SB 125 Testimony

Chairman Bacon, Vice Chairman Dolan, Ranking Member Thomas, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee concerning Senate Bill 125.

-My name is Jon Hepp, Jr.

-I am from North Ridgeville, Ohio.

-And, I am in opposition of SB 125 – as it is currently written.

I am a true advocate for equal shared parenting and fair child support when the parent has equal shared access to their child or children and when a child has equal shared access to both of their parents’. -- Since August of 2012, when my Ex filed for divorce, I have been fighting for access to my children within the Lorain County Domestic Court System.

In my research regarding domestic law and child support, I have read in numerous articles and journals that when parents live apart, that it is in the children’s best interest for parents to equally share in the parenting of their children. Unfortunately, since SB 125 approach to child support does not encourage equal shared parenting - I must oppose SB 125.

I would also like to address the fact that SB 125 does not calculate child support as a combined child support obligation of both parents, which I think is unfair. I believe that child support should be an obligation of both parents.

I also believe that SB 125 should reconsider the sanctions it puts on individuals who cannot keep up with their child support obligations, like drivers’ license suspensions. For some individuals that have unreasonably high child support obligations, I believe it is counterproductive to suspend their drivers’ license, thus making it even more difficult for them to earn money to pay their child support obligation.

As a member of the National Parent Organization (NPO), I am in support of their proposed / recommended changes to SB 125 listed below:

**NPO Proposed Amendment #1**

Standard Parenting Time Adjustment & Correction of the Mathematical Error

**NPO Proposed Amendment #2**

Inappropriate Baseline, Failure to Provide Due Process, and Unequal Treatment

**NPO Proposed Amendment #3**

Vague and Misleading Guidelines for Extended Parenting Time

* SB 125 provisions for handling extended parenting time (more than 40.7%) are both vague and misleading.
* The bill does not give any indication of what constitutes a “substantial deviation.”
* The standard parenting adjustment should be based on the combined obligation, so should the “substantial deviation” for extended parenting time.
* Arizona and Michigan approach these issues very differently so to avoid many of the problems.
* Cliff effects should be minimized so not to encourage disputes over meaningless differences in parenting schedules.

Unfortunately, Ohio SB 125 is not a pro-child, pro-equal shared parenting child support bill. If Ohio’s Legislature were to focus on the best interest of the child and address equal shared parenting laws, then fairer child support laws could be established.

\*\*\*Both parents’ deserve to be able to have a meaningful relationship with their children and children deserve to be able to have a meaningful relationship with both of their parents.\*\*\*

Respectfully Submitted,

Jon Hepp Jr.