

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES COMMISSION MEETING

***These are draft minutes and have not yet been approved by the Commission**

Minutes for the February 5, 2026, meeting held via Microsoft Teams. Agenda items are bolded.

Scribe: Gregory Bennett, DSS/OCSS

5:01pm – Call to order, provision for meeting minutes.

Roll Call

Present: CFSM Michael Ferguson, Chair, Graham Shaffer, Carolyn Signorelli, Darren Pruslow, Campbell D. Barrett, Allison E Post, Amy MacNamara, Michael Werner, Virginia Brown, and Susan Hamilton.

Not present: Gary Winfield, Cara Pavalock D'Amato, Scott Storms.

Minutes from the December 4, 2025 meeting moved to accept by Graham Shaffer and seconded by Michael Werner. The motion carried.

5:04 pm – Update on status of proposed regulation

Magistrate Michael Ferguson began the meeting by turning it over to Graham Shaffer to have an update on the status of the proposed regulations. Graham stated he wanted to bring everyone up to speed on what happening since our last meeting. He stated that the proposed regulations were accepted as legally sufficient by the Attorney General's office. He stated that the proposed regulation was then sent it to the legislative regulations review committee and it has been scheduled for a hearing on February 24, which is a Tuesday. Graham stated that he doesn't yet have a zoom link and that the hearing is at 11:00am in Room 1E of the Legislative Office Building, which is in Hartford and where the Commission had two public hearings on the proposed regulation. He stated that when he has a zoom link from the committee administrator, he will circulate that to all the members. Graham stated that he plans to attend in person, and it would be great to have as many members there in person, or at least there through zoom, as possible. He stated that we never know if they're going to have a lot of questions, so he will get that zoom link out as soon as he has it. He stated that since the last meeting and before the proposed regulation was submitted it to the Regulations Review Committee, it was realized in looking at old minutes and talking to some folks in both SES and OCSS here at DSS that there's usually been a delayed implementation of the new guidelines. Graham stated largely the reason for that is that CCSES, the computer eligibility system that's used in our IV-D program, needs to be reprogrammed with the new schedule and any new rules added to the guidelines, and similarly, private vendors who offer software to the bar for purpose of computing child support orders need to do the same. Graham stated an August 1st effective date was listed in the Notice of Decision to account for this. He stated it's necessary, after talking to folks within state government. He stated that regs review can do a number of things with the proposed regulation: they can reject it without prejudice because they feel like there's changes we need to make, and that this would delay the process a bit because we'd have to make those changes, then go back to the Attorney General's office and get it approved, and submit it for a new hearing; they could approve the proposed reg with just technical changes, in which case the reg would be filed with the secretary of the state's office and then our August 1st effective date would kick in. He stated that those are the two most likely outcomes as we get as we get to Regs Review. He stated if there were any questions, to let me know, but otherwise he would send that zoom link when he has it.

5:11 pm – Assignment of Work for the Preamble

Magistrate Michael Ferguson stated that committee really wants the people to be present versus the zoom in case we have to answer any questions. Magistrate Ferguson stated he would definitely be there with Graham and I think Darren said he would be there as well and hopefully attorney Signorelli could be there and some others as well. He stated that way it'll be the group of the Commission members that can field and answer the questions, so hopefully we can get a good group to be there. He asked whether there were any questions. With no responses, he stated the other big issue is we could probably start writing the preamble, and so he's not sure if anyone had an opportunity to look at it and to figure out what sections they want to see if they can revise. Magistrate Ferguson stated just so the committee could know, we met briefly and hopefully we can get some participation in rewriting the revising preamble. Carolyn Signorelli stated that she did tell Graham that she would be willing to help wherever the slack needs to be picked up and happy to help. Magistrate Ferguson stated rather than put everyone on the spot he will send an email out to everyone, all the Commission members, and you can pick what area you would like to revise and he will assign areas and then we can go from there. Susan Hamilton stated she was not sure if there is already people assigned to different sections yet and where the gaps might be, or are we sort of starting from just sort of a blank slate with each of the sections? Magistrate Ferguson stated that we have identified the different areas and so we can just kind of send you an e-mail and then you can say, oh, I want to do this, say and that might be a little easier. Graham Shaffer stated he would put together a list of all those topics to try to link that in with the different provisions of the preamble that are affected and then circulate that to the membership so that you can the things that we need to address. He stated that he's already circulated the Word document with the preamble from the previous version of the guidelines, and it appears typically what happens is the Commission goes subsection by subsection, subdivision by subdivision and says, here's what this provision talks about, we made no changes and here's why, or we did make changes. Graham stated typically because there was no reason to make changes, the Commission would just say in most sections that everything seems to be working fine, and then in those sections where they did make changes they note the change and provide some commentary for why they made the changes, what they think the changes mean, and then in sections where they debated changes but didn't make changes they explain why they did not. Graham stated he did also talk to Paul Bourdoulous at SES, who said he didn't think that the turnaround time was that great for getting the Guidelines booklets printed once they have a final version of the preamble, but he would still kind of like to have this done by early this summer. Graham stated with that August 1st implementation date, we can make sure that the judicial branch has everything they need to print the new booklets when the time comes.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson then asked if there were any questions or comments and by the next meeting we should have that document distributed to everyone, assigned the topics, and we should be going forward. He stated that he hopes that we can get a good portion of the Commission members to be present on the 24th at 11:00 AM and that's room 1E and that concludes the meeting.

5:17pm – Adjournment