

modification under RCW 26.09.170. The petition was supported by declarations, as well as financial and other documentation. Ms. Lyle's former husband, Keith Lyle, opposed modification. He contended Ms. Lyle had not established a change of circumstances that would warrant revisiting the 2009 order. Mr. Lyle also submitted declarations and documentation supporting his position.

¶4 A superior court commissioner heard argument on the petition after reviewing the parties' voluminous filings. No testimony was taken. The commissioner dismissed the petition for the reasons argued by Mr. Lyle, finding that Ms. Lyle had not shown a substantial change in circumstances or severe economic hardship as required for modification under RCW 26.09.170.

¶5 Ms. Lyle filed a motion for revision of the commissioner's decision. A superior court judge heard oral argument on the motion and considered the materials that had been previously filed in support of and opposition to the petition to modify, together with a transcript of the commissioner's hearing. The judge ultimately granted Ms. Lyle's motion for revision and petition for modification, finding that she had established the following circumstances under RCW 26.09.170(5), (6), and (7): (1) a substantial change in circumstances based on the children entering into a new age category and their significantly increased expenses, (2) severe economic hardship, and (3) change in income. The judge also adopted Ms. Lyle's proposed child support work sheet. Mr. Lyle appeals.

## ANALYSIS

¶6 Mr. Lyle does not challenge the superior court judge's decision to revise the court commissioner. His complaint goes to the scope of the judge's order on revision. According to Mr. Lyle, once the superior court judge decided to revise the commissioner's ruling on whether there were grounds for modification, the matter should have been remanded to