## HOUSE BILL 1930

State of Washington 65th Legislature 2017 Regular Session

By Representatives Frame, Rodne, and Jinkins

Read first time 02/03/17. Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

- 1 AN ACT Relating to child custody; amending RCW 26.10.030,
- 2 26.10.032, 26.10.100, 26.10.160, 26.10.190, 26.10.200, 26.09.260, and
- 3 26.09.270; and adding new sections to chapter 26.10 RCW.
- 4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:
- 5 **Sec. 1.** RCW 26.10.030 and 2003 c 105 s 3 are each amended to 6 read as follows:
- (1) Except as authorized for proceedings brought under chapter 7 13.34 RCW, or chapter 26.50 RCW in district or municipal courts, a 8 child custody proceeding is commenced in the superior court by a 9 10 person other than a parent, by filing a petition seeking custody of 11 the child in the county where the child is permanently a resident or where the child is found, but only if the child is not in the 12 physical custody of one of its parents ((or if the petitioner alleges 13 that)) and neither parent is a suitable custodian. In proceedings in 14 which the juvenile court has not exercised concurrent jurisdiction 15 16 and prior to a child custody hearing, the court shall determine if the child is the subject of a pending dependency action. 17
- 18 (2) Notice of a child custody proceeding shall be given to the 19 child's parent, guardian and custodian, who may appear and be heard 20 and may file a responsive pleading. The court may, upon a showing of 21 good cause, permit the intervention of other interested parties.

p. 1 HB 1930

- 1 (3) The petitioner shall include in the petition the names of any adult members of the petitioner's household.
- **Sec. 2.** RCW 26.10.032 and 2003 c 105 s 6 are each amended to 4 read as follows:
- (1) A party seeking a custody order shall submit, along with his or her motion, ((an affidavit declaring)) a declaration stating that the child is not in the physical custody of one of its parents  $((\Theta r))$ and that neither parent is a suitable custodian and setting forth facts supporting the requested order. In a custody action between a nonparent and a parent, the nonparent seeking custody has the burden to show that the child is not in the physical custody of one of its parents and either: (a) Parental unfitness; or (b) that the child's growth and development would be detrimentally affected by placement with an otherwise fit parent. The party seeking custody shall give notice, along with a copy of the ((affidavit)) declaration, to other parties to the proceedings, who may file opposing ((affidavits)) declarations.

- (2) ((The court shall deny the motion unless it finds that adequate cause for hearing the motion is established by the affidavits, in which case it shall set a date for hearing on an order to show cause why the requested order should not be granted.)) Determination of adequate cause shall be pursuant to an order to show cause. The show cause hearing shall not be set unless the court finds that the declaration or declarations provide a prima facie showing of adequate cause. A mere showing that nonparental custody of the child is in the best interests of the child is insufficient to establish adequate cause. The petition must be dismissed without the prima facie showing. At the show cause hearing all parties are entitled to present a declaration as to why the requested order should or should not be granted. If adequate cause is not established and the order is not granted, the petition must be dismissed.
- **Sec. 3.** RCW 26.10.100 and 1987 c 460 s 38 are each amended to 33 read as follows:
  - ((The court shall determine custody in accordance with the best interests of the child)) A nonparent seeking custody from a parent must prove, by clear, cogent, and convincing evidence, that the child is not in the physical custody of one of its parents and: (1) The parent is unfit; or (2) placement of the child with an otherwise fit

p. 2 HB 1930

- 1 parent will result in actual detriment to the child's growth and
- 2 <u>development</u>.
- 3 **Sec. 4.** RCW 26.10.160 and 2011 c 89 s 7 are each amended to read 4 as follows:
- 5 (1) A parent not granted custody of the child is entitled to 6 reasonable visitation rights except as provided in subsection (2) of 7 this section.
- (2)(a) Visitation with the child shall be limited if it is found 8 that the parent seeking visitation has engaged in any of the 9 10 following conduct: (i) Willful abandonment that continues for an extended period of time or substantial refusal to perform parenting 11 12 functions; (ii) physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; (iii) a history of acts of domestic violence as defined in 13 14 RCW  $26.50.010((\frac{1}{1}))$  or an assault or sexual assault which causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm; ((or)) (iv) a long-15 16 term emotional or physical impairment which interferes with the parent's performance of parenting functions as defined in RCW 17 26.09.004; (v) a long-term impairment resulting from drug, alcohol, 18 or other substance abuse that interferes with the performance of 19 parenting functions; (vi) the absence or substantial impairment of 20 emotional ties between the parent and the child; (vii) the abusive 21 use of conflict by the parent which creates the danger of serious 22 damage to the child's psychological development; or (viii) the parent 23 24 has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense under:
- 25 (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between 26 the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under 27 (d) of this subsection;
- (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of this subsection;
- 31 (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between 32 the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under 33 (d) of this subsection;
- 34 (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 35 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 36 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;
- 37 (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age 38 between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists 39 under (d) of this subsection;

р. 3 НВ 1930

- 1 (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;
- 2 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed 3 in (a)((<del>(iv)</del>)) (viii)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
- 4 (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an offense analogous to the offenses listed in (a)(((iv))) (viii)(A) through (H) of this subsection.
- 7 This subsection (2)(a) shall not apply when (c) or (d) of this 8 subsection applies.
- 9 (b) The parent's visitation with the child shall be limited if it is found that the parent resides with a person who has engaged in any 10 11 of the following conduct: (i) Physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; (ii) a history of acts of domestic 12 violence as defined in RCW  $26.50.010((\frac{1}{1}))$  or an assault or sexual 13 assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm; or 14 (iii) the person has been convicted as an adult or as a juvenile has 15 been adjudicated of a sex offense under: 16
- 17 (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between 18 the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under 19 (e) of this subsection;
- 20 (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between 21 the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under 22 (e) of this subsection;
- (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under
- 25 (e) of this subsection;
- 26 (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 27 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 28 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;

- (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of this subsection;
  - (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;
- 33 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
- 35 (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 36 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) 37 of this subsection.
- This subsection (2)(b) shall not apply when (c) or (e) of this subsection applies.

p. 4 HB 1930

- (c) If a parent has been found to be a sexual predator under chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter. If a parent resides with an adult or a juvenile who has been found to be a sexual predator under chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with the parent's child except contact that occurs outside that person's presence.
- (d) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection poses a present danger to a child. Unless the parent rebuts this presumption, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter:
- 16 (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted 17 was at least five years older than the other person;
- 18 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;

- 19 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at 20 least eight years older than the victim;
- 21 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at 22 least eight years older than the victim;
- 23 (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 26 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;
- (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;
- 29 (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 30 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of this subsection.
  - (e) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who resides with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted, or as a juvenile has been adjudicated, of the sex offenses listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection places a child at risk of abuse or harm when that parent exercises visitation in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person. Unless the parent rebuts the presumption, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with the parent's child except for contact that occurs outside of the convicted or adjudicated person's presence:

p. 5 HB 1930

- 1 (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted 2 was at least five years older than the other person;
- 3 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;
- 4 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 6 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 8 (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- 9 (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at 10 least eight years older than the victim;
- 11 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

3536

- 12 (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses 13 listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;
- 14 (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 15 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of 16 this subsection.
- 17 (f) The presumption established in (d) of this subsection may be 18 rebutted only after a written finding that:
  - (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, and (B) the offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child; or
  - (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child and the offending parent is in the child's best interest, and (C) the offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.
- 37 (g) The presumption established in (e) of this subsection may be 38 rebutted only after a written finding that:
- 39 (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed 40 by the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation,

p. 6 HB 1930

(A) contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and that parent is able to protect the child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person, and (B) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child; or

- (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the parent in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is in the child's best interest, and (C) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes contact between the parent and child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.
  - (h) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (f) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
  - (i) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who has been adjudicated as a juvenile of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this

p. 7 HB 1930

subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the person adjudicated as a juvenile, supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.

- (j) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the convicted person supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
- (k) A court shall not order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child of the offending parent who was sexually abused by that parent. A court may order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child who was not sexually abused by the parent after the presumption under (d) of this subsection has been rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years with no further arrests or convictions of sex offenses involving children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW and (i) the sex offense of the offending parent was not committed against a child of the offending parent, and (ii) the court finds that unsupervised contact between the child and the offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, or social worker with expertise in treating child sexual abuse victims who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child, and after consideration

p. 8 HB 1930

1 of evidence of the offending parent's compliance with community supervision requirements, if any. If the offending parent was not 2 3 ordered by a court to participate in treatment for sex offenders, then the parent shall obtain a psychosexual evaluation conducted by a 4 certified sex offender treatment provider or a certified affiliate 5 6 sex offender treatment provider indicating that the offender has the lowest likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants 7 unsupervised contact between the parent and a child. 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

2021

22

23

2425

26

2728

29

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

37

3839

40

(1) A court may order unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of a juvenile adjudicated of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection who resides with the parent after the presumption under (e) of this subsection has been rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years during which time the adjudicated juvenile has had no further arrests, adjudications, or convictions of sex offenses involving children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW, and (i) the court finds that unsupervised contact between the child and the parent that may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, or social worker with expertise in treatment of child sexual abuse victims who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile, and after consideration of evidence of the adjudicated juvenile's compliance with community supervision or parole requirements, if any. If the adjudicated juvenile was not ordered by a court to participate in treatment for sex offenders, then the adjudicated juvenile shall obtain a psychosexual evaluation conducted by a certified sex offender treatment provider or a certified affiliate sex offender treatment provider indicating that the adjudicated juvenile has the lowest likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile who is residing with the parent.

(m)(i) The limitations imposed by the court under (a) or (b) of this subsection shall be reasonably calculated to protect the child from the physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation. If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that limitations on visitation with the child will not adequately protect

p. 9 HB 1930

the child from the harm or abuse that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation, the court shall restrain the person seeking visitation from all contact with the child.

- (ii) The court shall not enter an order under (a) of this subsection allowing a parent to have contact with a child if the parent has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused the child, except upon recommendation by an evaluator or therapist for the child that the child is ready for contact with the parent and will not be harmed by the contact. The court shall not enter an order allowing a parent to have contact with the child in the offender's presence if the parent resides with a person who has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused a child, unless the court finds that the parent accepts that the person engaged in the harmful conduct and the parent is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm from the person.
- (iii) If the court limits visitation under (a) or (b) of this subsection to require supervised contact between the child and the parent, the court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between a child and a parent who has engaged in physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of the child unless the court finds based upon the evidence that the supervisor accepts that the harmful conduct occurred and is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing to or capable of protecting the child.
- (n) If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that contact between the parent and the child will not cause physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm to the child and that the probability that the parent's or other person's harmful or abusive conduct will recur is so remote that it would not be in the child's best interests to apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and (iii) of this subsection, or if the court expressly finds that the parent's conduct did not have an impact on the child, then the court need not apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and (iii) of this subsection. The weight given to the existence of a protection

p. 10 HB 1930

- order issued under chapter 26.50 RCW as to domestic violence is within the discretion of the court. This subsection shall not apply when (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m)(ii) of this subsection apply.
  - (3) ((Any person may petition the court for visitation rights at any time including, but not limited to, custody proceedings. The court may order visitation rights for any person when visitation may serve the best interest of the child whether or not there has been any change of circumstances.
- (4) The court may modify an order granting or denying visitation rights whenever modification would serve the best interests of the child.)) Modification of a parent's visitation rights shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section.
  - $((\frac{5}{1}))$  (4) For the purposes of this section:

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

1112

13 14

22

2324

25

2627

28

- 15 (a) "A parent's child" means that parent's natural child, adopted child, or stepchild; and
- 17 (b) "Social worker" means a person with a master's or further 18 advanced degree from a social work educational program accredited and 19 approved as provided in RCW 18.320.010.
- 20 **Sec. 5.** RCW 26.10.190 and 2000 c 21 s 21 are each amended to 21 read as follows:
  - (1) The court shall hear and review petitions ((for modifications of a)) to change a final, nonparent parenting plan, custody order, visitation order, or other order governing the residence of a child, including terminating the order to return the child to the care of the parent, and conduct any proceedings concerning a relocation of the residence where the child resides a majority of the time, pursuant to this chapter ((26.09 RCW)).
- 29 (2) <u>If the order is granted and a parent has a child returned to</u>
  30 <u>him or her, the parent may file a petition for entry of a parenting</u>
  31 plan under a separate cause number.
- 32 (3) If the court finds that a motion to modify <u>or terminate</u> a 33 prior custody ((<del>decree</del>)) <u>order</u> has been brought in bad faith, the 34 court shall assess the attorney's fees and court costs of the 35 custodian against the ((<del>petitioner</del>)) moving party.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 6. A new section is added to chapter 26.10 RCW to read as follows:

p. 11 HB 1930

(1) If the original custody order was entered by default, agreement of the parties, or after trial with no specific findings of the unfitness or actual detriment of the parents, the nonparent custody order must be terminated unless custodians or a nonmoving party demonstrates by clear, cogent, and convincing evidence the current unfitness of the parent or actual detriment to the child.

- (2) If the original nonparent custody order was entered pursuant to a finding of unfitness or actual detriment, the moving party must demonstrate by a preponderance of evidence a substantial change in his or her circumstances since the entry of the prior order, specifically related to the basis for the custody order and the best interests of the child.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. A new section is added to chapter 26.10 RCW to read as follows:
  - (1) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a residential schedule upon a showing of a substantial change in circumstances of either parent or of the child if the proposed modification is only a minor modification in the residential schedule that does not change the residence the child is scheduled to reside in the majority of the time and:
    - (a) Does not exceed twenty-four full days in a calendar year;
  - (b) Is based on a change of residence of the parent with whom the child does not reside the majority of the time or an involuntary change in work schedule by a parent that makes the residential schedule in the parenting plan impractical to follow; or
  - (c) Does not result in a schedule that exceeds ninety overnights per year in total, if the court finds that, at the time the petition for modification is filed, the residential schedule does not provide reasonable time with the parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time and it is in the best interests of the child to increase residential time with the parent in excess of the residential time period in (a) of this subsection.
  - (2) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a parenting plan upon a showing that:
    - (a) The custodians and both parents agree to the modification;
  - (b) The child has been integrated into the family of the moving party with the consent of the custodian and the other parent in substantial deviation from the parenting plan;

p. 12 HB 1930

(c) The child's present environment is detrimental to the child's physical, mental, or emotional health, and the harm likely to be caused by a change of environment is outweighed by the advantage of a change to the child; or

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

2829

30 31

32

33

34

3536

37

3839

- (d) The court has found the nonmoving custodian in contempt of court at least twice within three years because the custodian failed to comply with the residential time provisions in the court-ordered parenting plan, or the parent has been convicted of custodial interference in the first or second degree under RCW 9A.40.060 or 9A.40.070.
- (3) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a residential schedule pursuant to a proceeding to permit or restrain the relocation of a child. The person objecting to the relocation of the child or the relocating person's proposed revised residential schedule may file a petition to change the residential schedule. A hearing to determine adequate cause for modification is required so long as the request for relocation of a child is being pursued. In making a determination of a modification pursuant to relocation of a child, the court shall first determine whether to permit or restrain the relocation of the child using the procedures and standards 26.09.405 through 26.09.560. Following provided in RCW determination, the court shall determine what modification pursuant to relocation should be made, if any, to the residential schedule, custody order, or visitation order.
- (4) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time and whose residential time with the child is subject to limitations pursuant to RCW 26.10.160 may not seek expansion of residential time unless that parent demonstrates a substantial change in circumstances specifically related to the basis for the limitation.
- (5) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time who is required by the existing residential schedule to complete evaluations, treatment, parenting, or other classes may not seek expansion of residential time under of this section unless that parent has fully complied with such requirements.
- (6) The court may order adjustments to any of the nonresidential aspects of a residential schedule upon a showing of a substantial change of circumstances of a custodian, either parent, or of a child, and that the adjustment is in the best interests of the child.

p. 13 HB 1930

- 1 **Sec. 8.** RCW 26.10.200 and 1987 c 460 s 48 are each amended to 2 read as follows:
- 3 (1) A party seeking ((a temporary custody order or)) modification or termination of a ((custody decree)) nonparent custody order or 4 residential schedule shall submit together with his or her motion, 5 6 ((an affidavit)) a declaration setting forth facts supporting the requested order or modification and shall give notice, together with 7 a copy of the ((affidavit)) declaration, to other parties to the 8 proceedings, who may file opposing ((affidavits)) declarations. The 9 court shall deny the motion unless it finds that adequate cause for 10 11 hearing the motion is established by the ((affidavits)) declarations, 12 which may include the moving party demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence a substantial change in circumstances specifically 13 related to the basis for the limitation, in which case it shall set a 14 date for hearing on an order to show cause why the requested order or 15 16 modification should not be granted.
- 17 (2) If the original custody order was entered with no specific 18 findings of unfitness or actual detriment of the parties, adequate 19 cause is not required.
- 20 **Sec. 9.** RCW 26.09.260 and 2009 c 502 s 3 are each amended to 21 read as follows:

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

3031

32

3334

35

39

- (1) Other than modifications pertaining to a nonparent custody order governed by chapter 26.10 RCW and except as otherwise provided in subsections (4), (5), (6), (8), and (10) of this section, the court shall not modify a prior custody ((decree)) order or a parenting plan unless it finds, upon the basis of facts that have arisen since the prior ((decree)) order or plan or that were unknown to the court at the time of the prior ((decree)) order or plan, that a substantial change has occurred in the circumstances of the child or the nonmoving party and that the modification is in the best interest of the child and is necessary to serve the best interests of the child. The effect of a parent's military duties potentially impacting parenting functions shall not, by itself, be a substantial change of circumstances justifying a permanent modification of a prior ((decree)) order or plan.
- 36 (2) In applying these standards, the court shall retain the 37 residential schedule established by the ((decree)) order or parenting 38 plan unless:
  - (a) The parents agree to the modification;

p. 14 HB 1930

(b) The child has been integrated into the family of the petitioner with the consent of the other parent in substantial deviation from the parenting plan;

- (c) The child's present environment is detrimental to the child's physical, mental, or emotional health and the harm likely to be caused by a change of environment is outweighed by the advantage of a change to the child; or
- (d) The court has found the nonmoving parent in contempt of court at least twice within three years because the parent failed to comply with the residential time provisions in the court-ordered parenting plan, or the parent has been convicted of custodial interference in the first or second degree under RCW 9A.40.060 or 9A.40.070.
- (3) A conviction of custodial interference in the first or second degree under RCW 9A.40.060 or 9A.40.070 shall constitute a substantial change of circumstances for the purposes of this section.
- (4) The court may reduce or restrict contact between the child and the parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time if it finds that the reduction or restriction would serve and protect the best interests of the child using the criteria in RCW 26.09.191.
- (5) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a parenting plan upon a showing of a substantial change in circumstances of either parent or of the child, and without consideration of the factors set forth in subsection (2) of this section, if the proposed modification is only a minor modification in the residential schedule that does not change the residence the child is scheduled to reside in the majority of the time and:
  - (a) Does not exceed twenty-four full days in a calendar year; or
- (b) Is based on a change of residence of the parent with whom the child does not reside the majority of the time or an involuntary change in work schedule by a parent which makes the residential schedule in the parenting plan impractical to follow; or
- (c) Does not result in a schedule that exceeds ninety overnights per year in total, if the court finds that, at the time the petition for modification is filed, the decree of dissolution or parenting plan does not provide reasonable time with the parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time, and further, the court finds that it is in the best interests of the child to increase residential time with the parent in excess of the residential time period in (a) of this subsection. However, any motion under this

p. 15 HB 1930

subsection (5)(c) is subject to the factors established in subsection (2) of this section if the party bringing the petition has previously been granted a modification under this same subsection within twenty-four months of the current motion. Relief granted under this section shall not be the sole basis for adjusting or modifying child support.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

26

27

2829

30 31

32

33

34

3536

37

3839

40

- (6) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a parenting plan pursuant to a proceeding to permit or restrain a relocation of the child. The person objecting to the relocation of the child or the relocating person's proposed revised residential schedule may file a petition to modify the parenting plan, including a change of the residence in which the child resides the majority of the time, without a showing of adequate cause other than the proposed relocation itself. A hearing to determine adequate cause for modification shall not be required so long as the request for relocation of the child is being pursued. In making a determination of a modification pursuant to relocation of the child, the court shall first determine whether to permit or restrain the relocation of the child using the procedures and standards provided in RCW 26.09.405 through 26.09.560. Following that determination, the court shall determine what modification pursuant to relocation should be made, if any, to the parenting plan or custody order or visitation order.
  - (7) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time and whose residential time with the child is subject to limitations pursuant to RCW 26.09.191 (2) or (3) may not seek expansion of residential time under subsection (5)(c) of this section unless that parent demonstrates a substantial change in circumstances specifically related to the basis for the limitation.
  - (8)(a) If a parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time voluntarily fails to exercise residential time for an extended period, that is, one year or longer, the court upon proper motion may make adjustments to the parenting plan in keeping with the best interests of the minor child.
  - (b) For the purposes of determining whether the parent has failed to exercise residential time for one year or longer, the court may not count any time periods during which the parent did not exercise residential time due to the effect of the parent's military duties potentially impacting parenting functions.
- (9) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time who is required by the existing parenting plan to complete

p. 16 HB 1930

evaluations, treatment, parenting, or other classes may not seek expansion of residential time under subsection (5)(c) of this section unless that parent has fully complied with such requirements.

- (10) The court may order adjustments to any of the nonresidential aspects of a parenting plan upon a showing of a substantial change of circumstances of either parent or of a child, and the adjustment is in the best interest of the child. Adjustments ordered under this section may be made without consideration of the factors set forth in subsection (2) of this section.
- (11) If the parent with whom the child resides a majority of the time receives temporary duty, deployment, activation, or mobilization orders from the military that involve moving a substantial distance away from the parent's residence or otherwise would have a material effect on the parent's ability to exercise parenting functions and primary placement responsibilities, then:
- (a) Any temporary custody order for the child during the parent's absence shall end no later than ten days after the returning parent provides notice to the temporary custodian, but shall not impair the discretion of the court to conduct an expedited or emergency hearing for resolution of the child's residential placement upon return of the parent and within ten days of the filing of a motion alleging an immediate danger of irreparable harm to the child. If a motion alleging immediate danger has not been filed, the motion for an order restoring the previous residential schedule shall be granted; and
- (b) The temporary duty, activation, mobilization, or deployment and the temporary disruption to the child's schedule shall not be a factor in a determination of change of circumstances if a motion is filed to transfer residential placement from the parent who is a military service member.
- (12) If a parent receives military temporary duty, deployment, activation, or mobilization orders that involve moving a substantial distance away from the military parent's residence or otherwise have a material effect on the military parent's ability to exercise residential time or visitation rights, at the request of the military parent, the court may delegate the military parent's residential time or visitation rights, or a portion thereof, to a child's family member, including a stepparent, or another person other than a parent, with a close and substantial relationship to the minor child for the duration of the military parent's absence, if delegating residential time or visitation rights is in the child's best

p. 17 HB 1930

interest. The court may not permit the delegation of residential time or visitation rights to a person who would be subject to limitations on residential time under RCW 26.09.191. The parties shall attempt to resolve disputes regarding delegation of residential time visitation rights through the dispute resolution process specified in their parenting plan, unless excused by the court for good cause shown. Such a court-ordered temporary delegation of a military parent's residential time or visitation rights does not create separate rights to residential time or visitation for a person other than a parent. 

(13) If the court finds that a motion to modify a prior ((decree)) order or parenting plan has been brought in bad faith, the court shall assess the attorney's fees and court costs of the nonmoving parent against the moving party.

**Sec. 10.** RCW 26.09.270 and 2011 c 336 s 691 are each amended to 16 read as follows:

A party seeking a temporary custody order or a temporary parenting plan or modification of a custody ((decree)) order or parenting plan, other than a nonparent custody order, shall submit together with his or her motion, an affidavit setting forth facts supporting the requested order or modification and shall give notice, together with a copy of his or her affidavit, to other parties to the proceedings, who may file opposing affidavits. The court shall deny the motion unless it finds that adequate cause for hearing the motion is established by the affidavits, in which case it shall set a date for hearing on an order to show cause why the requested order or modification should not be granted.

--- END ---

p. 18 HB 1930