/9 call [4] 7/6 10/14 90/6 134/15 called [5] 10/3 10/9 61/12 65/9 123/22 came [2] 35/14 67/9 can [68] 6/6 9/12 13/16 15/9 15/15 18/19 23/8 46/6 46/9 48/20 50/9 52/5 53/10 59/7 62/17 63/6 68/22 71/20 72/5 72/18	cap [3] 38/19 62/7 62/9 capability [1] 6/20 capacity [1] 5/12 capita [1] 69/21 car [2] 34/13 44/3 care [6] 26/9 27/20
<u>C</u>	72/22 73/12 74/18 85/20 89/19 91/1	34/17 80/23 90/16 132/3
calculate [3] 60/17 135/15 136/11 calculated [1] 136/2 calculating [1] 81/5 calculation [3] 24/14 35/7 127/2 calculations [11] 31/2 31/4 32/4 32/10 40/2 96/16 125/8 135/6 136/6 137/1 137/22 calculator [3] 24/7 32/16 129/21	91/6 91/19 92/21 93/3 93/9 93/16 94/8 94/13 95/3 98/22 98/23 101/23	carefully [1] 98/5 caretaker [2] 26/10 27/21 caretaker/relatives [1] 26/10 caretakers [4] 40/16 40/17 41/2 43/5 Carolina's [1] 87/13 Carrie [2] 10/17

\mathbf{C}	Center
case [30] 21/21	17/15
25/23 27/14 29/1	Centra
38/17 64/16 66/22	12/23
92/2 92/2 92/11	cents []
92/16 92/21 93/3	certain
94/7 94/8 94/14	27/9
94/16 94/22 95/4	certain
95/5 95/6 95/10	5/14 25
98/14 103/16	78/20 8
103/17 103/23	91/1 1
104/12 119/16	122/20
128/10 128/10	138/5
caseload [2] 97/3	140/14
107/2	CERT
cases [15] 21/23	145/1
24/12 26/2 27/19	Certific
27/22 28/6 31/3	145/4
35/6 42/10 82/15	certify
82/16 95/7 96/15	145/16
97/9 102/22	chair ['
casted [1] 130/5	133/21
categories [3] 67/11	137/3 1
69/9 69/13	challen
category [1] 126/2	130/16
caused [2] 44/5	change
57/20	52/21 5
CCR [1] 146/9	63/4 67
cell [2] 66/20 66/20	76/20
cells [2] 106/20	80/18 8
107/6	106/13
census [1] 70/20	114/7

enter [2] 2/3 al [2] 3/18 1] 97/22 1 [2] 24/20 ly [16] 5/5 5/18 48/20 80/17 84/13 11/22 114/3 132/17 138/10 1 140/21 ed [4] 1/16 146/2 146/10 [3] 145/6 5 145/23 7] 2/6 7/15 136/13 139/2 140/3 1ge [1] e [23] 33/23 57/18 59/1 7/4 71/16 76/21 78/3 84/1 104/20 3 112/17 116/23

117/20 121/12 121/15 122/4 134/12 137/21 **changed** [1] 98/1 changes [11] 13/22 39/12 56/22 57/19 59/4 66/19 84/5 106/10 107/4 117/19 121/20 characteristic [1] 26/6 charged [1] 145/21 chart [12] 26/5 45/3 56/11 56/12 61/11 IFICATE [1] 70/11 77/10 77/22 87/9 90/11 91/20 94/21 charts [3] 19/4 45/1 113/4 chatting [1] 7/3 check [2] 11/12 45/14 checked [1] 24/5 Chief [1] 135/3 child [89] 1/2 1/14 2/14 2/21 3/11 16/20 18/18 20/1 22/2 22/5 22/6 22/12 23/6 24/3 25/1 26/17 26/18 27/1 27/6 27/22 28/1 28/3 34/17

Child [66] 46/19 46/22 47/6 47/23 49/11 50/8 50/13 55/18 55/20 57/7 62/9 64/2 64/12 64/12 64/21 65/2 69/7 69/20 71/2 74/2 75/6 75/20 77/1 80/12 80/23 81/1 81/11 81/14 86/9 93/20 94/13 94/16 102/10 103/9 110/19 111/18 116/8 116/8 116/14 116/14 116/21 120/6 120/16 121/10 121/16 121/16 123/4 125/14 126/8 128/22 129/2 129/13 129/23 130/16 134/12 134/18 134/22 135/5 135/9 135/15 136/2 136/6 136/11 136/23 139/4 145/9 child's [2] 50/17 80/23	childcare [3] 44/4 81/4 82/13 children [42] 25/5 25/22 26/2 26/3 26/7 46/23 49/21 50/6 61/2 61/9 63/9 63/23 64/11 64/11 65/4 65/12 65/12 65/16 69/18 72/19 77/2 77/3 79/2 83/6 94/19 95/10 95/12 97/17 102/16 109/1 111/15 111/21 112/10 128/20 129/5 129/7 129/10 129/15 129/22 130/3 130/22 131/20 choice [1] 130/4 choices [1] 115/6 chose [1] 117/2 circle [3] 24/22 122/14 138/11 circuit [3] 2/11 2/12 136/20 circuits [2] 134/14 135/13 circumstance [2]	42/9 42/12 42/22 42/23 43/1 56/18 56/19 57/5 58/21
child's [2] 50/17	circuits [2] 134/14	42/23 43/1 56/18

\mathbf{C}	67/15 107/19	95/3 97/13 98/4
coast [1] 36/16	coming [2] 53/17	99/2 99/14 106/4
Code [2] 128/16	65/23	108/17 112/8 113/3
128/16	commencing [2]	115/7 118/3 118/20
collected [2] 55/4	1/19 21/8	118/23 123/6 123/9
55/8	comment [6] 25/14	123/12 124/18
collective [1]	99/18 101/7 106/7	124/23 132/11
127/22	106/17 122/6	133/21 134/7
college [3] 3/4	commenting [1]	135/19 135/22
92/17 92/20	105/6	136/13 137/3
color [1] 139/9	comments [19] 9/3	137/20 138/6 139/2
Colorado [3] 2/4	9/21 12/14 12/17	139/15 139/16
17/16 89/12	13/18 25/11 25/18	139/17 139/20
Columbia [1] 54/10	44/19 48/8 74/13	140/17 141/1 141/9
column [1] 24/22	83/20 115/11	141/22 142/3
Comanor [4] 68/8	124/23 132/8	143/20 143/22
72/22 73/2 73/3	132/17 138/14	144/6 145/9 145/14
Comanor's [1] 73/5	141/22 143/7	145/18 145/19
	143/18	communicate [2]
combination [3] 73/15 79/21 91/13	Commerce [1] 3/4	140/11 143/14
	Commission [1]	communities [1]
combined [4] 76/23 86/11 108/6 108/7	146/11	139/11
	Commissioner [2]	community [3]
combines [1] 73/11	1/17 145/5	139/6 139/9 139/9
combining [3] 66/14 66/23 67/2	committee [68] 1/1	compare [2] 68/12
	1/1/1 2/5 6/11 6/13	92/6
come [7] 6/3 6/4 6/9	7/7 7/14 8/12 8/20	compared [4] 31/20
75/13 121/8 121/20	10/1 11/20 13/10	70/22 109/2 109/3
128/8	15/22 17/7 20/14	comparing [1] 91/8
comes [4] 51/13	21/15 49/18 51/13	comparison [1]
55/11 130/15	73/7 78/6 80/18	103/23
136/23	83/23 87/16 91/2	comparisons [3]
comfortable [2]		L L L [-]

C	144/5	constantly [1]
comparisons [3]	confidentiality [1]	66/19
65/17 77/20 103/17	24/1	constitutionality [1]
compelling [2]	cons [1] 117/6	130/17
73/18 89/6	consent [1] 23/14	consumer [7] 55/12
complements [2]	conservative [1]	57/20 58/1 59/3
20/13 21/22	94/5	60/12 63/4 72/4
complete [2] 92/11	consider [22] 21/13	consumers [1]
117/15	28/8 29/6 30/6	59/17
completing [1]	30/23 31/14 35/19	contain [1] 145/13
98/14	37/9 38/6 63/22	context [2] 25/19
complicated [2]	64/14 65/13 78/7	44/15
85/10 89/20	80/12 80/13 83/9	continue [1] 123/6
computations [1]	87/16 91/3 110/6	contribute [1]
137/17	118/23 139/3 139/8	71/18
computer [3] 6/23	considerable [1]	contributes [3]
18/21 145/13	33/21	63/11 76/6 84/6
computer-printed	consideration [7]	conversion [1]
[1] 145/13	35/12 35/15 80/1	83/17
con [1] 117/9	84/8 87/19 110/3	convert [2] 61/5
concentrate [2]	127/4	80/5
25/22 56/4	considerations [2]	converted [3] 33/9
concern [3] 28/17	77/23 78/1	68/23 109/16
103/6 103/13	considered [4]	copy [2] 1/10 17/9
concerned [4]	21/17 51/19 67/22	correct [4] 12/18
104/12 110/11	126/19	12/19 14/19 145/13
117/13 137/15	considering [2]	correction [1]
concerns [3] 18/23	84/10 89/1	14/23
20/7 74/9	consistency [2]	corrections [3]
conclude [1] 97/12	27/14 41/21	13/22 14/3 15/5
concluded [1] 64/6	consistent [4] 43/22	correctly [1] 9/12
Conclusion [1]	45/5 45/10 120/2	cost [6] 49/11 53/6
	l	

cost... [4] 63/23 79/9 91/22 103/11 costs [4] 50/8 50/13 64/2 65/2 could [38] 9/1 15/8 28/1 34/11 34/18 34/20 34/21 37/18 42/19 44/1 44/1 44/3 44/4 44/6 44/7 45/22 78/20 79/16 79/18 79/22 80/13 80/18 87/18 88/5 103/19 104/19 106/11 106/12 106/15 108/7 108/8 109/7 109/12 110/15 117/9 118/17 118/18 130/10 couldn't [2] 11/14 67/8 counsel [1] 145/17 counter [1] 65/7 counter-methodolo gy [1] 65/7 counterintuitive [1] 52/13 country [4] 59/14 134/1 134/5 134/5 county [5] 2/17 3/15 136/18 136/20

145/3 couple [8] 11/13 34/19 44/13 57/19 90/13 133/22 141/2 142/10 course [10] 6/2 8/7 29/8 36/9 63/17 79/10 84/19 87/1 87/17 97/6 court [27] 1/16 2/9 3/18 3/20 4/2 5/11 8/7 8/11 8/15 8/19 11/18 12/16 18/15 44/22 46/2 89/9 116/10 116/20 117/7 120/18 130/2 135/2 137/23 145/4 146/1 146/2 146/10 courts [3] 3/23 12/11 37/8 cover [1] 81/12 covered [1] 82/1 COVID [3] 35/21 39/10 142/20 COX [3] 2/8 7/18 85/9 CP [3] 109/16 109/23 110/6 **CP's** [1] 109/8 CPR [3] 98/7 125/9 custody [7] 26/20 127/21 CPs [3] 109/17

110/8 142/15 crazy [1] 142/20 create [2] 27/13 134/16 credible [2] **70/3** 74/2 credit [4] 71/13 71/15 80/13 80/14 CS [3] 119/17 120/10 129/17 CS-42 [2] 120/10 129/17 Culverhouse [1] 3/4 **curious** [1] 119/10 current [15] 50/1 50/10 51/22 54/1 55/10 56/8 65/21 65/22 66/18 75/22 87/3 93/14 99/23 100/16 129/13 **currently** [1] 100/2 **custodial** [15] 27/6 28/3 46/15 81/19 108/22 109/2 109/3 109/4 110/12 110/14 110/16 121/7 139/16 139/23 140/4 134/12 135/10 135/15 136/12

C custody [2]	100/4 100/6 107/14 108/22 109/1 125/8	decreases [19] 52/12 52/19 56/6
137/17 137/22	125/12 125/13	58/16 61/18 62/13
customary [1]	126/13 126/22	71/7 71/19 76/6
145/22	127/23 128/4 128/6	76/8 76/14 76/16
cutting [1] 103/9	134/17	79/11 84/6 94/15
cycles [1] 66/16	dated [1] 12/11	94/20 96/13 102/7
	dates [3] 141/2	102/11
D	141/7 141/10	decreasing [1] 70/4
Dadeville [1] 3/11	DAVIS [2] 2/6 7/15	deductibles [1]
daily [1] 132/3	day [2] 48/4 146/4	82/17
Dakota [3] 37/15	deal [1] 78/2	deduction [1] 71/14
90/2 90/8	Dean [1] 3/3	deemed [1] 64/20
data [69] 19/7	debated [1] 73/4	deeper [3] 40/20
19/18 19/19 21/21	decade [2] 67/21	48/3 52/10
22/3 22/4 22/19	73/11	default [2] 20/10
22/21 23/8 23/17	December [1] 21/9	111/7
24/3 24/18 26/23	decide [4] 112/8	definitely [1]
28/20 28/23 29/1	113/3 113/7 114/7	133/18
29/15 29/20 30/10	decides [2] 49/19	definition [3] 33/19
30/13 34/2 34/4	113/3	61/21 62/5
35/12 36/3 37/1	decision [9] 32/19	degree [2] 27/9
39/6 48/1 48/4	50/4 50/5 78/8 87/1	92/16
49/11 49/14 52/23	95/2 97/16 104/2	delay [2] 123/8
52/23 53/8 55/1	104/20	123/15
55/1 55/3 55/8	decision-makers [1]	dense [1] 98/17
55/11 56/9 63/22	32/19	Denver [2] 2/4
66/13 66/15 67/20	decisions [1] 91/7	17/16
68/11 70/20 72/21	decrease [9] 94/9	Department [4]
73/22 78/23 82/4	94/11 94/23 95/4	2/14 2/22 36/23
82/6 83/14 83/16	101/20 101/21	67/19
98/15 100/1 100/2	102/2 103/4 107/18	dependent [2]

deviete [1] 120/17 94/6 106/16 117/8 135/18
deviate [1] 120/17 deviating [1] 120/19 94/6 106/16 different [15] 35/21 55/1 56/20 61/15 117/8 135/18 discuss [1] 119/7 discussed [1] 138/4

D	40/23 43/17 46/3	141/15 141/18
discussion [2]	47/3 47/14 48/12	142/2 142/5 143/19
48/18 116/11	49/1 49/4 50/19	145/6
discussions [2]	52/16 53/15 57/18	document [6] 16/18
117/10 123/16	58/9 60/15 62/6	44/21 49/9 53/12
disperse [1] 143/21	62/19 62/20 65/10	75/16 98/23
distinction [1]	67/8 77/19 78/16	documents [2]
127/16	78/21 78/21 79/14	18/14 19/2
distribution [1]	79/18 79/18 79/19	does [13] 8/11
70/22	80/18 81/16 85/1	13/21 46/22 57/23
distributions [1]	86/5 86/14 88/3	65/15 74/12 82/13
71/1	89/10 89/10 89/21	87/10 100/4 108/22
District [2] 3/10	95/16 99/7 99/19	126/8 129/13
54/9	100/13 100/20	143/14
dive [3] 40/20 48/3	101/20 102/22	doesn't [8] 39/5
52/10	103/1 104/6 105/20	47/6 57/16 59/8
divide [2] 69/16	105/22 106/22	69/21 73/16 78/6
116/13	106/23 107/7 109/1	88/18
divided [3] 41/19	111/7 112/5 113/7	doing [20] 30/3
43/8 126/14	113/7 115/3 115/17	46/15 54/16 74/7
Division [4] 2/21	119/21 119/22	82/12 84/11 84/14
3/11 3/15 3/22	120/4 120/7 120/9	87/7 88/2 94/5 98/8
divorce [2] 129/8	120/14 123/10	113/1 113/14
134/13	123/17 125/7 126/1	127/19 127/20
divorced [1] 131/21	127/22 133/5 133/6	136/17 136/22
do [113] 6/2 7/4 7/7	134/7 134/14	136/23 142/14
7/10 13/6 13/10	134/23 135/5 135/5	142/14
17/19 17/20 18/4	135/8 135/9 135/15	domestic [2] 59/14
18/5 18/13 19/1	135/18 136/9	137/10
20/21 21/5 22/22	136/20 137/16	DON [1] 2/11
26/15 27/4 28/22	138/10 139/6	don't [58] 9/23 10/3
31/9 33/6 38/11	140/20 141/4	13/9 14/8 14/10

D don't... [53] 18/23 23/2 25/17 25/21 30/22 32/15 41/20 43/15 44/9 50/15 51/10 53/10 57/17 60/15 62/16 62/21 70/3 72/21 73/2 74/19 76/11 78/14 78/18 82/4 88/22 93/14 93/17 94/19 97/22 101/11 101/15 103/7 103/8 104/4 105/20 109/18 110/16 114/1 114/18 115/21 115/21 117/1 118/7 119/9 120/6 124/7 126/3 126/6 126/12 128/1 133/7 133/13 139/19 done [4] 5/5 120/3 131/11 140/16 dotted [1] 71/22 double [4] 24/5 36/11 45/14 81/7 double-checked [1] 24/5 doubt [1] 109/11 down [14] 14/6 20/3 34/14 38/1

44/3 56/10 71/2 74/16 74/17 75/3 76/9 85/20 98/23 113/17 dozen [1] 34/23 DR [14] 2/3 16/18 17/12 18/9 44/23 106/5 125/1 125/5 133/6 133/11 133/13 140/15 142/2 143/16 dragging [1] 89/9 driven [1] 104/16 drop [4] 39/8 53/9 57/21 121/11 130/20 duly [1] 145/23 **DUNN [3] 3/14 8/4** 99/20 during [6] 5/21 6/12 17/23 48/19 121/9 121/23

E

each [6] 5/14 56/14 67/11 77/6 92/7 106/20 earlier [7] 19/12 36/21 43/7 79/8 83/12 90/15 140/19 early [1] 16/18 earn [1] 37/20

earned [2] 80/14 92/8 earnings [5] 31/6 37/19 92/10 92/18 127/6 easier [2] 22/11 136/10 economic [14] 19/7 26/22 49/11 49/14 49/19 50/2 50/7 63/22 70/14 78/23 97/15 125/13 126/13 126/22 economically [1] 95/19 due [3] 35/21 94/23 economics [1] 87/2 economist [15] 17/14 38/14 49/22 51/2 55/6 57/4 66/9 67/13 68/7 70/6 73/11 73/17 73/22 84/3 97/23 economists [4] 50/15 50/19 51/7 55/17 economy [2] 111/11 111/13 edge [1] 47/13 **education** [1] **92/15** educational [2] 92/13 92/19 effect [3] 22/16

\mathbf{E}
effect [2] 65/3
102/21
effective [1] 38/14
eight [3] 47/2 92/23
95/7
either [8] 14/11
67/6 73/23 84/17
114/20 117/22
118/3 123/7
electricity [1] 59/19
else [16] 6/5 15/4 100/9 106/3 108/13
117/23 118/2 118/7
117/23 116/2 116/7
122/12 124/1 124/4
124/7 143/3 143/23
email [5] 7/1 7/3
12/8 12/11 12/23
emailed [4] 16/19
19/11 53/13 141/10
emails [1] 17/8
emancipating [1]
25/6
emergency [1]
81/23
employed [1] 31/7
employee [2]
145/17 145/19
employees [1] 37/3
employers [1] 38/20
30/40

employment [3] 29/10 37/23 44/9 enables [1] 46/3 **encourage [4] 5/20** 13/7 66/5 78/21 encouraging [1] 42/17 end [14] 9/3 9/6 9/10 9/18 18/2 41/16 52/17 90/10 100/17 100/18 103/5 105/2 142/16 142/23 ended [1] 116/4 ending [1] 140/13 ends [2] 88/14 102/10 **ENFORCEMENT** [4] 1/2 1/15 2/21 145/10 engaged [1] 111/15 engaging [1] 111/8 Engel [3] 65/9 91/12 91/14 enjoyed [1] 133/15 enough [4] 9/20 75/3 119/15 126/4 enter [1] 116/13 entertainment [1] 69/11 entire [1] 110/13 entitled [1] 129/10

epidemic [1] 39/10 equal [3] 81/22 92/13 136/21 equally [2] 64/15 65/14 equivalent [2] 33/7 33/16 error [2] 57/11 67/15 especially [5] 83/3 108/19 109/5 111/6 132/21 Espenshade [1] 91/11 **Esquire [11] 2/8** 2/13 2/18 3/1 3/6 3/8 3/10 3/12 3/17 3/22 4/1 essentially [2] 49/13 113/10 establishing [1] 131/2 estimate [2] 91/12 91/14 even [14] 28/5 36/4 38/16 39/4 71/17 76/20 84/3 94/15 95/14 100/16 111/20 119/15 121/4 130/16 **eventually** [1] **73/6** ever [4] 29/17

\mathbf{E}
ever [3] 47/14
48/4 51/10
every [4] 30/18
41/20 81/13 134/15
everybody [7] 14/1
16/19 18/19 23/5
98/23 118/10
132/19
everyone [3] 5/7
10/10 136/19
everyone's [1] 17/4
everything [1]
37/18
evidence [1] 89/2
evidenced [1] 146/2
exacerbates [2] 79/11 79/14
exaggerates [1] 62/13
examined [2] 37/18
45/9
examines [1] 64/13
example [4] 45/3
47/1 102/19 136/17
examples [3] 25/23
92/2 92/3
Excellent [1] 48/23
except [2] 91/15
116/17
exception [1] 120/4
excludes [1] 80/22
į l

executive [8] 19/7 44/20 48/11 49/2 49/6 49/7 49/17 102/5 exhibit [11] 35/1 61/12 68/16 74/21 74/23 86/1 91/5 92/1 92/5 95/9 102/5 existing [11] 49/13 50/22 68/21 71/23 73/13 74/1 80/21 86/3 93/6 95/15 142/8 Exp [1] 146/10 expand [1] 76/3 expands [1] 70/4 **expansion** [2] **83/5** 96/11 expected [1] 41/23 **expecting** [1] **97/1** expend [1] 64/12 expenditure [7] 55/12 57/20 58/1 59/3 60/12 63/4 72/4 expenditures [27] 50/17 50/18 52/23 55/3 55/8 55/11 55/18 56/9 57/6 59/5 59/7 59/7 59/11 59/21 60/9

61/4 62/10 62/11 62/18 63/9 64/13 64/19 64/21 69/7 69/10 80/4 83/10 **expenses [4] 81/2** 81/13 82/11 84/11 **expensive** [2] 69/17 111/21 experience [1] 37/21 expert [1] 105/7 expires [1] 146/11 explain [5] 18/17 53/2 53/8 120/8 120/18 **explained** [1] 121/6 explains [3] 19/20 71/6 87/13 explanation [1] 100/13 extent [1] 24/20 extraordinary [1] 45/16

F

faces [1] 80/9 **facilitate** [1] 135/4 factor [2] 76/5 129/21 factors [4] 35/18 51/4 51/18 97/21 fail [1] 5/21 failed [2] 19/8 68/5

F	favoring [1] 113/16	field [4] 29/1 29/20
	federal [40] 19/20	30/11 32/15
fair [2] 129/11 132/13	20/8 20/18 20/21	fields [2] 22/11
	21/5 22/12 22/20	30/13
fairly [5] 45/4 47/8	24/2 29/13 30/4	fifth [4] 54/5 58/17
57/3 128/21 129/6	30/5 31/13 32/22	58/22 80/20
fall [4] 66/1 107/6	35/11 36/17 39/13	figure [2] 76/12
125/7 126/1	39/15 42/14 49/12	104/8
falls [1] 86/15	51/20 51/23 52/4	file [5] 19/18 21/21
families [20] 49/21	52/14 63/21 75/23	98/14 117/21 121/8
50/6 52/15 58/12	76/2 80/2 80/7	files [1] 33/13
60/14 60/15 62/2	87/21 88/7 88/9	final [3] 111/4
62/21 64/10 65/4	88/11 93/23 105/7	114/23 116/8
65/11 77/5 79/2	110/1 110/22 112/3	finally [2] 83/17
83/13 83/15 89/3	112/6 128/19 138/7	130/13
97/17 98/6 112/10	federally [4] 29/8	financed [1] 66/2
129/9	30/17 30/19 107/5	financially [2]
family [5] 46/23	feds [1] 35/18	136/4 145/20
69/15 80/11 134/10	feedback [3] 135/4	find [10] 19/15
139/21 far [13] 27/12 54/15		30/18 33/15 45/23
72/21 74/13 78/23	feel [5] 6/21 99/14	46/4 74/19 75/4
97/17 125/17 126/5	107/19 114/4	96/19 96/20 129/7
127/21 135/5	119/11	finding [1] 31/20
136/14 137/14	fees [1] 59/20	findings [2] 19/18
143/4	fell [2] 40/4 97/9	129/17
	few [9] 26/2 35/6	fine [2] 85/18
father [1] 42/14	52/7 73/7 89/23	124/23
father's [1] 26/19 fathers [6] 26/8	97/9 123/18 131/1	finer [1] 106/11
31/19 32/1 33/7	141/7	finish [1] 41/4
140/10 140/10	few committee [1]	fired [1] 44/6
favor [3] 15/20	73/7	first [38] 5/1 5/9
113/13 114/8	FICA [1] 80/2	5/23 7/6 7/8 7/13
113/13/114/0		

First [32] 16/7 19/5 19/19 24/22 24/23 28/14 41/11 41/12 42/9 45/3 56/4 56/18 57/4 59/22 61/19 64/5 66/8 81/1 92/7 93/6 94/1 94/22 99/4 104/2 116/5 124/15 129/12 133/6 133/11 133/22 136/20 143/6 first-case [1] 94/22 five [15] 51/9 61/10 61/10 61/11 61/14 64/5 85/19 85/20 94/16 95/6 95/23 124/15 133/4 138/20 138/21 five-minute [2] 85/19 95/23 flip [2] 56/1 87/8 flipping [1] 95/20 floor [1] 38/19 Florida [4] 65/9 65/18 91/11 93/12 focus [5] 26/3 112/15 112/21	114/6 142/6 143/18 follow-up [3] 114/6 142/6 143/18 following [1] 146/3 fond [6] 66/14 66/23 67/5 73/2 73/14 89/5 food [5] 38/8 65/10 65/14 65/16 69/10 footnotes [1] 54/20 force [1] 130/4 forecasters [1] 51/8 foregoing [1] 145/12 forgot [1] 100/1 forgotten [1] 118/12 form [4] 67/9 119/17 129/17 130/7 formal [1] 111/12 formulas [1] 80/6 forth [3] 56/23 92/20 96/23 fortunately [1] 17/12 forward [2] 113/11 114/22 foster [2] 26/0	129/1 146/3 four [9] 33/1 54/3 56/13 68/16 69/16 77/3 94/14 95/6 138/8 four-year [1] 138/8 fourth [6] 43/1 58/17 58/22 68/13 80/1 92/16 frame [1] 140/14 free [2] 6/21 114/4 Friday [1] 12/15 fulfilling [1] 20/18 full [10] 31/6 31/8 32/21 33/8 33/16 54/22 88/6 102/4 111/23 129/11 full-time [5] 31/6 31/8 32/21 33/8 33/16 fully [4] 27/10 53/3 128/21 129/5 further [4] 74/18 103/11 145/16 145/23 furthest [2] 56/14
focus [5] 26/3	forward [2] 113/11	56/16

\mathbf{G}	107/1
gave [1] 92/4	115/7
general [2] 19/14	124/1
99/13	138/2
Georgia [1] 91/13	given
get [44] 7/2 17/22	gives
21/22 23/8 23/12	giving
23/17 24/12 24/19	112/1
28/19 31/10 42/19	go [29
46/23 47/6 48/4	48/21
50/4 53/12 54/19	56/3 5
58/20 71/5 71/13	63/19
71/14 78/23 79/17	73/16
84/5 89/16 94/17	77/9 8
105/1 108/4 108/10	92/21
109/11 110/16	98/18
111/13 111/22	113/2
111/23 122/11	115/2
122/13 123/2 123/2	130/3
140/22 142/7	goes [
142/12 142/13	113/1
142/18 143/8	going
gets [3] 89/17 117/7	10/14
140/19	18/5
getting [8] 16/22	18/21
22/3 32/7 32/9 58/2	23/2 2
58/9 63/7 142/22	31/2 3
give [22] 13/15 27/7	33/22
44/12 46/14 54/22	41/9 4
85/19 91/1 91/21	44/18
95/23 98/9 100/13	51/4 <i>5</i> 53/7 <i>5</i>
103/22 106/11	3311

14 110/5 115/5 7 115/17 123/9 15 131/12 **22** [1] 103/10 [1] 135/17 g [2] 106/9 18 9] 9/13 44/20 1 54/15 54/17 56/8 56/10 9 68/17 72/21 5 74/17 74/20 84/16 85/4 1 94/18 94/21 3 102/1 104/10 22 114/22 22 123/13 3 131/12 4] 57/6 70/1 11 126/7 [92] 7/10 4 11/17 14/19 18/13 18/16 19/1 19/5 25/10 26/10 31/12 32/6 2 40/7 41/3 44/15 44/17 3 49/3 49/23 52/12 53/2 53/18 54/13

54/14 54/14 54/14 55/21 56/2 56/3 56/11 61/9 62/14 63/12 63/14 63/17 65/3 65/20 67/23 68/14 68/17 71/18 72/11 74/5 74/6 74/16 75/2 76/9 76/22 77/4 77/16 77/18 77/21 81/14 83/7 85/8 85/10 89/1 89/5 91/4 95/23 96/3 96/17 102/6 102/15 104/23 107/5 109/11 110/14 110/18 111/10 111/19 112/3 112/14 112/14 115/22 116/6 120/4 120/14 121/23 123/21 126/16 128/15 129/21 132/6 good [6] 11/17 18/22 50/1 57/9 60/15 106/19 got [9] 7/1 8/13 11/16 14/3 44/6 52/8 58/9 102/4 122/18 gotten [4] 33/13

$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$	Gı
gotten [3] 44/8	gu
58/2 83/4	10
government [4]	1
20/8 20/21 21/5	$ \mathbf{G} $
80/7	gu
gracious [1] 66/3	gu
gradually [1] 39/23	1
grandma [1] 28/2	gu
graph [2] 92/6	2
108/5	gu
graphic [1] 106/8	1/
graphics [1] 67/23	20
graphs [1] 19/4	24 32
GRAY [4] 3/3 7/20	32
7/21 106/5	4(
grease [1] 142/13	52
great [8] 5/5 8/11	78
12/20 15/3 37/1	90
74/7 140/15 141/18	12
greater [3] 27/13	13
41/8 42/11	gu
greatest [2] 103/5	
103/13	H
green [3] 63/7 96/9	ha
96/10 CDEC [2] 2/1 7/21	10
GREG [2] 3/1 7/21	25
grids [1] 106/12	34
gross [6] 51/21 59/13 61/5 61/23	3.
68/23 80/5	4
group [1] 99/10	90
Stonb [1] ///10	1

uam [1] 54/9 uess [6] 99/4 105/8 122/11 123/1 06/7 108/20 10/10 137/6 **UEST [1] 2/2** uestimate [1] 23/9 uidance [2] 41/1 12/19 uideline [2] 20/2 7/13 **uidelines [32] 1/2** /15 18/18 19/22 0/1 22/13 24/7 4/10 24/14 28/9 1/1 31/4 32/4 32/9 2/16 35/4 35/7 0/1 50/22 50/23 2/4 68/5 76/21 8/2 78/13 78/20 6/15 120/17 25/15 128/23 39/4 145/10 iys [1] 42/20

ad [34] 5/2 10/2 0/15 17/3 26/20 9/3 31/4 32/1 34/3 4/8 34/14 34/16 5/7 35/8 36/3 7/14 77/6 81/5 0/4 96/15 102/19 15/11 115/12

118/12 120/23 123/20 123/21 125/10 133/23 135/20 135/22 137/18 half [6] 23/9 38/2 82/3 86/13 134/2 138/22 Hall [1] 11/2 hampering [1] 11/8 hand [16] 6/20 6/21 7/2 7/12 15/11 15/13 15/15 15/17 16/2 99/17 100/7 101/10 113/13 114/10 119/3 120/22 hands [7] 15/21 15/23 17/22 99/13 112/23 113/17 114/2 happen [5] 35/5 79/23 96/12 141/16 143/14 happened [4] 34/17 60/11 60/11 76/11 happening [5] 27/9 28/7 66/19 106/14 110/7 happens [4] 43/9 44/11 47/16 133/2

H
hard [3] 36/13
108/4 122/9
hardship [1] 26/22
has [36] 5/2 6/1
13/23 16/7 19/3
20/14 21/16 32/17
35/23 36/13 45/23
51/13 68/23 70/9
71/15 72/4 74/7
75/16 96/6 99/6
104/21 108/8 108/9
108/9 108/10 113/5 115/4 119/3 120/18
120/21 121/5 124/1
125/1 126/15
127/19 140/16
have [203]
haven't [4] 33/8
93/12 109/15 139/5
having [4] 89/7
117/14 119/15
136/3
he [29] 5/2 8/11
8/20 14/15 16/22
45/23 46/5 64/5
64/6 64/18 66/10
66/12 66/15 67/2
67/7 67/8 67/9
68/10 68/10 68/12
74/7 79/19 79/19
83/16 108/8 108/9

115/12 115/13 135/3 he's [2] 5/4 79/20 head [2] 80/10 118/16 health [5] 80/23 81/8 82/1 82/11 83/1 healthcare [1] 84/11 hear [4] 11/4 15/8 18/19 25/17 heard [2] 7/16 89/6 hearings [1] 130/12 heat [1] 106/9 heavy [2] 5/3 68/20 held [2] 1/15 82/9 **HELOCs** [1] 60/7 help [10] 5/14 61/17 114/12 124/21 130/19 135/4 136/16 137/4 140/11 141/19 helpful [4] 98/20 112/12 114/20 117/4 helping [3] 8/12 113/2 141/18 her [16] 5/12 5/14 7/16 17/16 37/20 37/20 46/7 86/17 99/10 112/19 119/3

120/21 133/8 133/9 140/15 140/17 here [21] 7/22 8/1 8/3 8/5 10/3 11/16 12/10 39/19 45/2 70/11 74/8 78/9 96/1 118/1 118/5 124/6 128/12 131/11 131/22 132/3 133/19 heroes [1] 141/18 high [16] 25/2 39/3 52/17 56/7 78/16 79/14 82/16 88/13 92/11 92/15 93/18 96/19 100/17 100/21 101/3 102/8 higher [22] 25/13 36/10 38/16 58/14 60/3 60/5 63/12 70/4 72/5 72/5 72/10 72/14 73/16 82/15 88/17 89/16 93/4 93/16 94/17 103/12 104/9 111/19 highest [10] 45/18 50/20 51/1 56/19 58/20 92/12 92/14 92/19 93/1 102/13 highlight [1] 27/18 highly [2] 30/17

Н
highly [1] 30/19
him [3] 14/18 46/7 66/14
hiring [1] 38/21
his [9] 14/15 37/19
37/20 64/5 67/8
68/10 86/16 115/13 138/14
historically [1]
137/9
history [2] 29/9
34/7
hit [2] 36/13 77/8
HOA [1] 59/20 hold [1] 18/1
home [4] 26/17
26/19 26/20 89/11
honestly [1] 103/7
honor [1] 14/18
Honorable [7] 2/9 2/11 2/16 3/14 3/20
4/2 8/13
hooked [1] 122/18
Hoover [1] 2/17
hope [4] 9/11 41/5
95/2 142/22
hopefully [2] 50/9 111/9
hoping [1] 109/12
hospitality [3]
36/15 37/11 39/9

host [1] 5/4
hotspot [1] 122/19
hour [4] 32/21
37/22 48/13 77/7
hours [13] 32/23
33/3 36/19 36/22
37/4 37/6 37/9
37/12 37/14 37/16
38/1 39/5 43/22
household [2]
50/18 80/10
households [3]
55/14 126/23 136/4
housekeeping [1]
16/8
housing [1] 69/10
how [27] 18/17
29/5 36/18 38/12
38/14 41/1 48/11
60/14 63/4 70/3
76/3 77/11 79/22
85/1 101/20 105/20
105/22 106/19
109/7 113/7 119/7
119/10 126/23
129/22 135/5
135/15 142/15
However [1]
130/21
Hoyem [1] 12/9
huge [1] 23/14
Human [2] 2/14

hundreds [2] 55/15 55/15 hurricane [1] 143/1 hurt [1] 34/15 I I'd [1] 98/3 I'll [3] 18/4 65/8 140/1 I'm [16] 7/22 11/7 11/8 14/18 18/4 61/9 66/14 79/19 79/22 85/22 101/17 110/17 126/15 127/14 135/23 136/18 I've [1] 5/22 idea [4] 23/18 25/12 42/20 91/21 **identified** [1] 124/4 identifiers [1] 23/18 **identify** [5] 5/15 5/21 6/5 6/6 15/9 identifying [1] 6/1 **Illinois** [2] 88/7 90/12 immediate [1] 47/17 impact [3] 26/1 72/13 93/4 impacts [1] 74/9

2/22

	Implement [1] 84/13 implementing [1] 107/3 importance [1] 29/14 important [10] 25/19 26/11 29/5 66/16 66/17 78/22 106/18 109/13 134/4 138/3 impossible [1] 142/21 improved [3] 63/5 72/3 72/17 imputation [14] 20/11 30/9 30/11 31/11 31/18 33/22 35/17 37/6 37/13 37/17 40/7 96/23 107/4 109/10 imputations [2] 21/12 110/7 impute [5] 37/21 103/1 127/13 127/22 128/1 imputed [12] 31/9 31/12 31/23 32/2 32/17 34/6 35/3 42/13 43/14 109/14 109/22 111/6	imputing [9] 21/14 29/5 31/15 36/21 38/22 39/4 39/5 110/4 127/5 Inaudible [1] 88/8 incapacitated [1] 127/14 incarcerated [9] 28/19 28/23 29/17 30/6 34/18 46/5 89/15 90/9 90/16 incarceration [2] 21/16 29/10 inches [2] 51/9 51/11 include [5] 59/8 59/11 105/15 116/19 116/20 include a [1] 116/19 included [3] 59/21 60/8 81/11 includes [3] 54/10 59/9 128/22 income [149] incomes [27] 31/1 40/1 57/21 58/4 58/5 60/4 61/20 62/2 63/13 70/4 70/10 70/21 72/1 72/2 72/6 72/10 72/14 73/16 76/23	77/8 78/15 89/16 93/4 94/17 104/9 110/15 128/3 inconsistent [1] 119/20 increase [8] 52/13 75/21 94/23 104/16 105/9 108/21 109/6 110/11 increased [1] 76/1 increases [13] 52/16 56/8 58/21 63/11 76/13 77/11 77/18 79/13 94/18 95/5 95/6 97/6 102/12 incur [1] 76/22 indicate [1] 129/19 indicated [6] 101/8 115/12 120/13 123/21 124/16 135/7 indicating [1] 120/15 indication [1] 29/22 individual [4] 21/13 29/6 31/14 110/3 industries [1] 36/12 industry [2] 37/10 39/10 ineffective [1]
--	--	---	--

42/19 45/13 58/3 58/10 70/2 129/19 132/10 140/16 142/6 142/17 143/16 initiated [1] 44/2 injury [1] 130/20 input [3] 13/11 34/8 127/12 installment [2] 59/9 60/6 instance [1] 37/10 instead [2] 60/13 86/19 insurance [7] 34/16 80/23 81/9 82/1 82/9 82/22 83/1 intend [1] 17/3 intensive [1] 65/16 intent [1] 20/2 intervort [0] 46/10 66/12 interrupt [1] 10/1 introduce [1] 5/9 investment [1] 59/16 involuntary [2] 21/17 90/17 involve [2] 29/3 29/16 involved [1] 130/10 is [400] is intended [1] 110/1 is [400] is intended [1] 17/3 intensive [1] 65/16 intent [1] 20/2 intervort [0] 46/10 66/12 interrupt [1] 10/1 introduce [1] 5/9 interrupt [1] 10/1 33/12 33/19 36/7 36/11 38/12 38/16 38/16 38/18 38/1 39/4 39/23 40/3 41/14 41/16 43/1 44/12 44/1 46/6 50/3 52/2 53/15 53/17 55/1 56/2 57/3 61/12 61/13 62/3 62/10 64/17 65/12 66/1 64/17 65/12 66/1 64/17 65/12 66/1 66/17 69/4 71/9 71/21 72/1 72/5 72/9 72/20 73/8 73/12 74/1 75/1 75/11 78/11 78/2 79/15 82/18 83/2	15 15 19 14 12 10 15 18
intensive [1] 65/16 50/3 50/15 99/6 75/11 78/11 78/2 100/10 114/5 115/3 79/15 82/18 83/2	2 8

it's [35] 94/12 96/8 96/16 96/17 101/19 102/6 102/7 102/15 103/17 105/12 105/14 105/16 108/2 108/3 108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21 111/20 112/5 113/2 5/10 5/20 8/8 8/8 145/4 146/9 Jefferson [1] 3/15 Jeffries [1] 118/14 JENNIFER [4] 2/13 8/2 105/5 105/9 JEREMY [10] 4/7 100/8 100/12 101/6 113/14 115/23 117/14 118/2
96/8 96/16 96/17 101/19 102/6 102/7 102/15 103/17 105/12 105/14 105/16 108/2 108/3 108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21
101/19 102/6 102/7 Jefferson [1] 3/15 78/12 102/15 103/17 Jeffries [1] 118/14 judge [23] 2/9 2/11 105/12 105/14 JENNIFER [4] 7/19 7/19 14/7 105/16 108/2 108/3 2/13 8/2 105/5 14/20 14/22 89/7 108/6 110/18 105/9 100/8 100/12 101/6 110/21 110/21 JEREMY [10] 4/7 113/14 115/23 117/14 118/2 117/14 118/2
102/15 103/17 105/12 105/14 105/16 108/2 108/3 108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21 Jeffries [1] 118/14 judge [23] 2/9 2/11 7/19 7/19 14/7 14/20 14/22 89/7 100/8 100/12 101/6 113/14 115/23
105/12 105/14 105/16 108/2 108/3 108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21
105/16 108/2 108/3 108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21
108/6 110/18 110/21 110/21 105/9 JEREMY [10] 4/7 113/14 115/23
110/21 110/21 JEREMY [10] 4/7 113/14 115/23
0/0 0/15 115/11 117/14 119/2
115/20 119/16 123/23 124/10 118/11 118/13
126/14 126/17
126/18 126/23 131/5 132/4 120/7 120/23
127/18 131/14 Jim [2] 118/14 122/11 123/1
133/17 134/18 118/17 judges [16] 32/20
138/5 142/19 job [17] 5/5 8/12 38/22 119/5 119/11
142/20 142/22 34/13 35/19 38/9 135/5 135/7 135/17
item [1] 112/14
items [2] 55/16 58/9 60/15 74/7 136/17 137/5
103/12 111/7 111/14 137/10 137/12
its [1] 106/23 121/17 121/18 138/13 143/6 143/6
IV [1] 102/22 140/15 141/18 Judicial [1] 2/12
IV-D [1] 102/22 jobs [3] 39/1 39/2 JULIA [2] 3/20
T 44/1 8/13
join [4] 11/14 JULIE [4] 2/16
jail [1] 34/19 123/21 124/2 7/20 14/1 119/20
JANE [14] 2/3 132/12 July [4] 36/4 37/2
17/13 17/19 85/19 joined [4] 8/22 11/5 37/11 136/19
98/20 99/3 99/6 124/2 143/17 July 2020 [1] 37/2
100/2 100/15 joining [1] 17/17 July the [1] 136/19
112/19 114/12 joint [5] 135/9 just [113] 6/18 7/10
115/9 140/23 143/8 135/14 136/12 7/11 7/12 7/16 9/5

J
just [107] 10/15
11/22 14/12 14/18
18/6 19/9 25/10
27/18 29/4 29/19
30/2 32/18 33/11
38/11 39/7 39/11
39/12 39/14 39/18
41/3 47/5 49/1 49/4
51/10 51/14 53/14
53/18 54/5 54/15
57/12 60/11 61/16
62/1 62/18 66/18
69/8 73/21 75/11
76/8 76/18 77/10
77/16 79/3 82/10
83/14 84/9 85/13
85/16 86/1 87/10
89/2 89/12 91/21
93/2 93/11 93/23
96/14 99/12 100/18
100/19 100/20
101/2 101/3 101/13
102/4 102/18
104/23 105/12
106/6 107/13
107/21 108/5
110/10 110/13
110/21 112/2
112/18 113/2 113/6
114/14 115/7
115/19 118/8 119/1

 \blacksquare

119/10 119/20 120/1 120/7 120/16 120/18 120/19 121/2 121/22 123/11 125/5 126/16 127/15 131/14 133/21 139/1 139/2 139/8 139/12 141/5 142/11 142/16 142/19 Justice [4] 4/2 8/18 8/19 135/3 justification [1] 107/11

K

KAREN [3] 3/14 8/4 99/19 KATIE [2] 2/18 118/10 keep [14] 20/2 32/5 53/18 54/13 54/13 54/14 54/14 61/13 74/16 75/2 76/9 96/3 107/9 114/21 keeping [1] 113/10 keeps [1] 70/3 KENNETH [12] 4/6 8/22 123/23 124/11 133/1 133/1 133/3 133/9 136/8 136/9 138/4 140/8

Kenny [1] 10/19 Kentucky [1] 45/12 kicking [1] 93/9 kid [3] 25/7 25/8 82/23 kids [5] 74/11 102/14 133/19 134/5 141/19 kind [8] 47/18 68/20 108/2 113/2 116/4 122/15 127/18 128/12 KING [6] 3/12 7/18 10/2 15/17 15/18 120/21 knew [1] 107/20 know [106] 10/3 11/13 18/3 23/1 23/13 23/14 24/16 26/18 26/21 27/15 27/23 28/23 29/12 31/11 36/20 38/5 40/16 43/16 43/17 44/2 44/11 46/11 46/20 47/15 47/15 47/18 47/20 48/12 48/20 51/8 51/20 53/10 56/22 57/2 57/4 57/11 57/12 57/14 57/15 57/18 58/8 63/17 65/4 67/12 67/13 67/14

K	57/23 58/8 59/2	laws [2] 128/20
know [60] 69/16	67/3	134/13
69/20 70/3 71/12	lag [1] 47/17	lawyers' [1] 78/12
72/10 74/19 76/11	laid [1] 44/8	lay [1] 110/14
77/13 77/13 81/21	lands [1] 85/23	leads [1] 129/12
85/14 85/20 86/12	language [7] 87/13	learn [1] 5/8
87/2 90/15 91/6	90/12 91/1 116/20	learning [1] 5/3
101/11 101/20	117/1 117/4 121/4	least [6] 10/11
104/6 105/19	large [4] 1/17 77/17	24/17 76/16 96/13
106/14 106/19	109/9 145/5	97/2 101/8
107/1 107/6 107/9	largely [1] 91/7	leave [2] 44/10
107/16 107/17	larger [2] 49/3 63/7	100/20
108/2 108/6 108/7	last [24] 16/17 24/8	leaving [1] 87/7
109/20 110/18	28/13 34/3 35/8	left [2] 56/15 119/6
110/21 110/21	35/13 37/17 38/3	Legal [2] 3/6 3/22
111/2 111/21	39/8 42/2 42/22	legislation [2] 30/5
111/23 112/2 112/4	43/2 45/1 51/7	68/6
113/19 115/11	54/19 56/19 67/21	legislative [1] 68/5
117/6 122/10	97/14 101/15	legislators [1]
122/23 123/12	102/19 106/8 134/2	136/7
125/18 126/4 126/6	135/12 135/19	leisure [2] 37/10
126/12 126/20	late [1] 13/23	39/9
127/4 127/20 128/7	later [11] 12/14	lengthy [1] 17/10
132/7 134/11	12/23 20/4 25/19	less [18] 31/12 37/8
136/22 137/8 139/8	28/12 45/14 70/11	40/12 42/6 42/16
139/19 142/12	76/5 83/12 123/2	47/7 58/5 60/21
	133/16	61/22 67/10 70/17
known [4] 50/13	LATHESIA [2]	77/1 77/7 89/15
50/14 65/1 69/6	2/20 7/23	97/3 97/9 102/10
L	law [5] 2/6 2/7	108/23
labor [8] 19/19	119/16 130/14	let [13] 5/9 6/8 9/7
35/12 36/23 43/19	136/9	16/6 17/20 44/18

L	82/12 86/5 87/9	95/14 95/15
let [7] 75/4 85/4	87/16 88/16 98/3	link [1] 46/6
85/7 99/22 115/9	99/14 100/19 101/3	listed [1] 124/14
119/1 123/12	104/12 105/6	litigating [1]
let's [15] 48/10	106/12 107/16	130/23
74/11 74/15 74/18	107/17 107/22	little [35] 5/18 6/20
75/4 76/10 81/22	114/14 115/2	13/23 14/13 20/23
86/7 99/12 104/10	116/15 118/3	24/11 25/2 25/12
107/17 111/7	118/22 120/9	40/23 47/17 47/19
128/13 138/21	120/12 120/14	48/13 52/7 61/14
143/5	120/16 120/19	72/1 73/12 74/18
letting [3] 66/3	121/6 122/8 126/8	74/20 75/12 79/20
85/13 98/18	127/4 127/10	84/21 85/6 85/8
level [7] 2/14 45/3	127/18 131/8	94/4 94/4 96/9
52/4 76/1 76/2 87/3	131/16 132/8 133/3	106/11 106/14
87/22	133/14 135/22	108/11 109/18
levels [4] 52/2 69/2	139/2 139/10	110/11 128/12
73/1 79/4	142/19 143/7	138/19 142/18
leveraged [1] 72/11	143/19	142/22
liaison [1] 8/19	likely [4] 30/20	living [3] 53/6 79/9
licensed [1] 145/23	43/23 60/3 60/6	91/22
life [1] 129/8	limit [2] 22/23	load [1] 5/3
like [71] 5/13 7/5	116/18	local [1] 105/7
9/10 9/17 11/15	limited [2] 31/3	long [4] 77/9
12/3 12/5 13/12	33/17	111/14 111/16
18/4 20/22 26/14	limits [1] 117/12	122/3
27/8 33/19 44/2	line [19] 10/16 14/6	long-run [2] 111/14
45/3 46/5 47/1	20/5 28/16 53/22	111/16
47/13 47/16 48/2	62/7 62/18 62/19	longer [2] 85/7
51/8 51/9 57/12	68/20 69/3 69/5	98/18
58/18 60/17 63/19	71/22 72/20 72/22	look [45] 18/21
71/12 73/7 77/5	73/9 79/3 89/21	20/9 22/21 31/5
11114 1311 1113		

$ \mathbf{L} $
look [41] 34/1
36/18 36/22 45/6
45/11 47/13 49/2
49/3 49/7 49/15
51/4 53/20 54/12
54/18 56/20 57/2
57/13 58/16 63/1
65/11 72/18 75/15
76/15 87/12 90/23
96/14 97/4 97/15
97/21 98/4 102/3
103/16 104/10
109/7 109/18 111/2
111/5 126/21
132/11 133/16
139/3
looked [9] 17/7
32/3 34/9 40/8 52/9 70/21 70/23 93/1
93/1
looking [15] 21/21
36/21 39/18 49/10
61/1 61/19 73/22
74/22 97/7 101/18
101/22 102/21
103/1 103/4 138/2
looks [8] 11/15
26/14 27/8 35/21
45/15 58/18 63/19
64/18
Lord [1] 146/5

lose [2] 122/16
122/17
loss [2] 44/12
130/20
lost [2] 34/12 47/4
lot [27] 11/8 13/9
19/4 26/15 30/15
33/12 35/21 38/10
40/6 40/11 40/15
41/21 43/12 44/10
44/14 72/5 77/17
78/19 84/5 86/14
103/2 103/12
112/16 115/22
127/5 139/6 140/19
lots [1] 45/20
love [1] 98/3
low [35] 20/12
20/16 26/12 28/11
31/19 38/9 39/17
39/21 57/21 58/13
58/18 61/18 61/20
61/20 61/23 69/5
72/1 78/15 84/7
86/21 86/22 89/4
93/22 96/18 98/2
98/5 98/12 100/17
100/22 101/3
101/19 105/17
109/9 112/7 142/16
low-income [12]
20/12 26/12 28/11

39/17 39/21 78/15 86/21 86/22 98/2 98/12 105/17 112/7 lower [27] 34/23 36/2 41/14 41/15 41/16 42/4 42/6 42/8 43/20 43/20 53/6 62/13 70/10 70/10 72/1 73/13 77/5 79/12 82/14 84/3 91/18 97/10 101/19 105/2 107/13 108/19 139/10 lower-paying [1] 43/20 lowered [1] 52/15 lowering [1] 107/11 lowest [6] 50/21 51/1 56/18 58/4 72/23 103/5 lube [1] 142/13

M

MADDOX [3] 3/22 5/2 124/6 made [8] 15/6 39/13 48/5 59/1 59/4 87/18 93/2 106/17 Madison [1] 136/18 Mail [1] 12/14 main [1] 129/4

|--|

108/22 109/14 109/15 127/8 means [7] 38/18 38/22 41/16 69/14 105/22 130/7 140/18 measure [13] 55/17 55/17 57/23 59/5 59/6 59/13 63/5 70/15 72/3 72/17 79/10 79/15 84/4	82/15 82/21 82/23 83/5 83/6 medical [2] 81/2 81/13 meet [6] 11/20 22/11 29/13 39/13 90/22 112/5 meeting [15] 1/1 1/15 5/21 6/13 12/7 13/21 16/10 17/19 77/15 112/15 123/14 135/19 137/11 143/13 144/6 meetings [5] 12/6	141/22 143/17 145/15 145/18 145/19 memo [1] 115/23 mention [3] 6/8 17/3 118/9 mentioned [8] 36/20 43/6 70/9 79/8 90/15 99/7 100/15 133/23 merge [1] 33/12 met [1] 93/23 method [4] 84/2 86/17 87/5 106/9 methodologies [3]
79/10 79/15 84/4 measured [2] 30/10 70/13 measurement [3] 31/10 64/23 74/2 measurements [5] 52/22 54/8 56/4 59/22 80/4 measures [1] 61/3		86/17 87/5 106/9

\mathbf{M}	40/9 40/11 42/23	91/16
middle [3] 71/23	43/3 43/13 43/15	Missouri [1] 87/10
78/14 104/9	87/4 88/12 88/13	Mobile [1] 118/19
midway [3] 100/18	88/16 88/17 88/19	mode [1] 88/20
100/23 101/4	89/7 89/12 89/13	model [1] 78/2
might [32] 26/18	89/18 89/22 90/1	models [2] 78/14
27/7 27/23 28/8	90/14 92/8 92/9	78/20
29/19 31/7 32/20	92/18 93/10 101/22	modification [5]
33/22 34/13 34/14	103/1 103/18	46/8 46/10 76/19
34/23 37/8 38/2	103/21 106/1	116/23 117/22
38/5 40/21 40/21	109/10 127/6	modifications [1]
65/5 74/20 85/11	minimum-wage [1]	25/5
97/1 105/8 107/18	37/23	modified [1] 22/15
109/17 115/13	Minnesota [2] 68/2	modify [4] 22/10
118/6 118/8 119/8	73/4	45/23 46/7 121/9
119/21 119/21	minus [1] 57/14	modifying [1]
137/7 137/8 142/11	minute [9] 51/5	46/21
millions [2] 129/7	55/23 57/8 67/23	moment [1] 114/10
130/2	85/19 95/23 122/16	money [1] 108/23
mind [3] 32/5 107/9	138/22 141/5	monitored [2]
141/3	minutes [6] 85/21	30/14 30/19
mindful [1] 132/18	123/19 124/15	Montgomery [11]
minds [1] 138/6	133/4 138/20	1/18 2/10 2/15 2/19
mine [2] 61/15	138/21	2/22 3/7 3/19 3/21
110/18	miracles [1] 22/3	3/23 4/3 145/3
minimize [1] 81/15	miscellaneous [1]	month [9] 33/4
minimum [46] 20/3	69/12	34/10 41/20 61/22
26/12 31/6 31/8	misinterpretation	77/1 77/2 77/3 86/8
31/23 32/2 32/12	[1] 130/14	88/15
32/22 33/8 33/16	miss [2] 10/9 10/11	monthly [2] 41/12
35/8 37/23 38/13	missed [1] 143/4	76/23
38/15 38/17 38/23	Mississippi [1]	months [4] 43/8
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>

M	53/13	Mr. [1] 8/22
months [3] 43/10	mortgage [6] 47/21	Mr. Kenneth [1]
45/21 47/2	59/8 59/11 59/18	8/22
Moore [4] 2/9	60/5 60/7	MS [3] 2/20 15/11
122/11 123/1 135/3	most [27] 22/10	15/17
Moore's [1] 115/23	24/17 25/8 25/13	Ms. [1] 118/1
more [68] 19/6	28/21 50/1 54/7	Ms. Steinwinder [1]
21/12 28/12 30/20	62/20 64/8 65/21	118/1
31/21 33/19 40/23	66/17 78/4 81/16	much [28] 13/6
41/5 42/5 42/18	84/9 84/17 86/5	18/12 28/5 29/21
42/18 43/23 47/7	86/14 91/10 93/17	36/10 38/15 48/11
50/7 52/15 53/2	93/19 95/18 101/22	53/9 60/14 71/17
53/9 54/16 55/10	102/21 104/12	72/15 77/12 78/15
56/8 56/10 58/6	110/8 112/9 127/12	78/22 79/13 84/12
60/3 60/6 62/3	Mostly [1] 102/10	85/1 88/21 88/22
62/22 65/5 65/16	mother [1] 109/15	89/5 93/16 94/6
69/17 69/18 72/10	mother's [1] 26/19	101/20 102/12
72/12 72/15 75/1	mothers [8] 26/8	103/11 110/15
76/4 77/19 78/22	31/18 32/1 33/10	126/23 129/22
80/15 81/17 83/13	33/14 33/15 109/17	multiplied [1]
84/12 84/21 91/1	109/20	87/23
95/3 95/8 97/1	motion [4] 15/9	multiply [1] 88/5
101/19 102/14	15/10 15/14 16/4	must [1] 20/21
101/19 102/14	move [6] 44/18 48/8	muted [1] 6/10
108/1 108/11 109/8	48/10 74/7 91/4	my [32] 6/23 10/10
109/22 110/7 111/4	116/23	16/21 18/20 18/21
111/15 117/7 120/2	moved [1] 90/1	53/18 63/15 68/14
123/9 130/16 131/9	movement [1]	68/15 73/17 73/21
134/16 135/14	114/18	74/10 74/16 85/3
134/10 135/14	moving [2] 74/8	89/11 95/20 97/22
142/14 142/15	74/8	102/6 103/5 103/13
	Mr [2] 9/1 9/11	114/6 118/15 122/2
morning [2] 16/18		

\mathbf{M}	98/18	11/3 12/14 12/23
my [9] 122/19	needs [3] 15/5	15/7 16/3 16/5
122/19 129/12	16/14 131/23	16/11 23/18 23/22
129/16 131/19	negative [2] 46/13	25/16 46/1 48/9
132/2 136/5 136/12	128/2	53/17 73/18 74/14
132/2 130/3 130/12	negatively [1] 16/5	75/1 79/5 83/21
	neglect [1] 26/21	88/9 100/11 108/15
myself [2] 125/11	neighboring [2]	113/23 122/7 124/6
143/15	94/12 95/16	128/2 129/18
N	neither [1] 145/16	129/19 133/8
name [5] 7/11 7/12	net [2] 57/8 83/10	138/16 139/18
7/14 14/16 146/3	never [1] 23/12	142/1 142/5 143/9
names [2] 5/19	new [10] 20/8 21/6	143/11 146/10
10/15	22/15 31/13 33/23	nobody [2] 107/20
NATHAN [3] 4/1	93/8 93/22 96/22	108/1
8/17 137/7	97/19 129/9	non [10] 26/9 27/21
national [3] 26/23	newest [3] 56/17	40/15 40/17 41/2
36/2 42/15	82/4 82/6	109/2 109/4 110/12
nationally [3] 36/6	next [26] 13/19	139/16 140/4
36/7 55/15	21/2 21/8 26/5 30/8	non-custodial [5]
natural [1] 18/8	35/14 44/16 49/15	109/2 109/4 110/12
NCP [5] 109/8	51/17 61/7 63/19	139/16 140/4
109/16 109/23	77/10 77/15 87/8	non-parent [5] 26/9
110/4 142/16	90/22 91/4 94/21	27/21 40/15 40/17
nearby [1] 91/10	95/9 97/12 98/8	41/2
nearly [1] 33/6	112/15 112/22	none [1] 66/6
necessary [2]	123/8 123/14	noon [2] 6/14 6/14
115/20 117/2	132/13 141/7	normal [1] 137/14
need [7] 6/2 6/18	Nine [1] 86/1	normally [1]
16/8 41/10 48/22	nineteen [1] 55/9	137/11
112/14 124/22	no [40] 10/12 10/18	North [3] 87/12
needed [2] 69/20	10/20 10/22 11/1	90/2 90/8
	<u> </u>	

N not [97] 5/19 8/1 9/2 10/4 10/16 11/5 11/6 11/7 12/17 15/8 16/20 16/21 17/7 21/17 22/7 22/8 23/5 23/10 24/7 25/2 27/10 27/18 27/21 28/16 28/20 30/6 30/12 38/18 38/19 38/20 38/20 41/21 43/11 43/21 44/12 53/17 61/13 62/3 66/14 66/23 67/5 73/2 73/8 73/14 78/4 79/13 79/22 80/4 85/10 85/23 88/20 89/5 92/10 100/10 100/16 100/17 101/3 101/3 102/23 105/13 105/14 107/9 107/10 110/18 111/4 111/5 111/10 112/23 113/21 114/23 115/20 115/22 116/1 116/6 118/17 118/18 119/12 119/16 119/19 119/22 120/3 120/4 120/14 121/5 122/3

124/4 126/9 126/14 127/13 127/14 128/3 130/21 131/20 133/7 135/8 137/23 139/22 Notary [1] 146/11 note [1] 11/18 noted [2] 6/9 31/22 notes [1] 142/6 nothing [3] 84/18 90/4 143/23 notice [9] 12/6 12/12 13/3 28/7 35/5 40/18 46/14 61/19 80/3 noticed [1] 58/3 notices [1] 12/22 notifying [1] 116/21 noting [1] 30/11 November [1] 141/12 November 5th [1] 141/12 now [44] 15/20 17/18 18/6 19/16 20/14 28/2 31/12 32/3 36/4 36/7 39/21 48/1 55/3 58/20 59/6 60/8 60/13 60/16 63/1 63/5 63/14 64/22

65/23 66/20 66/21 68/4 70/18 72/14 87/22 93/12 96/14 97/4 100/2 107/5 107/7 108/1 111/19 113/11 114/9 121/17 122/19 131/20 142/9 142/14 nuanced [3] 21/13 82/20 108/11 nuances [2] 52/8 108/4 number [6] 45/20 53/21 102/16 131/4 140/10 146/3 number of [1] 131/4 numbers [3] 23/21 71/2 107/21

O

Obamacare [1] 83/4 obligated [5] 29/7 33/9 33/10 82/2 86/15 obligated's [1] 90/4 obligation [1] 86/10 obligor [1] 90/8 obviously [12] 7/15 17/10 23/1 23/12 31/11 35/16 35/20

O obviously... [5] 36/15 112/17 112/20 127/6 132/12 occupations [2] 43/20 43/21 occur [1] 117/19 occurs [1] 102/8 October [1] 141/11 off [13] 7/11 7/12 44/8 44/13 64/15 65/14 71/9 71/11 83/6 116/22 118/15 121/11 122/15 offer [2] 44/9 44/19 Office [5] 3/10 3/23 8/11 12/10 12/16 Officer [1] 12/9 official [1] 36/1 often [2] 109/8 110/7 oh [6] 54/13 54/15 61/13 68/16 75/12 126/11 okay [45] 8/2 9/7 9/16 11/11 13/5 14/4 16/12 16/16 18/9 18/19 18/23 35/13 39/4 41/5 47/11 48/10 48/15 48/23 75/17 76/13

85/5 85/12 85/15 86/3 95/22 96/2 99/16 100/12 101/5 101/11 102/18 105/6 105/13 106/2 108/12 114/1 114/18 118/17 122/8 124/9 124/12 126/11 132/4 138/17 138/23 Oklahoma [1] 45/11 old [3] 65/13 68/2 91/11 oldest [1] 56/15 once [6] 7/12 33/23 37/17 89/7 104/8 134/6 one [76] 5/15 6/3 9/5 16/5 16/14 19/5 19/6 19/9 19/13 25/1 25/7 25/7 25/7 26/3 27/11 27/17 35/18 43/2 44/23 45/17 47/12 49/8 49/9 50/7 52/11 52/18 52/18 53/1 53/12 53/20 53/21 54/5 54/12 54/16 55/5 56/10 56/16 57/22 59/4 62/15 66/8 66/22 74/11

75/6 75/19 75/19 77/1 78/1 80/22 84/20 84/22 84/23 86/9 94/7 94/13 94/14 94/16 97/19 101/13 102/10 102/20 103/16 103/23 104/13 105/11 106/17 108/19 116/14 116/21 118/15 119/9 119/11 121/10 125/5 129/4 136/1 one-page [1] 49/9 ones [7] 20/9 30/20 35/6 41/9 60/4 91/17 94/18 online [1] 79/21 only [23] 24/10 24/15 28/22 30/13 32/7 32/8 34/11 40/2 40/4 40/9 45/12 48/12 68/1 70/1 70/2 86/16 86/18 91/17 96/15 97/9 119/6 129/5 130/22 ons [1] 81/3 open [4] 22/23 23/2 74/5 99/1 openings [1] 38/10

O	107/22 111/19	101/1 106/17
opinion [2] 73/17	112/1 116/8 116/14	109/22 114/9
122/2	117/16 120/8	117/18 122/10
opportunities [2]	120/10 130/2	122/23 123/1
29/11 35/20	ordering [1] 26/16	124/10 127/20
opportunity [2]	orders [23] 22/16	129/15 131/19
13/8 134/1	23/1 23/2 23/10	132/14 134/15
oppose [2] 16/2	25/1 25/7 26/12	137/12 141/21
113/19	29/3 29/16 40/3	145/15 145/18
opposed [1] 113/9	40/4 40/9 40/11	145/20
opposing [1] 130/6	40/13 40/17 41/1	others [3] 113/9
option [11] 62/15	41/8 42/11 42/12	114/17 130/4
80/17 110/5 110/17	43/3 43/3 46/21	otherwise [1] 117/3
116/5 116/16	128/23	our [34] 5/11 6/6
116/17 117/2 119/9	ordinarily [1]	8/7 11/12 12/9
119/11 121/7	140/20	13/19 16/10 23/3
options [5] 44/10	ordinary [1] 81/13	59/14 77/23 98/8
79/5 116/5 116/19	other [63] 3/17 6/23	100/5 100/16 105/7
142/10	10/14 15/5 16/8	108/3 113/20
	20/5 20/7 21/4	117/11 126/19
orally [1] 13/10	24/15 26/4 26/5	132/18 132/23
orange [2] 62/7	28/16 29/18 29/23	133/19 134/1 134/4
62/17	31/20 35/10 38/3	134/5 134/12 135/2
order [36] 11/19	44/21 45/8 46/17	135/7 136/15
23/6 25/7 27/1 27/8	46/18 48/7 51/3	140/13 142/10
40/10 41/12 41/13	51/18 52/6 62/4	142/21 143/5 143/6
45/23 86/11 86/18	62/4 63/1 63/16	146/5
87/4 88/20 89/8	63/18 63/20 66/4	ourselves [1] 5/22
89/12 89/13 89/18	66/6 77/23 78/1	out [29] 8/12 10/10
89/22 90/2 90/7	81/20 84/8 84/15	13/3 13/23 16/19
90/14 90/18 93/10	86/21 87/17 87/18	24/23 25/23 39/23
103/18 103/21	90/13 95/16 98/1	45/23 46/5 55/17
106/1 107/13	70/13 73/10 70/1	73/23 40/3 33/1/

O out... [18] 62/17 63/10 65/23 65/23 70/15 75/13 76/12 81/2 82/10 82/11 84/10 104/8 107/22 109/16 116/13 127/9 141/9 142/10 outcomes [1] 134/19 outlays [4] 59/6 59/9 60/2 72/9 outlets [1] 12/8 outside [2] 128/12 130/5 over [15] 17/18 22/9 24/11 32/11 34/22 43/7 52/14 57/18 66/21 73/11 78/18 87/10 96/17 128/13 138/20 over-representative [1] 32/11 overriding [1] **99/5** overstate [2] 50/13 69/7 overstates [1] 65/15|PALMER [10] overview [2] 115/5 115/17 overwhelmed [1] 79/20 overwhelming [1]

27/19 own [3] 68/10 77/15 92/22 Ownership [1] 66/20

P

p.m [2] 12/23 144/7 page [37] 14/5 14/23 14/23 19/3 28/14 30/9 35/14 49/9 49/16 49/16 53/20 54/16 54/19 56/1 56/11 56/13 61/10 61/10 61/11 61/13 63/15 63/20 68/15 68/15 74/10 74/10 74/16 75/6 75/15 77/10 84/20 85/22 85/23 87/9 95/20 97/14 102/6 pages [2] 61/14 145/13 paid [8] 23/11 41/18 42/1 43/7 60/14 107/10 107/15 111/20 2/16 7/20 14/22 100/8 100/12 113/15 118/2 118/11 119/21 120/23

pandemic [3] 35/22 36/13 39/11 paper [1] 78/8 paragraph [1] 54/20 parent [32] 21/14 26/9 26/20 27/2 27/6 27/7 27/21 28/3 29/7 31/15 40/15 40/17 41/2 44/2 46/15 47/2 81/19 81/20 82/2 86/15 92/8 108/23 109/3 109/3 109/4 110/13 110/14 110/16 121/7 130/6 135/23 136/1 parent's [1] 26/6 parenting [1] 136/21 parents [17] 30/7 33/9 43/12 77/6 86/6 90/5 90/10 92/12 92/17 116/21 129/7 129/15 130/3 130/10 130/23 134/21 140/4 parents' [1] 37/19 parity [9] 70/12 70/19 71/5 71/17 79/10 84/4 88/1 91/19 91/20

Part [12] 2/17 16/10 19/21 22/19 30/8 34/12 86/20 110/21 110/22 119/16 119/18 133/18 part-time [2] 2/17 34/12 participate [2] 118/18 140/18 particularly [6] 13/13 28/9 36/11 58/4 72/14 111/20 parties [1] 89/9 partly [1] 72/2 parts [1] 86/22 party [4] 29/3 29/17 43/5 90/16 PASCHAL [4] 4/6 8/23 9/1 124/11 pass [1] 143/15 passes [1] 16/4 past [1] 12/6 patient [1] 5/7 patterns [3] 61/8 72/19 95/11 pause [4] 18/4 18/6 25/10 44/17 pay [8] 41/20 42/7	paying [4] 42/6 43/20 108/23 111/6 payment [9] 22/19 22/21 23/3 41/7 41/10 41/22 45/2 47/6 47/21 payments [12] 22/6 42/16 43/10 43/11 45/21 59/9 59/10 59/12 59/18 60/5 60/7 60/7 pays [1] 47/2 PDF [1] 19/11 Pennsylvania [3] 45/17 46/9 47/5 PENNY [8] 2/6 7/15 11/10 16/13 48/11 85/1 119/4 133/13 people [16] 6/3 11/8 17/21 18/1 38/20 38/21 46/17 47/19 47/20 47/22 99/13 106/19 113/16 125/18 139/7 141/15 per [11] 55/14 69/13 69/21 77/1 77/2 77/3 81/1 81/1 81/10 81/11 97/19 percent [9] 32/12	permanently [1] 127/7 permit [1] 24/2 person [5] 13/17 15/9 80/12 128/9 136/3 personal [3] 23/18 139/21 139/23 personally [1] 131/16
25/10 44/17		• •

Petition [2] 117/21 121/9 phased [1] 39/23 phone [4] 18/20 66/20 114/13 122/19 phones [1] 66/21 physical [3] 6/19 98/9 136/12 pick [1] 99/9 pictures [1] 5/18 pie [2] 24/23 26/5 place [2] 87/11 130/8 placeholders [1] 98/10 places [1] 44/9 plan [4] 27/4 27/5 28/1 114/9 please [4] 139/3 139/6 139/8 139/12 plus [2] 46/11 57/14 pocket [1] 81/2 pockets [1] 36/10 podium [1] 18/10 point [8] 5/20 6/17 7/5 95/13 101/13 115/2 123/18	88/11 practical [1] 100/19 practice [6] 2/16 2/19 3/1 3/8 3/13 81/16 practitioner [1]	18/1 113/8 preliminarily [1] 101/8 preliminary [3] 40/19 113/6 113/20 premise [1] 110/23 premises [1] 112/4 premium [2] 81/9 82/2 preparation [1] 38/8 prepare [1] 143/4 prepared [1] 128/12 present [2] 13/8 13/10 presentation [3] 17/23 48/20 133/15 president [1] 134/9 presidential [1] 57/13 presumption [1] 37/22 presumptive [1] 90/18 presumptives [1] 38/4 pretty [10] 31/19
7/5 95/13 101/13	81/16	38/4

pretty [1] 136/18 previous [1] 12/21 price [14] 52/2 69/2 70/12 70/19 71/5 71/16 79/4 79/10 84/4 88/1 91/19 91/19 99/11 113/6 prices [10] 52/13 70/8 70/10 70/17 71/11 71/21 74/4 76/17 93/11 114/23 primary [3] 27/5 81/18 138/9 principal [2] 59/8 59/12 printed [1] 145/13 printing [1] 19/10 prior [1] 13/21 privacy [1] 23/15 private [10] 2/16 2/19 3/1 3/8 3/13 37/2 82/16 82/21 83/1 102/23 privately [2] 23/11 82/9 probably [15] 5/23 25/21 28/5 28/21 32/11 33/21 38/23 66/1 77/14 83/22 84/9 84/19 88/3	roblems [1] 6/1 rocedures [1] 29/3 roceedings [1] 45/6 rocess [3] 5/4 5/8 3/14 roduct [1] 59/14 ROFESSOR [6] /6 2/6 3/3 7/20 8/8 73/3	provided [2] 12/12 13/3 providing [1] 140/16 provision [6] 27/13 28/9 34/1 45/19 46/2 110/2 provision that [1] 45/19 provisions [5] 21/11 31/14 45/22 96/22 126/4 public [22] 4/5 6/11 6/15 6/15 8/22 12/9 12/13 12/22 13/7 13/11 16/21 17/15 19/14 115/10 123/20 124/1 124/5 124/13 132/14 133/1 143/18 146/11 public's [2] 10/15 123/19 published [3] 70/13 78/10 111/3 pull [6] 5/3 22/4 36/4 45/14 53/11 115/18 pulled [1] 38/7 pulling [2] 25/23 53/15 pulls [1] 83/16

R
rearing [6] 64/13
64/21 65/2 69/7
71/3 74/3
reason [16] 6/3
25/3 26/22 44/7
47/3 53/1 53/4
58/23 59/10 62/4
62/19 62/20 73/18
90/20 109/21
135/14
reasons [10] 27/17
34/23 52/18 52/19
52/20 66/23 72/7
72/7 72/8 72/8
reassures [1] 39/12
rebuttable [1] 90/20
recall [1] 118/10
receipts [3] 81/15
81/18 81/19
receive [5] 12/17
13/12 13/14 127/10
131/18
received [5] 14/1
14/2 16/17 17/9
139/5
receiving [3] 26/6
107/20 108/1
recently [1] 93/20
recognize [2] 5/6
23/5

recommend [5] 51/2 70/6 97/13 104/1 116/1 recommendation [3] 40/22 99/9 113/4 recommendations [1] 73/21 recommended [1] 51/17 recommends [1] 49/18 reconfirms [1] 30/3 35/11 110/1 record [8] 7/13 8/6 9/4 11/23 16/15 23/20 119/18 120/13 recorded [1] 32/4 records [1] 29/9 recovery [1] 129/8 red [3] 96/12 96/19 97/3 **Referee** [1] 2/17 referenced [2] 55/13 78/9 references [1] 54/22 referred [1] 14/7 reflects [2] 42/4 82/19 reg [1] 29/13 regard [9] 28/18

35/1 81/10 88/19 98/7 126/12 137/6 137/16 137/22 **regarding [2] 136/5** 139/1 regardless [1] 117/20 **Region [2] 45/6** 45/11 **registered** [1] 10/15 regulated [1] 30/17 regulation [3] 30/6 regulations [3] 24/2 39/15 138/7 rejected [1] 73/6 relate [1] 80/4 relates [2] 83/11 123/3 relating [2] 45/1 138/15 relations [1] 137/10 relationship [2] 26/7 139/23 relative [3] 127/1 145/17 145/19 **relatives** [1] 26/10 released [1] 54/6 relevant [1] 18/17 **remember** [8] 14/8 14/10 43/12 57/10 60/23 63/21 101/15

remember [1] 118/15 remembered [1] 102/19 remembering [2] 60/16 101/14 remind [1] 5/13 remotely [1] 11/20 remoteness [1] 117/13 removed [3] 26/17 26/18 116/18 rents [1] 59/19 replicate [1] 67/7 report [14] 8/9 19/6 19/9 49/4 52/1 52/10 53/11 53/22 55/13 85/9 102/3 102/4 115/18 119/3 reported [1] 145/6 Reporter [7] 1/16 5/11 6/6 8/7 145/4 146/2 146/10 REPORTER'S [1] 144/8 Reporting [1] 146/1 represent [1] 140/9 representative [5] 32/6 32/11 96/18	request [5] 46/8 130/9 131/4 135/21 140/2 require [2] 39/16 138/8 required [4] 20/15 29/8 62/22 107/5 requirement [7] 19/21 20/19 22/20 36/18 49/12 63/22 116/19 requirements [4] 22/12 39/13 94/1 112/6 requires [5] 35/11 35/15 38/9 41/6 110/2 research [11] 2/3 17/14 17/15 22/8 24/4 42/15 43/18 47/14 111/5 111/12 111/16 researched [1] 111/1 reserve [36] 20/16 39/22 52/3 75/22 75/23 83/18 84/22 86/23 87/20 88/4 88/14 90/3 90/6 93/9 93/15 93/18 93/21 94/3 95/1	102/9 103/18 103/21 104/11 104/17 105/3 105/10 105/23 108/21 109/5 110/12 112/13 142/8 142/11 reserves [2] 47/20 75/11 resort [2] 37/17 38/3 Resources [2] 2/14 2/22 respond [1] 140/3 response [23] 10/12 10/18 10/20 10/22 11/1 11/3 15/7 16/3 16/11 25/16 48/9 74/14 83/21 100/11 108/15 113/23 122/7 128/2 138/16 139/18 142/1 143/9 143/11 responses [1] 11/5 responsible [1] 82/3 rest [5] 11/21 26/9 41/4 76/7 91/15 restaurant [1] 36/14 result [1] 94/15
32/6 32/11 96/18 97/8 107/2		

R	Rogers-Rothbarth	14/17
results [3] 103/22	[2] 66/9 73/10	safe [1] 144/4
135/7 145/21	role [1] 111/4	said [11] 5/22 21/1
retail [1] 36/14	roll [2] 7/6 123/22	23/4 44/3 51/7
retain [3] 89/22	rolls [1] 116/22	101/1 101/3 101/18
95/15 100/5	room [3] 81/23	118/10 130/17
reunite [2] 27/5	124/3 124/8	136/9
28/1	rotation [1] 137/14	same [17] 14/23
review [11] 17/11	Rothbarth [18]	47/1 61/8 63/9
18/18 19/22 19/22	52/22 53/23 54/2	65/10 71/3 80/9
21/2 21/8 21/9	54/4 54/8 54/11	81/8 83/14 83/15
97/21 101/15	56/16 64/3 64/7	92/2 95/10 110/16
128/22 138/8	64/9 64/16 65/22	116/17 126/1
reviews [1] 49/18	66/9 66/10 73/10	129/10 129/10
right [37] 6/14 7/9	73/20 80/3 104/5	Santa [1] 68/9
9/19 10/8 10/13	round [1] 32/20	Sarah [2] 4/2 8/18
11/9 14/14 18/9	rounded [1] 33/5	save [2] 7/10
19/15 30/3 48/4	row [1] 19/20	141/10
52/9 55/3 56/17	Roy [1] 135/3	savings [3] 47/19
62/17 65/23 68/4	rule [5] 111/2 112/3	47/20 47/22
68/22 71/22 74/20	135/16 137/20	saw [2] 16/5 135/20
75/5 78/23 87/22	137/21	say [28] 8/1 9/18
98/19 99/21 102/8	rules [4] 21/6 46/2	23/16 45/9 47/9
102/9 104/14	88/9 110/22	49/23 51/9 51/10
104/18 105/18	run [2] 111/14	56/2 58/8 77/17
110/20 114/9	111/16	81/22 86/7 88/10
125/16 128/5	runs [1] 71/22	100/21 100/22
128/11 138/23	Rutgers [1] 66/10	103/14 104/7 105/6
142/9	\mathbf{S}	105/8 106/23
Rights [1] 134/10	S-T-E-P-H-E-N [1]	107/17 111/5
Rogers [3] 66/9	14/16	111/17 118/7 130/8
66/9 73/10	S-T-E-V-E-N [1]	133/14 142/19

130/21 says [13] 20/21 24/9 36/18 39/8 49/10 62/7 74/11 75/19 78/13 82/6 89/3 127/9 134/18 scenario [2] 92/16 94/22 scenarios [3] 92/21 93/3 95/10 schedule [51] 25/21 44/17 49/13 49/22 50/11 51/19 51/21 51/22 52/9 54/1 56/6 62/15 68/4 70/19 71/3 71/23 73/14 78/18 80/16 80/20 80/21 81/6 81/12 82/11 84/5 84/18 86/4 86/9 86/13 87/7 87/21 88/2 93/13 93/21 96/6 97/18 97/20 98/9 99/23 100/16 101/9 103/16 103/20 104/3 104/8 105/12 126/20 126/21 128/8 142/7 142/21 104/7 138/9 school [3] 2/7 92/11 5cientific [1] 134/17 54/23 56/11 57/2 58/15 58/21 61/2 53/16 54/20 54/2 55/17 58/15 58/21 61/2 66/22 62/14 63/6 63/12 63/20 65/2 68/22 69/3 69/22 70/5 71/20 72/5 72/22 73/12 74/2 74/15 74/18 75/4 76/10 79/12 87/1 76/10 79/12

		Seen [1] 114/4 select [1] 22/15 selected [2] 21/23 22/14 selection [1] 40/3 self [37] 20/16 39/22 52/3 75/11 75/21 75/22 83/18 84/22 86/23 87/19 88/4 88/14 90/3 90/6 93/8 93/15 93/18 93/21 94/3 95/1 96/6 96/11 104/17 105/3 105/10 105/23 108/21 104/11 104/17 105/3 105/10 105/23 108/21 109/5 110/12 112/13 142/8 142/11 self-support [36] 20/16 39/22 52/3 75/11 75/21 75/22 84/22 86/23 87/19 88/4 88/14 90/3 90/6 93/8 93/15 93/18 93/21 94/3 95/1 96/6 96/11 98/2 102/9 103/18 103/21 104/11 104/17 105/3	105/10 105/23 108/21 109/5 110/12 112/13 142/8 142/11 self-support reserve [1] 83/18 send [3] 81/19 132/10 143/20 Senior [2] 4/1 8/17 sense [6] 39/1 48/5 51/15 87/4 106/10 142/12 sent [4] 12/6 12/11 13/23 141/9 separate [3] 50/16 55/20 116/12 separation [1] 134/14 SEPTEMBER [6] 1/4 1/19 12/15 13/1 145/12 146/4 September 11 [1] 12/15 September 15th [1] 13/1 serve [2] 15/16 134/1 service [5] 27/22 122/16 122/18 132/18 132/22 Services [1] 3/6 serving [3] 5/12	46/19 51/16 set [11] 40/9 40/12 40/13 41/1 43/4 76/10 111/18 120/9 130/23 131/2 141/7 Seth [1] 10/21 settling [1] 116/4 seven [7] 63/15 69/9 74/23 92/23 95/7 97/21 102/5 several [8] 78/3 99/7 101/1 113/15 123/20 135/12 136/7 137/19 shaded [7] 39/20 40/5 43/1 76/3 86/4 86/16 87/14 shall [11] 116/10 116/11 117/3 117/5 119/8 119/14 119/17 119/18 120/1 120/12 121/4 share [5] 50/17 55/20 55/21 81/21 136/21 shares [5] 65/10 65/15 78/5 91/10 108/5 sharing [2] 81/15 137/18 she [17] 5/11 5/23 8/2 17/13 100/23
--	--	--	---	---

\mathbf{S}	42/9 42/15 68/18
she [12] 101/12	75/6 75/14 75/16
101/18 105/7 108/9	76/3 77/10 77/23
108/10 125/1 125/2	82/5 92/1 96/5
133/7 140/16	Sick [1] 44/10
140/18 140/18	side [6] 46/11 46/13
140/19	98/13 98/13 142/7
She's [1] 8/14	142/7
Shelby [1] 2/17	sides [1] 139/12
Sherman [2]	significant [1]
118/14 119/21	121/12
should [14] 19/15	similar [3] 45/15
57/2 62/21 76/9	72/20 95/11
89/23 97/18 97/23	simple [1] 120/19
99/15 99/22 100/5	since [7] 8/1 39/10
100/8 107/12	83/4 93/13 100/23
119/14 128/10	101/2 134/12
shouldn't [3] 37/5	single [2] 80/8 80/8
129/9 129/23	sir [2] 9/21 15/2
show [16] 5/19	site [1] 37/1
42/13 50/8 61/7	situations [3] 82/20
63/18 65/8 67/23	90/19 137/5
70/12 83/12 99/13	six [4] 25/22 26/2
99/16 102/7 106/12	74/21 95/7
107/15 108/22	sixth [1] 83/9
112/23	skew [1] 23/3
showed [2] 83/12	skewed [2] 41/16
106/9	42/5
showing [1] 8/2	skills [1] 38/10
shows [19] 32/16	skip [4] 61/9 63/14
35/2 35/3 35/8	68/14 128/13
41/11 41/13 41/17	slight [1] 69/4

slightly [2] 36/2 66/11 slower [1] 48/14 small [3] 14/18 34/5 95/5 46/13 smaller [2] 28/5 62/10 snow [2] 51/10 51/11 so [256] Social [2] 125/20 126/17 some [95] 6/19 9/3 9/8 9/20 10/2 13/16 17/6 18/7 21/20 22/10 23/15 24/18 25/3 25/4 25/19 26/21 27/3 28/7 28/19 30/2 30/16 31/10 33/21 33/21 37/7 41/10 43/10 43/10 43/18 44/7 47/18 47/21 48/3 50/9 50/12 50/14 52/12 52/21 55/19 56/6 56/7 58/12 58/15 58/21 63/11 63/18 69/8 69/12 71/6 71/19 75/6 79/11 81/12 82/10 84/6 87/2 88/23 89/2 90/11 90/17

some [35] 90/19 90/22 90/23 92/17 92/20 98/10 107/14 109/21 111/11 112/2 115/12 115/13 117/9 117/12 119/5 121/2 126/5 127/8 128/14 129/15 130/4 130/4 130/7 132/7 135/12 135/13 136/16 136/17 137/12 138/20 142/5 142/6 142/14 142/14 142/16 somebody [7] 57/15 67/13 67/16 126/15 127/7 127/13 128/9 someone [1] 135/21 something [19] 5/16 6/4 20/22 34/16 38/5 39/18 44/11 51/9 60/17 77/14 87/8 87/15 91/2 112/20 114/8 120/12 120/14 120/19 143/13 sometimes [8] 13/9 18/20 25/4 26/18 27/3 32/19 44/11	somewhere [1] 78/9 sorry [11] 9/14 43/3 48/17 68/15 69/12 72/8 85/2 85/15 110/17 122/18 135/23 sort [15] 5/8 26/21 31/10 41/10 55/19 61/8 62/12 63/10 71/12 71/15 81/12 99/5 106/9 141/17 142/14 sound [1] 95/19 sounds [3] 47/1 47/16 104/11 source [3] 23/8 24/15 126/14 South [1] 37/15 southern [3] 45/6 45/10 45/12 space [1] 129/19 speak [18] 5/15 6/11 6/18 9/10 12/3 18/10 100/10 114/5 115/3 115/19 116/2 118/3 124/17 137/13 139/20 139/22 140/5 141/4 speaker [2] 2/2 132/23 speaking [1] 139/14	specific [1] 135/8 specifically [1] 31/5 spells [1] 14/15 spend [9] 42/18 52/16 62/22 69/18 72/12 72/16 83/13 90/22 126/23 spending [3] 58/6 62/3 65/5 spent [6] 34/19 61/2 64/18 129/22 134/2 138/20 spouse [4] 131/17 131/20 131/22 132/2 squeezes [1] 60/22 squeezing [1] 63/8 SSDI [1] 126/8 SSI [3] 125/19 127/9 127/10 stable [1] 57/3 staff [7] 2/9 3/18 3/22 4/1 8/18 138/13 141/15 staircase [1] 96/8 stand [1] 144/1 standard [2] 134/15 136/21 STARKEY [2] 3/1 7/21

S start [4] 95/5 99/12 107/3 143/5 starting [1] 129/9 starts [2] 33/23 64/10 state [31] 1/3 1/17 2/14 21/7 23/5 30/18 32/6 37/15 45/16 51/20 51/23 66/7 68/1 70/16 73/8 77/19 80/2 80/7 88/17 89/8 89/11 92/8 93/19 97/8 105/21 128/16 128/20 141/19 145/2 145/5 145/8 state's [2] 50/22 105/21 State-level [1] 2/14 stated [1] 12/21 statement [3] 40/13 129/1 130/9	31/10 31/43 30/0	STEPHEN [2] 3/8 7/19 steps [1] 97/12 Steve [2] 14/7 118/14 Stewart [2] 4/2 8/18 stick [3] 73/23 79/16 88/10 still [20] 22/23 28/6 29/22 30/16 33/10 35/23 51/2 59/7 65/8 73/7 79/19 82/5 88/20 95/14 103/19 121/7 126/18 135/13 136/2 136/3 stop [3] 5/20 83/7 98/17 stops [2] 68/22 72/20 storm [1] 11/7 strip [1] 96/9 stripped [1] 23/17
80/7 88/17 89/8 89/11 92/8 93/19 97/8 105/21 128/16 128/20 141/19 145/2 145/5 145/8 state's [2] 50/22 105/21 State-level [1] 2/14	101/1 109/22 110/5 110/8 126/5 127/3 127/12 127/20 132/20 statewide [3] 12/8 36/9 107/2 stating [1] 135/22 statistics [7] 43/19 57/16 57/23 58/8 59/2 67/4 67/14	65/8 73/7 79/19 82/5 88/20 95/14 103/19 121/7 126/18 135/13 136/2 136/3 stop [3] 5/20 83/7 98/17 stops [2] 68/22 72/20 storm [1] 11/7
129/1 130/9 statements [1] 145/14 states [64] 19/21 20/6 20/9 20/15 20/21 20/22 21/5 22/10 24/17 25/8 25/13 26/15 27/3 28/16 28/21 29/18 30/1 31/20 35/19	status [1] 11/13	*

Sure [15] 10/16 11/7 11/8 14/19 18/22 22/9 25/2 79/19 79/22 85/23 101/17 121/22 132/14 136/18 140/7 surprising [1] 34/5 surrounding [1] 93/17 survey [8] 55/12 57/20 58/1 59/3 60/13 63/5 72/4 135/6 surveys [1] 55/14 Sweet [1] 85/5 swift [2] 29/12	62/18 69/15 81/4 83/14 84/10 85/8 98/22 111/16 128/18 129/14 133/8 taken [3] 71/9 71/11 131/23 takes [2] 47/15 78/3 taking [2] 82/10 132/1 talk [17] 26/11 28/4 28/10 28/11 44/15 52/7 55/22 57/7 65/18 65/20 76/4 76/8 77/18 84/21 91/6 125/12 137/8 talked [1] 63/3 talking [9] 25/20	taxpayer [2] 80/8 80/9 taxpayers [1] 111/13 teaches [1] 67/14 teaching [1] 79/20 team [2] 22/1 112/19 tell [4] 9/1 54/21 114/11 140/1 tells [3] 26/23 38/13 38/14 ten [1] 134/3 tentatively [1] 141/7 terms [1] 114/20 Terry [1] 2/9 than [39] 12/15
swift [2] 29/12 46/20 switch [4] 60/2 72/9 73/19 77/21 system [5] 23/7 23/11 24/4 24/16 111/9 systems [1] 30/14 T table [2] 34/22 106/21 tad [1] 54/16 take [15] 40/20 48/3 49/2 62/17	talking [9] 25/20 53/19 79/3 87/6 88/23 102/17 127/5 128/7 142/13 talks [2] 53/23 95/3 tax [19] 51/20 51/23 52/15 57/5 60/21 61/2 62/8 63/6 63/8 67/4 71/15 72/13 72/16 80/2 80/6 80/9 80/13 80/14 80/15 taxes [6] 52/14 60/14 60/16 60/20 63/7 71/12	12/23 25/13 25/13

\mathbf{T}	65/
thank [40] 4/8 5/2	69/
8/8 9/21 9/22 10/5	70/
10/7 11/11 12/1	75/
13/5 14/20 15/13	75/
15/18 16/1 17/2	77/
18/11 22/1 48/6	81/
54/13 85/17 98/16	86/
98/17 98/19 99/21	89/
101/5 106/2 108/12	91/
112/11 113/16	93/
119/4 122/9 125/4	96/
133/12 133/18	102
140/5 140/7 140/15	103
141/14 144/1 144/3	107
thankful [1] 132/21	111
thanks [2] 8/15	112
140/4	118
that [682]	125
that's [97] 6/3 7/1	130
11/7 11/9 14/12	13]
14/19 24/12 27/11	134
27/14 27/17 28/16	138
30/12 31/2 31/19	the
34/6 35/13 36/1	18/
36/9 36/10 36/15	34/
38/9 40/2 41/18	37/
42/4 42/5 44/21	41/
47/9 48/15 51/6	46/
51/12 52/3 53/1	60/ 62/
53/21 54/5 56/12	64/
57/9 60/3 62/1 62/1	U4/

65/8 65/22 66/22 /6 69/6 69/18 /7 72/6 73/10 /9 75/10 75/17 /21 76/19 76/22 /13 78/9 81/12 /14 84/12 85/18 /20 87/1 87/15 /3 90/20 90/21 /2 91/12 93/7 /15 94/6 95/2 /10 97/5 102/5 2/12 103/2 3/15 104/16 7/11 109/13 1/17 112/7 2/20 116/10 8/15 124/23 5/13 128/9 0/23 131/20 1/21 132/1 4/21 137/19 8/6 138/9 ir [63] 17/22 /1 19/21 28/22 /12 34/13 34/15 /1 37/16 38/3 /1 44/5 45/20 /2 47/4 58/6 59/2 /8 60/16 60/20 /3 62/11 62/22 /13 64/19 67/4

68/4 69/8 81/21 83/1 83/13 84/18 86/7 86/10 88/14 90/3 90/6 91/18 91/18 92/12 92/14 92/19 93/13 93/20 93/21 103/9 108/23 109/1 110/15 110/23 111/15 118/19 120/8 122/9 127/1 127/19 127/20 127/22 130/3 130/19 132/15 139/20 139/23 them [17] 13/1 18/16 22/15 42/7 44/5 46/3 50/10 54/10 65/14 66/7 91/10 93/23 111/8 111/8 111/9 127/11 136/16 themselves [2] 6/12 6/16 then [97] 6/1 6/5 6/14 6/15 7/4 7/11 13/14 14/15 18/6 20/1 21/7 21/9 26/4 26/8 27/1 31/22 32/8 33/1 33/3 33/14 39/23 41/6 41/17 42/2 42/22

T
then [72] 43/1
43/2 43/6 43/10
44/18 44/20 46/3
46/6 48/16 49/3
56/7 56/14 56/17
60/1 60/10 61/5
64/14 64/18 65/13
69/3 74/6 75/3 77/9
77/16 78/16 79/12
81/18 81/20 83/9
83/17 84/19 85/6
85/7 86/17 87/5
89/15 89/17 92/1
92/20 92/23 93/6
93/10 94/17 95/4
95/7 95/9 95/17
96/20 97/20 99/1
99/8 103/20 104/7
104/10 106/16
107/3 110/5 110/13
110/14 111/12 114/6 114/11 116/9
117/8 127/11
128/11 129/23
131/18 132/11
142/9 143/15
143/23
there [97] 9/13 16/7
16/23 17/14 18/14
23/15 23/22 24/1
24/17 25/10 26/1

28/8 30/10 30/13 33/20 35/13 36/9 37/5 39/1 39/2 39/8 40/11 40/15 41/4 43/9 43/11 44/4 44/17 50/7 51/18 52/20 54/15 56/3 56/7 60/2 60/8 61/15 66/18 70/15 73/17 74/10 74/17 75/5 75/5 75/12 76/9 76/14 76/15 77/17 78/4 79/6 81/7 81/23 82/7 84/1 88/23 89/21 91/9 94/11 96/4 96/8 97/1 97/5 101/1 102/7 105/10 107/20 108/7 108/20 110/22 111/7 112/17 113/18 114/2 114/8 117/16 119/6 119/20 119/23 120/1 121/5 121/19 122/10 122/23 123/22 123/23 127/8 127/9 130/6 133/8 133/17 136/14 136/22 137/9 139/15 143/3 143/23

there's [74] 18/7 18/7 25/4 25/11 30/15 34/17 34/22 38/10 40/6 41/21 41/22 42/5 42/7 43/23 47/17 49/9 52/1 52/7 52/20 53/22 54/3 54/4 54/8 56/6 57/1 57/10 57/13 57/17 57/19 61/10 63/17 64/1 64/22 67/18 68/7 70/11 73/18 75/2 77/11 77/22 78/8 79/5 81/17 83/17 86/2 86/9 87/2 87/9 87/17 88/9 89/2 89/23 90/7 90/11 94/9 94/18 94/23 96/3 96/8 96/13 105/11 105/13 107/17 112/16 115/6 121/12 121/15 129/18 130/13 134/13 135/9 135/14 136/12 136/20 there's a [1] 96/3 thereof [1] 145/21 these [28] 10/14 20/8 21/20 22/12

T these [24] 41/7 42/15 42/20 44/8 45/1 52/5 52/6 62/16 63/16 65/20 68/19 69/1 69/13 76/7 77/8 83/8 83/23 91/8 91/22	78/22 79/1 79/15 83/23 84/4 84/9 87/19 89/6 89/10 91/6 95/18 98/5 98/20 99/5 100/5 104/21 109/13 109/19 111/1 112/11 112/16	22/19 23/4 23/7 23/17 23/23 25/20 26/10 26/15 29/15 30/22 32/5 32/11 33/9 33/20 35/16 35/17 36/3 39/21 40/12 40/19 40/19 41/4 42/16 43/7
14/13 14/18 16/14 24/21 27/11 30/4 35/10 36/17 47/12 52/11 60/10 65/11 100/20 107/8 112/9 134/4 things [12] 21/4 21/20 28/7 45/20 52/5 52/6 57/1 91/5 98/11 127/19 127/21 128/15 think [65] 10/9 11/9 13/15 16/14 27/11 30/22 38/1 40/5 40/15 43/4 44/14 50/5 51/6 51/13 52/8 55/6 59/15 62/16 62/21 64/3 66/17 70/14 71/17 73/1 74/8	121/19 123/7 124/16 125/13 135/20 137/10 141/8 thinking [1] 32/10 thinks [5] 64/4 99/22 100/8 113/20 143/12 third [10] 24/21 33/7 41/17 42/23 43/5 79/7 90/16 104/7 107/8 130/13 third-party [2] 43/5 90/16 this [106] 5/8 7/5 7/10 10/1 16/6 16/18 19/3 19/13 19/17 19/20 20/13 21/22 22/3 22/4	61/16 62/14 64/23 66/1 67/9 67/19 68/18 68/23 71/4 72/2 75/3 77/4 77/7 77/10 78/7 83/11 84/20 85/7 86/3 86/8 90/11 91/20 92/6 92/7 93/22 94/1 95/13 97/13 101/12 109/15 109/21 110/17 112/23 113/19 114/9 115/2 115/9 119/1 120/5 123/18 126/16 128/21 130/10 131/23 135/19 135/22 136/7 136/8 136/13 138/10 139/17

T this [2] 141/16 146/4 those [90] 13/2 19/10 22/11 22/23	127/10 129/9 132/9 133/6 138/11 139/11 141/5 141/9 though [7] 36/4 71/17 76/20 84/3	tier [1] 89/13 time [61] 2/17 7/10
27/22 28/6 30/18 30/19 31/3 31/5 32/7 32/9 34/3 35/4 35/8 36/19 40/4 40/17 41/9 42/12 43/2 43/4 43/20 43/21 43/23 45/4 46/21 47/7 50/11	101/14 111/20 119/15 thought [7] 48/14 58/13 60/22 85/3 85/11 106/17 119/8 thoughts [2] 100/14 115/8 thousands [2]	48/12 48/18 51/7 52/14 57/18 71/4
50/12 54/20 54/21 54/23 55/22 58/4 58/12 58/15 59/20 61/17 62/13 63/11 63/20 65/6 71/1 71/19 79/11 79/12 81/3 81/19 82/9 82/19 82/21 83/11	126/22 126/22 three [21] 19/3 51/9 56/1 59/22 61/9 61/12 65/20 66/6 72/6 72/7 72/19 74/11 77/3 92/11 94/14 95/6 95/10 97/14 102/13 104/6	78/18 78/19 85/1 85/9 88/22 90/22 90/22 94/1 101/16 101/23 102/20 103/3 115/13 116/18 117/12 121/10 121/15 121/19 123/9
84/6 88/16 89/14 90/15 90/16 90/18 91/5 91/7 93/3 96/14 97/2 97/15 97/21 99/13 99/16 103/22 106/20 107/3 107/6 107/11	132/2 three-page [1] 19/3 threshold [1] 76/20 through [9] 18/5 18/16 19/5 48/16 49/4 55/9 122/18 123/3 143/15	132/13 132/15 133/8 134/20 135/2 136/1 137/18 138/21 140/5 140/13 142/21
107/13 107/21 110/22 117/10 118/4 121/9 122/1 122/13 123/2	throughout [1] 106/20 throwing [1] 107/21	time-sharing [1] 137/18 timely [1] 79/22 times [5] 5/16 32/23

T
times [3] 33/1
99/7 103/2
timing [1] 96/3 Title [1] 102/22
today [8] 5/3 8/9
8/20 8/22 11/8
18/21 102/4 119/1
today's [1] 12/7
too [11] 6/22 19/15
22/19 35/17 54/15
66/18 84/23 88/22
118/7 119/20
142/23
took [7] 22/16 33/2
40/1 41/19 52/10
70/20 87/21
top [6] 21/10 40/18
69/5 71/9 71/23
118/15
topic [3] 138/2
138/3 138/5
total [6] 22/8 50/18
57/5 57/6 61/4
62/11
totally [1] 30/23
touched [1] 128/14
track [2] 22/5
59/18
tracked [4] 59/12
59/19 59/19 59/20
tracking [1] 82/23

training [8] 136/14 136/15 137/4 137/7 137/8 137/9 137/14 138/15 transcript [4] 6/7 13/20 14/16 145/14 transportation [2] 69/11 69/15 trend [1] 84/14 trial [3] 116/20 117/7 117/14 tried [1] 67/7 true [1] 145/13 truly [1] 28/2 try [8] 6/22 6/23 7/4 13/7 108/3 108/10 114/7 134/16 trying [7] 25/23 31/9 68/3 68/12 117/23 134/3 134/22 **Tuesday** [1] 13/1 TurboTax [1] 60/18 turn [1] 17/18 turnover [1] 43/23 Tuscaloosa [2] 2/7 3/5 tweak [1] 98/11 two [46] 14/3 18/14 19/2 25/7 26/3

30/10 36/12 47/7 52/20 57/1 59/4 61/7 61/8 72/7 72/8 72/18 73/21 74/11 77/2 77/6 86/6 89/13 94/8 94/14 94/19 95/4 95/11 97/22 104/6 104/6 115/6 116/5 116/7 116/14 116/17 116/18 117/2 117/12 117/19 119/6 119/12 120/7 121/9 122/1 123/22 124/12 two-tier [1] 89/13 two-year [2] 116/18 117/12 type [5] 36/3 67/16 108/4 113/8 136/16 typical [1] 37/9 typo [1] 52/1

U

U.S [2] 12/14 67/19 uh [2] 128/2 128/2 Uh-uh [1] 128/2 under [5] 34/22 38/3 74/21 76/16 128/19 underground [1] 111/11 underlying [1]

29/4 29/14 understand [8] 12/16 21/15 21/18 26/1 56/5 61/17 122/21 140/9 understanding [1] 16/22 understate [2] 50/14 65/1 understates [1] 28/21 understating [1] 60/20 unemployed [2] 30/7 90/17 unemployment [5] 21/18 35/16 36/1 36/5 39/2 United [2] 45/5 132/20 University [3] 2/7 3/4 68/9 unless [2] 16/6 120/12	124/21 125/10 133/10 unnumbered [1] 95/21 unsung [1] 141/17 until [1] 20/23 up [42] 5/19 13/17 16/23 33/5 35/14 45/2 50/10 53/11 53/12 53/15 53/18 54/15 54/17 60/9 62/19 67/9 70/1 74/5 74/20 80/16 88/14 90/10 93/2 98/1 99/1 113/14 114/6 115/18 116/4 116/10 120/22 122/18 126/16 128/8 128/8 128/15 131/6 133/8 136/22 140/19 142/6 143/18 upcoming [2] 136/15 137/4 update [16] 25/21 49/21 50/1 51/3 51/3 68/4 97/18 99/8 99/15 101/9 103/19 104/3 113/4 113/8 123/4 136/9	93/20 updating [4] 28/10 44/16 87/3 113/12 uploaded [1] 133/17 upper [2] 63/2 67/22 us [27] 5/20 6/1 8/12 8/15 13/15 17/13 17/17 22/3 26/23 70/23 71/2 80/18 93/11 94/2 97/20 98/21 99/16 114/11 115/17 123/12 123/21 124/2 124/2 132/12 141/17 141/19 143/17 USA [1] 70/8 usage [1] 66/20 USDA [6] 67/18 67/21 68/1 68/3 69/6 114/14 USDA or [1] 114/14 use [38] 6/21 7/3 13/7 18/20 24/2 32/14 32/18 37/8 37/16 50/1 54/10 55/1 55/17 57/8
unless [2] 16/6	103/19 104/3 113/4	37/16 50/1 54/10

U use... [18] 68/2 69/13 70/12 79/9 80/6 84/15 86/8 86/16 88/5 88/12 88/16 91/15 103/20 104/4 113/5 115/13 130/15 130/18 used [26] 22/5 22/6 22/7 24/8 24/14 30/15 37/16 54/7 59/5 60/13 65/8 66/7 67/20 73/8 76/18 76/18 80/10 83/3 83/5 88/21 91/13 92/3 92/9 92/12 92/17 121/18 uses [12] 54/11 64/14 66/10 66/12 68/11 83/15 88/7 88/8 90/8 91/11 91/13 113/11 using [19] 6/20 7/2 18/20 33/11 33/23 53/1 60/17 61/21 70/7 71/4 71/16 73/5 79/16 84/17 86/17 87/14 111/17 114/22 128/3 usual [1] 145/21 usually [9] 26/22 29/18 31/23 38/9

38/11 42/16 57/12 69/17 69/19

\mathbf{V}

VA [3] 130/15 130/17 131/15 value [1] 13/11 variable [3] 102/15 130/1 130/11 variation [2] 44/7 82/8 varied [1] 102/3 **VENOHR [14] 2/3** 16/18 17/13 17/13 18/10 44/23 125/1 125/6 133/6 133/11 133/14 140/15 142/2 143/16 verified [1] 43/18 version [1] 90/3 versus [1] 71/15 very [22] 13/6 22/4 45/15 49/16 53/22 65/12 65/13 68/2 69/5 83/2 83/7 88/21 89/5 91/11 93/14 95/5 97/14 98/5 98/16 98/20 100/19 132/17 veteran [4] 131/12 131/17 133/2 133/23 veterans [4] 126/1

126/18 130/19 132/18 veterans' [1] 126/7 via [7] 1/17 11/21 12/8 12/14 17/17 140/18 145/15 video [1] 8/1 videoconference [1] 1/18 viewpoint [1] 117/18 violates [1] 23/23 virtually [1] 46/23 visit [1] 81/23 visitation [1] 134/15 visual [1] 61/16 visually [1] 100/10 volume [1] 18/22 voluntarily [3] 30/7 34/21 89/4 vote [4] 115/6 119/1 123/7 123/14 voting [1] 11/16

W

wage [29] 24/18 31/6 31/8 31/23 32/2 32/12 32/22 33/8 33/17 34/2 34/4 35/9 37/23 38/7 38/13 38/15 38/17 38/23 42/23

|--|

\mathbf{W}	94/4 135/1	60/19 62/6 63/6
we [348]	were [46] 6/9 6/9	63/20 66/5 69/20
we'll [1] 76/12	13/2 18/14 19/2	69/23 70/6 71/4
we're [1] 29/18	21/6 24/19 25/1	73/22 75/17 76/11
we've [1] 134/11	28/19 36/12 37/3	78/16 79/1 79/7
	37/12 40/9 40/12	81/16 82/13 82/19
weaknesses [1] 19/10	40/15 40/17 41/8	83/1 85/3 86/5
	58/6 58/13 58/14	86/14 89/3 89/22
weather [1] 51/8 web [1] 12/7	59/20 59/22 60/20	90/5 90/23 91/21
	73/4 80/10 86/8	93/5 94/5 95/16
website [7] 16/20 18/15 19/14 44/22	94/9 94/10 95/14	95/18 97/12 98/7
49/8 133/17 135/20	95/17 100/21	102/16 103/2
week [5] 33/1 33/3	100/22 101/18	103/14 104/1 105/1
36/22 37/6 123/8	102/20 102/23	106/13 107/15
weekend [1] 134/16	103/4 106/10	112/3 113/1 114/11
weeks [4] 33/1 33/2	106/16 117/12	114/21 115/2 119/7
34/20 44/13	122/10 122/15	119/8 120/15
welcome [1] 25/18	122/23 123/21	122/21 125/23
L -	123/22 127/4 130/7	132/6 134/7 134/14
well [17] 18/11 36/14 51/14 64/15	what [93] 11/12	134/22 136/22
65/14 95/17 100/15	14/6 18/3 18/4	140/2
102/20 117/9	18/13 19/1 19/11	what's [8] 36/19
119/13 121/14	19/17 20/13 22/14	41/23 50/5 51/14
119/13 121/14	25/2 26/23 27/3	97/16 98/6 100/2
	30/17 31/9 32/14	112/8
127/17 132/19 136/17 140/1	35/2 35/5 35/19	whatever [3] 104/5
	38/21 39/17 40/21	117/19 123/17
WELLER [2] 3/20	40/22 41/23 42/20	when [68] 6/14
8/14	43/9 43/17 44/15	19/10 20/3 21/14
went [12] 13/3	49/1 49/9 49/17	22/22 23/16 23/20
22/17 37/23 48/13	50/14 50/19 51/14	25/20 25/22 26/11
54/15 60/9 83/6	55/16 58/11 58/21	26/16 27/14 28/4
87/10 94/2 94/3		

$ \mathbf{W} $
when [55] 28/10
29/4 31/15 31/22
32/3 33/6 33/17
34/1 34/9 37/17
39/1 39/3 39/23
40/8 42/6 46/15
50/8 53/6 56/8 57/2
57/12 58/16 58/20
63/1 65/18 70/18
71/5 76/15 77/19
87/20 89/15 90/2
90/13 90/21 94/17
97/4 100/23 101/18
102/3 103/16 107/3
110/4 116/7 116/21
121/10 123/22
126/13 126/14
126/21 130/14
134/13 135/9 136/9
136/11 136/22
where [42] 6/20
24/12 27/23 31/3
35/4 35/6 36/3 36/6
39/20 39/22 40/14
42/13 45/22 51/12
59/14 62/2 67/3
68/17 74/19 75/4
75/7 77/7 77/11 82/16 85/23 96/10
96/12 96/15 97/5
100/20 101/2 102/9
100/20 101/2 102/7

103/8 106/10 106/16 108/20 109/1 110/22 120/17 121/18 125/7 135/14 whether [15] 9/2 27/12 32/17 43/14 49/19 64/15 78/17 82/23 84/10 97/18 104/2 105/23 125/20 125/21 140/3 which [44] 21/15 25/1 28/11 28/15 32/21 33/3 33/18 34/2 42/10 44/16 44/21 45/12 49/12 52/12 55/13 59/22 63/2 63/15 65/7 69/14 70/5 70/13 72/9 78/2 79/18 80/11 87/4 87/6 92/5 95/19 95/21 97/7 97/19 102/6 104/8 109/23 111/3 111/11 113/9 117/20 129/12 132/3 134/5 140/18 whirlwind [1] 85/16 who [20] 6/5 8/19 8/22 10/15 13/17

29/3 29/17 57/23 68/8 99/14 99/14 99/22 100/9 101/7 114/3 117/23 118/9 122/13 127/13 143/17 whole [7] 19/9 64/22 88/2 97/8 103/20 115/21 118/23 why [17] 25/12 34/6 34/23 42/17 50/3 56/5 56/7 57/8 58/15 61/17 93/15 94/6 109/13 112/7 120/8 120/13 120/18 wider [1] 82/8 will [78] 6/11 6/16 6/22 6/23 7/4 7/10 7/14 9/3 9/7 9/19 16/23 17/18 18/6 20/4 22/10 23/16 25/6 27/1 28/11 40/20 41/22 44/12 44/20 45/14 54/21 54/23 56/23 57/7 65/17 65/23 68/16 70/11 74/16 76/4 81/19 81/20 84/20 85/7 85/18 85/20 89/3 91/21 98/7

\mathbf{W}
will [35] 98/13
98/17 101/2 108/3
108/10 109/19
111/22 112/21
113/12 114/21
114/22 116/3 116/8
116/13 118/10
120/7 122/11 123/2
123/16 124/15
124/17 124/20
124/21 127/12
128/13 132/11
133/4 133/6 133/16
136/8 140/22
142/10 142/18
143/15 144/1
willingness [1]
140/17
WILSON [2] 4/1
8/17
wind [2] 85/20
113/14
winter [1] 137/11
wise [1] 113/2
withholding [3]
80/6 117/16 120/10
within [6] 74/1
107/15 109/4 116/7
129/1 130/23
without [12] 23/13
46/7 64/11 65/4

65/6 65/12 91/6 105/2 117/11 126/9 130/3 142/7 won't [3] 17/10 115/6 118/23 wonder [1] 47/18 word [1] 9/18 wording [1] 20/23 work [12] 33/12 67/8 69/22 110/9 111/10 122/9 122/22 123/3 125/22 127/8 127/11 137/19 worked [5] 22/3 34/12 34/22 36/20 115/4 workers [5] 29/1 38/8 92/10 92/14 92/18 working [4] 16/22 37/3 66/2 123/5 works [1] 57/16 worksheet [3] 33/11 81/3 81/7 worksheets [2] 116/12 117/15 worth [1] 89/8 would [116] 5/13 5/14 5/15 5/19 5/23 6/18 7/5 7/7 9/10 9/17 11/12 12/3

13/14 15/20 16/2 17/20 18/1 18/4 23/9 23/12 33/2 37/12 37/21 37/22 45/9 47/9 47/13 48/2 48/2 51/1 55/5 66/5 69/14 70/6 73/23 76/3 77/7 77/8 77/14 79/17 79/19 80/11 80/12 80/16 80/17 81/7 81/22 82/2 84/1 84/2 84/16 85/4 86/12 86/12 86/18 87/16 88/4 90/10 94/11 94/15 96/12 97/12 98/3 98/8 99/9 100/6 100/21 100/22 103/14 104/1 104/7 105/2 105/6 106/19 108/20 109/13 113/18 113/20 113/21 114/8 114/10 114/11 114/12 115/2 115/14 115/16 116/22 117/1 117/4 118/2 118/22 120/1 121/6 122/3 122/8 126/3 129/18 131/3 131/8 132/8 132/9

W 21/1 21/7 21/10 22/17 22/18 36/2 would... [15] 132/9 43/8 55/15 58/5 133/3 133/7 133/10 61/22 81/1 81/11 133/14 135/4 116/18 117/12 135/11 137/4 139/1 138/8 146/4 140/20 143/7 years [17] 54/21 143/14 143/19 55/2 67/3 73/12 143/19 143/20 73/15 78/4 100/1 wouldn't [4] 78/21 116/7 117/20 101/16 103/22 119/17 120/7 127/12 121/10 122/1 134/2 Wright [3] 10/21 134/3 135/12 14/7 14/8 137/20 write [1] 14/6 yellow [1] 97/4 writing [4] 13/8 yes [15] 9/5 9/15 132/10 132/11 12/5 15/2 17/2 48/6 143/21 49/23 53/14 105/4 written [4] 12/13 125/4 127/18 12/17 135/21 140/2 131/10 132/5 Y 133/12 141/6 y'all [2] 123/11 **yesterday** [2] 11/7 123/17 141/10 Yarbrough [1] yet [8] 11/6 14/1 10/19 16/20 27/10 33/10 yeah [14] 11/15 109/16 119/18 48/17 54/13 54/19 136/1 72/8 74/15 74/17 you [434] 75/9 75/10 76/14 you've [1] 78/17 85/16 87/12 106/22 your [48] 6/21 7/2 114/16 7/11 7/11 7/12

year [17] 11/21

17/4 17/8 17/23 28/9 28/10 56/14 61/13 61/14 71/12 71/13 71/14 74/1 77/15 78/17 85/23 87/19 92/21 100/7 100/14 101/10 113/12 113/17 114/10 115/4 115/8 115/18 118/9 118/12 124/22 125/3 129/13 131/6 132/16 132/21 133/15 137/14 138/21 140/5 140/8 142/23 yours [2] 18/10 115/17 yourself [7] 5/15 6/10 9/12 99/17 114/4 124/21 133/10

Z

15/13 15/21 16/2

zero [8] 35/5 40/12 41/8 42/10 42/11 90/7 90/10 90/18 Zoom [6] 1/18 11/21 13/2 17/17 140/18 145/15 Zooming [1] 5/4