MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied (searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)



121st MAINE LEGISLATURE

FIRST REGULAR SESSION-2003

Legislative Document

No. 234

H.P. 189

House of Representatives, January 23, 2003

An Act To Create a Uniform Approach to the Determination of Child Support When Parents Provide Substantially Equal Care for Children

Reported by Representative NORBERT of Portland for the Family Law Advisory Commission pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 19-A, section 354, subsection 2. Reference to the Committee on Judiciary suggested and ordered printed under Joint Rule 218.

Millicent M. Macfarland
MILLICENT M. MacFARLAND
Clerk

_	Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows:
2	Sec. 1. 19-A MRSA §2001, sub-§8-A is enacted to read:
4	
_	8-A. Substantially equal care. "Substantially equal care"
6	means that both parents participate substantially equally in the child's total care, which may include, but is not limited to, the
8	child's residential, educational, recreational, child care and
Ü	medical, dental and mental health care needs.
10	
	Sec. 2. 19-A MRSA §2006, sub-§4, as enacted by PL 1995, c.
12	694, Pt. B, §2 and affected by Pt. E, §2, is amended to read:
14	4. Computation of parental support obligation. The total
	support obligation must be divided between the parties in
16	proportion to their respective gross incomes. The court or
18	hearing officer shall order the party not providing primary residential care to pay, in money, that party's share of the
10	total support obligation to the party providing primary
20	residential care. The primary residential care provider is
	presumed to spend the primary care provider's share directly on
22	each child. <u>If the court or hearing officer determines that the</u>
	parties provide substantially equal care for a child for whom
24	support is sought, presumptive support must be calculated in
	accordance with subsection 5, paragraph D-1.
26	
	Sec. 3. 19-A MRSA §2006, sub-§5, ¶D, as enacted by PL 1995, c.
28	694, Pt. B, $\S 2$ and affected by Pt. E, $\S 2$, is amended to read:
2.0	
30	D. When the parties have equal annual gross incomes and provide residential-care-equally substantially equal care
32	for each child for whom support is being determined, neither
34	party is required to pay the other a parental support
34	obligation. The parties shall share equally the child care
J 1	costs, health insurance premiums and uninsured medical
36	expenses.
38	Sec. 4. 19-A MRSA §2006, sub-§5, ¶D-1 is enacted to read:
40	D-1. When the parties do not have equal annual gross
	incomes but provide substantially equal care for each child
42	for whom support is being determined, the presumptive

enhanced basic support entitlement.

parental support obligation must be determined as follows.

(1) The basic support entitlement for each child must be determined in accordance with subsection 1 and

enhanced by a multiplier of 1.5. This product is the

44

46

48

	(2) Using the enhanced basic support entitlement, a
2	total support obligation for each child must be
	determined pursuant to subsection 3. The amount is the
4	enhanced total support obligation.
6	(3) Using the enhanced total support obligation, a
	theoretical parental support obligation must be
8	determined for each party as though the party were the
	nonprimary residential care provider under subsection 4.
10	
	(4) The party with the higher annual gross income has
12	a presumptive obligation to pay the other party the
	<pre>lower of:</pre>
14	
	(a) The difference between their parental support
16	obligations as calculated in subparagraph (3); and
18	(b) The presumptive parental support obligation
	determined for the payor party under the support
20	guidelines as though the other party provided
	primary residential care of the child.
22	
	Sec. 5. 19-A MRSA §2007, sub-§3, ¶A, as enacted by PL 1995, c.
24	694, Pt. B, $\S 2$ and affected by Pt. E, $\S 2$, is repealed.
26	CT IN ARA A TOST
10	SUMMARY
28	mbis bill salauses second suchland in second to
20	This bill addresses several problems in current law. It
30	provides a standard for the courts and the parties in cases where
32	the parents provide substantially equal parenting for the child
34	but have unequal incomes. Current child support guidelines are silent on this matter.
34	Silenc on this matter.
31	The bill provides a presumptive calculation in cases where
36	the parents provide substantially equal care for the child.
	Current child support guidelines permit a deviation but provide
38	no guidance for a presumptive determination of the amount of the
	deviation.
40	
	The presumptive calculation contains a recognition that when
42	both parents have substantial residential responsibility and each
	provides a home for the child, the child expenditure is likely to
44	be significantly greater than it would be if the child were
	living primarily with one parent. The 1.5 multiplier in the
46	calculation takes into account the increased costs of 2
	households providing shared residence.
48	
	The bill eliminates the current specific child support
50	deviation criterion that is based upon 30% residential care of

the child. The 30% threshold is very close to the amount of time that "an alternate weekend, split holidays and vacation" nonresidential parent has. Litigation to defend or support a deviation occurs, with parents fighting over a very few days and nights, counting them for the court, in order to be under or over that threshold. Such litigation focuses the court and the 6 parties away from the best interest of the child. elimination of the 30% deviation does not deprive a parent who is very active in the life of the child and who provides less than substantially equal parenting from petitioning the court for a 10 deviation under another provision that permits the court to 12 deviate when the court finds that the application of the guidelines would be "unjust, inequitable, or not in the child's best interest" pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 14 19-A, section 2007, subsection 3, paragraph Q.