First Supplement to Memorsndum 72-2
Subject: Study 39.30-Attachment, Garnishment, Bxocution (Bmployees Earaings Protection Law)

This memorandum deals with the revisions, if any, that should be made in Section 723.050 which restricts the amount of earnings that may be withheld pursuant to an earnings withholding order.

The staff has prepared a revised Withholding Comparison Table using the new withholding tables for state income taxes. The new table is set out on page 9 of the revised recommendation (attached to Memorandum 72-2). The new table is substantially the same as the previous one; only minor changes in amounto previoubly computed were necessary.
please refer to the table on page 9 of the revised recommendation. The ropresiantatives of creditors have expressed concern about the amounts withheld under the proposed legialation in the sange from apperaximertely $\$ 80$ to $\$ 200$ per week. It would be possible, if the Comission were so inclined, to increase the amounte withheld ubder the proposed statute by applying a greater percentage than 25 percent on a portion of nomesampt earninge. Por example, the fallowing formula might be used:

Except as otherwise provided in Sectiona 623.030, 723.031, and 723.106, the maximum amount of the earnings of a judgment debter in any worioneok that can be withheld pursuant to this chapter 1s:
(1) 25 percent of the first $\$ 20$ of nonexempt earnings.
(2) 50 percent of the next $\$ 20$ of nonexempt earnings.
(3) 25 percent of the remainder of nonexempt earnings.

This would make the following changes in the revised table set out on page 9 of the revised recomendation.

PROPOSED STATVIE

| Gross Earnings | Disposable Earnings (Married anil 2 children) | As drafted |  | As revised above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | withbeld | net | withheld | net |
| \$60 | \$56.28 | -0- | \$56.28 | -0- | \$56.28 |
| \$70 | 65.56 | -0- | 65.56 | -0- | 65.56 |
| \$80 | 73.54 | \$5 | 68.54 | \$5 | 68.54 |
| \$90 | 81.52 | \$6 | 75.52 | \$8 | 73.52 |
| \$100 | 89.00 | \$8 | 81.00 | \$12 | 77.00 |
| \$110 | 96.68 | \$10 | 86.68 | \$15 | 81.68 |
| \$120 | 104.36 | \$12 | 92.36 | \$17 | 87.36 |
| Amounts above \$120 |  | no change | add out pose on p mend | to amoun table fo statute s ge 9 of re ion | set <br> prot out COM- |

When the staff examines the diposable earnings for various brackets and the amounts withheld under the statute as drafted and takes into account the expenses of maintaing housing and raising two children, the conclusion reached by the staff is that the amounts set out in the statute as drafted column are reasonable and that the amounta set oast in the polumir for the revised stomate ase wecegatro. The amount remajaing for the support of four persons, even under the statute as drafted, is handiy enough to maintain the family at a poverty level. Also, if the formula for the revised statute were adopted, the statute could require withholding in excess of federal requirements when the $\$ 600$ for week class was reached if the employee is under a public retirement system. It also should be recognized that the actual net pay for the various income categories set out above often will be less than shown because there will be additional deductions for such items as union dues, union initiation fees, deductions for health and welfare premiums (including company retirement programs), and the like.

Respectfully submitted,
John H. DeMoully
Executive Secretary

