

The Uniformed Service Member's Voice in Government
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR UNIFORMED SERVICES
Hawaii Chapter (HI-1)
January 31, 2015

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL 807 WITH COMMENTS
RELATING TO FAMILY COURT

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS, MILITARY, INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS & CULTURE AND THE ARTS

HEARING ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2ND AT 9:00AM,
IN CONFERENCE ROOM 309

Aloha Chair Cachola and Vice Chair Ito: Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to testify in support of House Bill 807. On Capitol Hill the National Association for Uniformed Services (NAUS) is "The Service Member's Voice in Government." Here, in the great State of Hawaii, NAUS Hawaii Chapter (HI-1) serves at the will and pleasure of our nation's largest per-capita uniformed services community..

NAUS Hawaii Chapter (HI-1) is extremely grateful for your committee's noble efforts to exempt Federal Title 38 United States Code chapter 11 related disability benefits, from claims of creditors, attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, as provided by federal law; and prohibiting their being awarded to any other person.

Arizona and most recently Wyoming addressed this issue in their legislatures. In addition to the protections our HB 807 propose, these States prohibit indemnification of those who would claim access to the subject disability benefits, in a divorce action.

NAUS Hawaii Chapter (HI-1) respectfully urges this committee to consider:

- a. including the legislative example set by the Arizona and Wyoming legislatures, regarding claimant indemnification and
- b. legislatively encouraging our courts to defer judgment to the United State's Veterans Administration's equitable disability compensation apportionment policy, before imposing scheduled payments, for support claimed by a subject disabled veteran's dependent children, custodian/guardian and spouse.

NAUS Hawaii Chapter respectfully encourages this committee to consider including both of our aforementioned additional legislative protections in the proposed revised Chapter 580, Hawaii Revised Statutes. This legislative action most certainly will strengthen our State's support for United States Code, Title 10, Section 1408(a)(4)(B) intent, and be much appreciated by our divorcing disabled veterans and military personnel.

Thank you for being here for us,

D Egge

Dennis Egge; Chapter President



1298 Kukila Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96818;
Naushawaii1@yahoo.com; 808-382-5833

KLEINTOP, LURIA & MEDEIROS

A LIMITED LIABILITY LAW PARTNERSHIP

CHARLES T. KLEINTOP
TIMOTHY LURIA
DYAN M. MEDEIROS

DAVIES PACIFIC CENTER, SUITE 480
841 BISHOP STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

NAOKO C. MIYAMOTO
CATHY Y. MIZUMOTO

LATE

TELEPHONE:
(808) 524-5183

FAX:
(808) 528-0261

EMAIL:
D.Medeiros@hifamlaw.com

TO: Representative Romy Cachola, Chair
Representative Ken Ito, Vice-Chair
House Committee on Veterans, Military, International Affairs & Culture
and the Arts

FROM: Dyan M. Medeiros
E-Mail: d.medeiros@hifamlaw.com
Phone: 524-5183

HEARING DATE AND TIME: February 2, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.

RE: Testimony in Opposition to HB807

Good morning Representative Cachola, Representative Ito, and members of the Committee. My name is Dyan Medeiros. I am a partner at Kleintop, Luria & Medeiros, LLP and have concentrated my practice in Family Law for sixteen (16) years. I am also a past Chair of the Family Law Section of the Hawaii State Bar Association. I submit this testimony today against HB807.

I recognize and appreciate the sacrifice and dedication of the men and women who serve in our military. They deserve our utmost respect and gratitude as do their families. That being said, HB807 creates problems that will hurt the spouses and children of veterans who receive disability benefits and discriminates against disabled people who are not veterans. Moreover, I do not believe this bill is necessary to protect those disabled veterans who truly need all of their veterans' disability benefits to support themselves. The laws governing spousal support in Hawai'i already provide that protection.

First, veterans' disability benefits are considered income for child support purposes. There is no logical basis to deem veterans' disability benefits to be income for one purpose (i.e. child support) but not another (i.e. spousal support). Moreover, although it may seem like excluding veterans' disability benefits from income for spousal support purposes will not affect children, that is simply untrue. Child support does not provide for 100% of a child's needs. Both parents are responsible for contributing to their child's needs. If custodial parents are denied spousal support that they need in order to support themselves and their children, that will certainly affect the children's standard of living.

Second, it is important to understand that spousal support in Hawai'i is awarded based on the factors identified in Hawai'i Revised Statutes §580-47(a) and caselaw. Simply put, alimony is awarded based on need. The Court first considers whether the requesting party needs alimony after taking into account the property awarded to that party in the divorce (including the income producing capability of that property) and that party's own income. If the requesting party doesn't need alimony, no alimony is awarded. If the requesting party demonstrates a need for alimony, the Court next considers the ability of the other spouse to pay alimony while meeting his or her own need. If the other spouse doesn't have the ability to pay alimony and support himself or herself, there will be no award for alimony.

It is also important to know that spousal support is almost never a lifetime award. Generally, alimony awards are temporary and for a period of time the Court feels is necessary to allow the recipient to become economically self-sufficient.

It is common for spouses of military members either not to work or not to have been able to build a career due to changes in duty stations, deployments, caring for children, etc. It is also common, therefore, for them to need some financial assistance either during or after a divorce in order to become economically self-sufficient. This can be achieved either through property division, spousal support, or both.

HB807 is unnecessary because if a veteran is so disabled that he or she requires all of their income (including their veterans' disability benefits) to support themselves, the Court will not award spousal support. However, many veterans are able to work in addition to receiving disability benefits. In that case, the Court may decide, after examining all of the circumstances (including the requesting spouse's work history and obligations), that an award of spousal support is appropriate. The Court may also decide, based on the property division award or other factors, that an award of spousal support is not appropriate. HB807, however, takes away the Court's ability to weigh all of the applicable factors and make an informed decision that is best for both spouses and for their children.

Third, it is important to understand the difference between property division and spousal support as they apply to military retired pay (i.e. military pensions) and veterans' disability benefits. Under federal law, veterans' disability benefits are not subject to property division in a divorce case. In contrast, military pensions (just like civilian pensions) are subject to property division in a divorce case.

Dividing a military pension as part of a property division award provides both the military member and the former spouse with a stream of income after the member's retirement. The division is based on a percentage that is determined by the length of the member's service during the parties' marriage. The income is shared until either the retired member or the former spouse dies. Since veterans' disability benefits are not subject to property

division under federal law, former spouses do not share in veterans' disability benefits for their lifetime following a divorce.

It is important for this Committee to understand that military members must often waive an equivalent amount of their retired pay/pension in order to receive veterans' disability benefits. For example, if a military member is entitled to receive \$2,000.00 in retired pay and is found to also be entitled to \$700.00 in veterans' disability benefits, the member will have to waive \$700.00 of his retired pay. In other words, the member will receive \$1,300.00 in retired pay and \$700.00 in veterans' disability benefits for a total of \$2,000.00. Practically speaking, if the military member's retired pay is divided as property in a divorce, the former spouse will only receive a percentage of the reduced retired pay (i.e. \$1,300.00) rather than a percentage of the original retired pay of \$2,000.00.

HB807 now seeks to say that the "extra" \$700.00 the military members can't even be considered for spousal support purposes. Because of the complicated relationship between military retired pay and veterans' disability benefits, HB807 will have the effect of reducing a military member's ability to pay spousal support in the eyes of the Court even if that is not the reality of the situation. This will result in fewer spousal support awards even if the former spouse actually needs support and even if the military member actually has the ability to contribute to that support. Because alimony is awarded based on need, this could easily result in more former military spouses and dependents requiring the assistance of welfare programs and taxpayer funds.

Finally, there are many people in our society who are not military members but who receive disability benefits due to physical or mental disabilities. Their disability benefits are considered income for alimony (and child support) purposes. In establishing preferential treatment for veterans' disability benefits, HB807 discriminates against those other people who receive disability benefits.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to HB807.