

March 6, 2019
Oregon SB-318

Chair Prozanski, Vice-Chair Thatcher and members of the committee:

The children of Oregon are harmed daily by the state courts ruling, the worst part about it, Nobody seems to care. Our current family courts law system has a very unspecified system they use today (The Blueprinted Model): if there is a disputed custody issue, the court will rule in an almost automatic manner: Child custody will go to mom, parenting time will be structured on a near automatic 80/20 split (every other weekend for dads), child support will be addressed by the Oregon Child Support Calculator.

SB318, has the power to change that horrible little section of the Blueprinted model, the 80/20 parenting time split. The 80/20 split has the power of excepting one parent as the parent and simply excusing, removing, setting aside one parent. In 2019, Why are we still practicing this model today, its wrong, its horrible, and its still being used.

Before Family courts;

An intact family unit, has 2 parents, both working, not working, or what ever arrangement they have. Both parents in theory play some kind of important and active roll in the child or children's lives. And decision making, in theory are made by both.

After Family courts; (The Blueprinted model)

Mom; Receives Child Custody, Receives authority of decision making, Receives Child support, and Receives 80% of parenting time.

Father, Receives an order of child support, Receives parenting time of 20%.

I have tried doing some basic searches on the history of our current Blueprinted model and there's a few things I've learned. There are virtually almost no legal professionals willing to speak about it (theirs a few but not many will), I'm still searching for mental heath professional documents on or about this, but none of them seem to endorse the idea of the current model.

The blueprinted model used today seems to fail the current written statutes and laws.

#1. ORS 107.101 (4) Grant court the widest discretion in developing a parenting plan

-Why is this even stated and published when the courts seem to over whelming default to the Blueprinted model.

#2 ORS 107.102 (4) (b) In developing a parenting plan under this subsection, the court may consider only the best interest of the child and the safety of the parties.

-Can you find anyone in the Family Legal System, willing to attach there name to this idea, that this blueprinted model is in the best interest?

#3 ORS 25.275 (2) (a) The child is entitled to benefit from the income of both parents to the same extent that the child would have benefited had the family unit remained intact

-So under the idea of fiances the child should have funding from both parents to the extent as if the family remained together. But a child shouldn't have access to both parents as if the family unit remained intact? WHAT this is crazy, if this is law, then why isn't the parents/child contact interpret in the same manner, but instead the blueprinted model is used.

#4 ORS 107.105 (b)The court shall develop the parenting plan in best interest of the child, ensuring the noncustodial parent Sufficient access to the child.

-This is the written Oregon Statutes, yet SUFFICIENT access is left to OPION, and the opions of sufficient are the judges (These are the very people who have come up with this Blueprinted model and use it daily, are they using it for simplicity or lazyness, is this something they actually believe is Best Interest)

The idea of the Blueprinted model, its real. The parent child relationship is all to often not a care or concern for the family court system.

Please pass SB318.

My personal story/testimony summarized.

I learned a that I had a child that was a few years old. I went to the courts to try to gain access to my child, finally a custody evaluation took place. A Jennifer Price published a 35 page custody evaluation, this large packet of papers contained lots on the mothers history. From multiple substance abuses (meth to pill adications), to having the state remove children from her custodial care (lets just say more than once), lists of court cases, mother refusing access to the child-both visits/communication, and list goes on and on. There was one thing about this document, there wasn't a sentence about fathers negativity or extreme life history, nothing. And yet the Blueprinted model was used.. February of 2018!!!

Question to ask.

Can you find a Judge that will go on record and state this Blueprinted Model is the best thing they can do? Ask that very judge, "Is this current model we're using right now, is it in the very best interest of children?"

-I'm more than willing there is not a single judge that will agree with it, but yet they use it every single day, and do so willingly.

Can you find a Mental Health Professional, doctor level, who would go on record and state that the best interest of a child is to follow the Blueprinted Model and also follow the 80/20 parenting time of it.

-Again, I'm more than willing to bet, you wont find a single person to respond on record, and I'm more than willing to bet not a single person would attach there name to it.

Please pass SB318

Sincerely,
Jason Nickerson