



STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY STATE CONTRACTING STANDARDS BOARD

Dillon Stadium Report

Introduction

Public Act 07-1, passed by the General Assembly during their September 2007 Special Session, was entitled, “An Act Concerning Clean Contract Standards.” The Act signed into law by Governor Rell established the State Contracting Standards Board (SCSB) as an independent Executive Branch agency. The Act required all state contracts contain provisions to ensure accountability, transparency, and results-based outcomes. The Act further defines “contract” or “state contract” as an agreement or combination or series of agreements between a state contracting agency or quasi-public agency and a business. It is the mission of the SCSB to require that state contracting, and procurement are understood and carried out in a manner that is open, cost effective, efficient and consistent with State and Federal statutes, rules, and regulations. Consistent with its mission, the SCSB undertook a review of the Capital Region Development Authority and its role in the renovation of Dillon Stadium.

On August 9, 2019, the SCSB voted to form a working group to examine the procurement processes for the renovation of Dillon Stadium in Hartford. One of the purposes of the renovation was to attract a professional sports team to play at the renovated stadium. The examination by the SCSB was prompted by three events. Principally, it was the report and discussion of the Public Auditors’ report that took place at the SCSB’s meeting on August 9, 2019 regarding the expenditure of funds on the renovation of Dillon Stadium. It also included two contests filed by TJ Clynych on behalf of Civic Mind, LLC on October 24, 2018 and December 14, 2018. Lastly, the Board had extensive discussion at its December 14, 2018 meeting regarding newspaper reports and the subsequent investigation by the State Election Enforcement Commission concerning political contributions made by a principal of the Hartford Sports Group to the gubernatorial campaign of Bob Stefanowski.

SCSB Chairman Lawrence Fox appointed three Board members and himself to the Working Group along with SCSB Executive Director David Guay and Graduate Intern Lauren Gauthier. The Board’s working group members were Brenda Sisco, Jean Morningstar, and Robert Rinker.

The SCSB undertook this examination under its authority granted by C.G.S. 4e-3 and 4e-4 to 4e-47, inclusive. With the exception of Executive Director, David Guay, the Board’s work is performed by its voluntary Board members. Any limitation of this report is attributed to the lack of staffing of the Board. As initially envisioned by the General Assembly, the Board was to have ten staff members including the State’s Chief Procurement Officer (CPO). The CPO’s position was vacated in 2017 and the SCSB as of the

date of this report has not received the funding or permission to fill this critical position. The report was delayed in part because of the ongoing pandemic.

The Board in issuing its final report on Dillon Stadium has shared a draft report with CRDA, the Office of Policy Management, the Auditors of Public Accounts, and the Attorney General for their feedback.

The report provides a chronology of events and makes certain conclusions and recommendations. The recommendations made are in some cases specific to CRDA and their processes but may also be applicable to other State agencies and quasi-public agencies. The General Assembly may want to seek legislative changes to Connecticut State Statutes based upon these recommendations. The Board in adopting these recommendations is willing to work with any interested party in furthering the goal of a transparent and competitive procurement processes throughout State government and its political subdivisions.

Attached to this report are exhibits referenced in the report. The exhibits are essential to understanding the basis of the report and its conclusions and recommendations.

Dillon Stadium

The Dillon Stadium issue was first brought to the attention of the State Contracting Standards Board (Board) when TJ Clynch of Civic Mind, LLC filed contests under C.G.S 4e-36 with the Board on October 24, 2018 and December 14, 2018 (See Exhibits 1.1 and 1.2). Mr. Clynch's contests regarded the Request for Proposal (RFP) for Dillon Stadium and the award to the Hartford Sports Group (HSG) (See Exhibit 2).

The Board's Contested Solicitations and Awards Subcommittee (Subcommittee) conducted a review of the contest as provided for under its statutes. The Subcommittee heard from Mr. Clynch, Capital Region Development Authority's (CRDA) officials, and Mr. Sarwar, a responder to the RFP. The Subcommittee dismissed the contest without prejudice because it was not clear whether or not the Board and its subcommittee had jurisdiction over the matter. The matter of jurisdiction centered on the public entity that had the contract with HSG. The Board and its Subcommittee would have jurisdiction if the contract was between CRDA and HSG. The Subcommittee would not have jurisdiction if the contract was between the City of Hartford (City) and the "winning" proposer, which was HSG. At the time of deliberations by the Subcommittee, there was no signed contract. The City of Hartford did not enter into an agreement with HSG/Hartford Athletics, LLC until February 2019 well after the expenditure of bonds funds for the renovation of Dillon Stadium. Ultimately, the Board decided to examine the Dillon stadium project because of the involvement of CRDA, a quasi-public agency, and the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars.

The Working Group on Dillon Stadium established a timeline for the development of Dillon Stadium (See Exhibit 3).

The RFP was issued by CRDA on behalf of the City on September 15, 2017 (See Exhibit 1.1). The objectives of the RFP were stated as:

1. Secure greater uses of Dillon Stadium with a strong preference for a professional sports team.
2. Provide for the upgrade and repair of the Stadium.
3. Establish an operational management program for the Stadium.
4. Compliment and assist Colt Park renewal and recreational programs operating within the Park.
5. Spur other community redevelopment and renewal within the U.S. National Park area.

The RFP detailed in the "selection criteria" section five criteria, but without any specific weighting. The criteria were as follows:

1. Proposed use of facility
2. Respondent's experience, technical competence and financial plan
3. Respondent's capacity to perform work

4. Private capital/public capital program, and
5. Efficacy of revenue return and economic impact to the City of Hartford.

This is the first and only time that there is mention of use of public capital, though due to how vague the wording is, it is uncertain what CRDA was actually imagining or trying to convey about the availability of public funds.

There were three respondents to the RFP. The respondents were the Hartford Sports Group, Civic Mind LLC, and Hartford City Football Club.

The RFP was initiated by an exchange of letters between CRDA's Executive Director Michael Freimuth and the City's Mayor Luke Bronin (See Exhibit 4). It appears that the exchange of letters may have been prompted by earlier communication between the City and CRDA.

The City had previously attempted to redevelop the stadium on its own with disastrous results from its then developers. Some of the designated developers James Duckett, Jr. and Mitchell Anderson of Premier Sports Management Group were arrested, prosecuted and imprisoned for illegal activities related to a purported \$30 million renovation of Dillon Stadium (See Exhibits 5.1 and 5.2).

In Mr. Freimuth's letter to Mayor Bronin, Mr. Freimuth requested a Memorandum of Agreement regarding the role of CRDA's involvement in the project. Mr. Freimuth stated at the first meeting of the Subcommittee regarding Civic Mind, LLC's contest that there was no memorandum and he regretted the decision to move forward without it.

HSG's response to the RFP issued by CRDA on behalf of the City called for an investment of \$10.7 million in public funds for the reconstruction of Dillon stadium (See Exhibit 6). HSG's main response was centered on bringing to a renovated Dillon Stadium a Tier 2 professional soccer team. The other respondents did not have similar responses regarding the renovation of Dillon stadium or a higher tiered professional soccer team. The response from Civic Mind, LLC called for outside capital to renovate Dillon stadium over a period of time (See Exhibit 7). HSG was the winning proposer recommended by CRDA to the City on or about December 1, 2017.

The State Bond Commission at its February 16, 2018 approved \$10 million for the renovation of Dillon Stadium, contingent upon a signed agreement for a professional sports team (See Exhibit 8). Did HSG know of the availability of the bond funds for the renovation of Dillon stadium prior to submitting its proposal? If it did not know, HSG's proposal would have been deficient in that its main response to the RFP was to bring a professional soccer team to Dillon stadium.

Following the RFP process and the selection of HSG, a series of negotiations took place. Based upon these initial negotiations, term sheets were agreed upon and approved by CRDA's board, and the City's Common Council on April 9, 2018 (See Exhibit 9). The initial agreements as reflected in the term sheets were between the City and CRDA, and CRDA and HSG. At that time or anytime in the future, there were no actual signed contracts between CRDA and HSG. On or about February 2018, CRDA and HSG reached

an understanding regarding the design of a renovated Dillon stadium with JCJ Architects (JCJ) (See Exhibit 10). HSG entered into a contract with JCJ. Said contract was later assigned from HSG to CRDA in September 2018 for consideration of \$1. The JCJ contract with HSG and later assigned to CRDA was done without a competitive process. In terms of project design, however, the CRDA and the City agreed that a CRDA sole source contract with JCJ was desirable and justified, given the time constraints, the firm's familiarity with Dillon Stadium and the work that they had completed to date on the project (See Exhibit 11).

Late summer and early fall of 2018, HSG's principal owner, Bruce Mandell, and his family made significant contributions to gubernatorial candidate Bob Stefanowski and the Connecticut Republican Party. General Counsel for CRDA, Anthony Lazzaro, informed HSG of the required affidavits on political contributions no later than May 31, 2018 (See Exhibit 12), but Mr. Mandell proceeded with those contributions. In November 2018, Mr. Mandell self-reported these contributions to the State Elections Enforcement Commission (SEEC). The SEEC found that Mr. Mandell met the definition of a prospective state contractor and consequently violated state law and paid a fine (See Exhibit 13).

The standard for the Board is not the prospective state contractor definition under SEEC's statutory framework. The Board would have found HSG a non-qualified proposer if the contract was in fact between HSG and CRDA. The City Council initially approved of a contract on April 9, 2018 (See Exhibit 14.1). It was not until February 13, 2019 that the City's Council approved an amended contract with HSG to bring a professional sports team to Dillon stadium (See Exhibit 14.2).

On August 16, 2019, Lawrence Fox, Chairman of the SCSB, requested from OPM Secretary Melissa McCaw information regarding the release of bond funds for Dillon stadium (See Exhibit 15.1) On August 28, 2019, Gareth Bye, Director of Legal Services for OPM, responded by email to Mr. Fox and David Guay, Executive Director of the SCSB providing certain items requested in the letter. (See Exhibit 15.2). The items included a bond allotment adjustment (Document Number CRD00034) request by Michael Freimuth, CRDA Executive Director, dated April 4, 2018 for \$10,000,000 for Dillon stadium (See Exhibit 15.3). The items also included an April 12, 2018 memorandum from then OPM Secretary, Benjamin Barnes to then Governor Dannel Malloy requesting his approval of the allotment transaction of \$10,000,000 to CRDA for Dillon stadium (See Exhibit 15.4). Governor Malloy approves the allotment transaction on April 12, 2018.

Mr. Fox posed two additional requests in his letter dated August 16, 2019 (See Exhibit 15.1). First (item 3), was a request to provide procedures used in approving a draw of bond funds. Second (item 4) was "When approving the draw of bond funds, is the bond authorization reviewed?" Mr. Bye replied in his email of August 28, 2019, "As to the specific questions set forth in item 3 and 4, there is no OPM approval of "draws." After the State Bond Commission approval, all funds are allotted to the agency when requested by such agency and when it is ready to commit such funds to a contract ("draws" would happen via the terms of their contract). The requesting agency is responsible for compliance with all

statutes and policies.” As of the April 4, 2018 request by CRDA and approved by Secretary Barnes and Governor Malloy no such contract was in place, and no contract would be in place until February 2019.

In its audit of CRDA dated August 2, 2019, the Auditors of Public Accounts (Auditors) found CRDA did not comply with the State Bond Commission and its board of directors’ requirement that an executed agreement be in place prior to spending bond funds (See Exhibit 15.5). The Auditors also found that CRDA spent \$4,039,356 of these state bond funds for the construction of the stadium between July 20, 2018 and February 24, 2019 without an executed agreement in place between the City of Hartford and a professional sports team. The Auditors noted that the City subsequently entered into an agreement with a professional sports team on February 25, 2019. In an email on August 6, 2019 from State Auditor John Geragosian to Mr. Guay, Mr. Geragosian states, “I’ve attached the 2-8-18 CRDA board minutes which clearly state the requirement to have an agreement in place. The second attachment is the CRDA bond authorization dated 2/16/18 which clearly states that the funds are subject to an agreement between Hartford and the team. The third attachment is the minutes of a 6/1/18 Venue Committee meeting in which Mr. Freimuth has to be “cautioned” regarding the State Bond Commission Dillon Stadium fund resolution” (See Exhibit 15.6)

The project continued with the issuance of a construction management RFP by CRDA to develop Dillon Stadium on April 2, 2018 in which Newfield Construction was selected on June 1, 2018. The contract executed was between CRDA and Newfield Construction (See Exhibit 16). This would effectively make the developer of the stadium neither the City of Hartford nor HSG, but rather CRDA. The license agreement for construction and operation between the City of Hartford and CRDA was signed on June 8, 2018 and CRDA sublicensing to the Hartford Athletics, LLC the presentation of professional soccer and lacrosse as well as various community events and uses (See Exhibit 17).

The Auditors report on Dillon stadium was the subject of extensive discussion between the Auditors and the Board on August 9, 2019 (See Exhibit 18).

Construction was completed and the stadium is now operational.

This report focused on the procurement and contracting processes for Dillon stadium, but the Working Group wonders why the RFP was issued by CRDA on behalf of the City in the first place. When Dunkin Donuts Stadium was built by the City as part of the DoNo Development project, the City got a commitment from a Double A baseball team to play at the stadium. While there were delays in construction and issues with the initial developer, the Hartford Yard Goats and the stadium has been a rousing success for the City (with a noted exception of this past season due to the pandemic) and will serve as the anchor for the development of this area of the city.

Since Mr. Mandell and the Hartford Sports Group had an interest in bringing a Tier 2 professional soccer team to a renovated Dillon stadium, why not just license the use of the stadium to the Hartford Sports Group. Why not allow CRDA to do what it does best which is to renovate and redevelop Dillon stadium and the surrounding area? In the end, this is what actually occurred here. Why the charade of an RFP

and a convoluted procurement process? This question is not answered by this report but may be best left to the Legislature and others in the Executive branch to answer or remedy a solution.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. When the City asked CRDA to conduct an RFP on its behalf, the City and CRDA should have entered into a memorandum of agreement outlining the roles, responsibilities and procedures for conducting such an RFP. In the future, CRDA should enter into memorandums of agreement when acting on the behalf of a state agency or a public subdivision of the state.
2. The circumstances for the waiver of competitive procurement applicable to the JCJ Architecture contract are found in C.G.S. 4e-1(16), emergency procurement and C.G.S. 43-16(6), waiver of bid or proposal for extraordinary circumstances. The SCSB does not find these circumstances to apply to the JCJ contract. CRDA should have known of the need for transparency in this process given the prior history regarding the Dillon Stadium renovation and the expenditure of public dollars. CRDA should incorporate language regarding the waiving of competitive procurement into its policies and procedures on procurement.
3. In issuing an RFP, it is assumed that all interested parties submitting responses have access to the same information. It appears that HSG through its prior discussion with the City was aware of the need for \$10 million for renovating Dillon Stadium. It also appears that CRDA was also aware of those discussions. In issuing the RFP, it should have included the amount of funds necessary to renovate Dillon stadium and the potential source of public funds so that respondents or potentially other respondents were aware of such funds. CRDA should in future procurement make sure that all bidders or proposers are operating on a level playing field.
4. If the City and CRDA knew at the time public money was going to be available or possibly available, it should have been explicitly stated in the RFP.
5. CRDA listed objectives for the RFP. These objectives and selection criteria should be used by the evaluation team to assess each proposal. In the future, CRDA, when issuing an RFP with multiple objectives/criteria, should disclose the weight of each objective/criteria. Disclosing the weighted criteria will allow each bidder/proposer to make their best offers and, eventually, the bidder/proposer will see how their offer lined up with other respondents to the RFP. Such weighting of objectives and selection criteria are recommended in the American Bar Association's Model Procurement Codes.
6. Following the RFP and recommendation of HSG by CRDA to the City, the City effectively abandoned the RFP by substantially changing the construct of the original RFP. CRDA and/or the City should have declared at that point the RFP and its evaluation were no longer valid. CRDA should develop as part of its procurement policies and procedures; 1) notification to bidders or proposers when it plans the to abandon a RFP 2) notification to bidders or proposers of any substantial change to a RFP, and 3) the effect of any substantial change to a RFP and the proposals submitted by the bidders or proposers.

7. Following the abandonment of the RFP, HSG, CRDA and the City entered into term sheets that were approved by the CRDA Board, and the City's Common Council. The initial term sheets were between the City and CRDA, and CRDA and HSG. It appears that the parties operated as though the term sheets were legally binding contracts. CRDA should have only engaged with HSG under a legally binding contract. CRDA should develop as part of its procurement policies and procedures that any expenditure of public funds or commitment of resources with a non-public entity should not occur until there is a legally binding agreement. SCSB further recommends any agreement between a quasi-public and a non-public entity should be reviewed for form by the Attorney General's office.
8. As recommended above, CRDA should conduct a review of its policies and procedures for the procurement of goods and services. The SCSB will share with CRDA model language for undertaking its review.
9. In February 2018, the State Bond Commission approved \$10 million in public funds for the renovation of Dillon stadium contingent upon a signed agreement for a professional sports team. The funds were released to CRDA prior to a signed agreement and CRDA expended those funds prior to a signed agreement. OPM should put into a place a procedure to ensure that the terms of a bond authorization are met prior to the release of funds. CRDA's representation that then Secretary Barnes knew of the situation is insufficient to secure the funds and to expend such funds. As state in #7 above, term sheets are not legally binding agreements. In the event that CRDA and/or the City failed to reach an agreement with HSG, public funds would have been improperly spent. In the case of the original arrangement under the term sheets, it would not have been possible for CRDA to have entered into a legally binding agreement with HSG because of the political contributions made by HSG owner, Bruce Mandell to the gubernatorial campaign of Bob Stefanowski. Such contributions would have made Mr. Mandell's company a non-qualified proposer and/or contractor under C.G.S 4e-34. CRDA should inform prospective bidders, proposers and contractors at the onset of its procurement process of the prohibitions on political contributions under C.G.S. 9-612(f).
10. CRDA should not have directed HSG to enter into a non-competitive contract with JCJ Architecture. As stated above, term sheets are not legally binding agreements and therefore CRDA had no authority to direct HSG to circumvent the competitive bidding process for a project that CRDA would ultimately be the project manager. SCSB saw no authority or contract that allowed CRDA to direct HSG to use JCJ Architecture. CRDA should develop as part of its procurement policies and procedures that any expenditure of public funds or commitment of resources with a non-public entity should not occur until there is a legally binding agreement.
11. CRDA in the Dillon Stadium renovation had in effect become the project manager. It instructed HSG to hire JCJ Architecture to design the renovation work and it hired through a RFP process Newfield Construction to do the renovation work. To assume that role, the City entered into a license agreement with CRDA. Any actions taken by CRDA as the licensee would have to be in compliance with State law and its own policies and procedures regarding the procurement of goods and services.

12. The SCSB finds that it is not in the public interest to have public funds expended without legally enforceable contracts; to do so puts these public funds at risk.
13. (Post Comment Recommendation) The Board of CRDA has the fiduciary responsibility to comply with laws and regulations but also to avoid any activity which would imply the slightest chance of contracting improprieties. We recommend the Board review its governance policies and procedures and make changes, if any, to ensure that the highest standards of transparency, accountability, security, and trust prevail for the benefit of the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut.

Responses to Draft Report

The draft report was written with the expectation of allowing agencies to correct inaccuracies and missed facts, rebut points, and to adjust language to present a balanced view.

On October 9, 2020, SCSB Executive Director sent the draft report to CRDA, OPM, Auditors of Public Accounts, and the Attorney General's Office (See Exhibit 19).

OPM – No formal response was received by the Board.

Auditors of Public Accounts – The Auditors of Public Accounts responded to the Board with a letter dated October 27, 2020 (See Exhibit 22).

SCSB Concluding Comments – The report reflects the changes brought to the Board by the Auditors of Public Accounts.

Attorney General's Office – No formal response was received by the Board.

CRDA – On November 9, 2020, Deputy Executive Director Anthony Lazzaro requested an extension of time to respond to the report (See Exhibit 20). Mr. Lazzaro stated the CRDA Board would discuss the report at its November 19, 2020 meeting. The Board granted the extension of time. On November 30, 2020, Susan Hopgood, Chair of the CRDA Board respond to the Board's draft report in a letter to Lawrence Fox, Chair of the SCSB (See Exhibit 21).

SCSB Concluding Comments –

In paragraph #1 of the letter, CRDA described the RFP as an advisory exercise. If that was the intent of the CRDA, they may want to have considered a Request for Information (RFI). An RFI would have allowed the CRDA to better prepare the RFP for Dillon stadium. The Board would also note that the short turnaround on responding to the RFP may not have allowed prospective proposers to do their due diligence on the state of repair needed for Dillon stadium.

In paragraph #2, CRDA states that SCSB did not have jurisdiction. The issue of jurisdiction ran to who were the parties to the contracts. The term sheets as described in the body of this report showed that there was to be a contractual relationship between CRDA and HSG. It is disingenuous to say otherwise. Why then would the City's Common Council take action in February 2019 to change that relationship to one between the City and the Hartford Athletic, LLC from the tri-partite agreement between the City, CRDA and HSG previously approved by CRDA's Board and the City's Common Council.

In paragraph #5, CRDA states, "While the City and CRDA had signed agreements, the signatures on the City-HSG were held up though all material terms and approvals were finalized. Waiting was risking the project's success." The Board feels that not waiting put taxpayers' dollars at risk. As stated above, the

contractual relationships were not changed until February 2019. The Board acknowledges CRDA's commitment going forward with projects in that it will not do so without signed contracts.

In paragraph #6, CRDA stated that the signatures were held up because of the impermissible campaign contributions. Again, as stated above, the impermissible campaign contribution held up the execution of the contract because CRDA was party to the contract(s). If as described in paragraph #6, the contract was between City and HSG, there would be no need to be concerned about the impermissible campaign contributions. Contrary to CRDA assertion that SEEC had jurisdiction, but SCSB did not, if the contract was between CRDA and HSG as spelled out in the term sheets, SCSB may have found HSG was a non-qualified proposer and/or state contractor. The Board under its authority may have nullified such contract.

Recommendation #1 – CRDA accepts the Board's recommendation regarding the use of MOUs in the future.

Recommendation #2 – CRDA accepts the Board's recommendation regarding developing sole source standards in its procurement procedures.

Recommendation #3 – CRDA states the deterioration of the Dillon stadium would not have given any of the respondents a good handle on the final needs of the stadium. In preparing a RFP with such a short turnaround time, the proposers should have been given an opportunity to do their due diligence on the state of Dillon stadium prior to submitting their responses.

Recommendation #4 – CRDA accepts the Board's recommendation to make proposers aware of potential funding sources in future projects.

Recommendation #5 – CRDA states that it was following OPM's Procurement Standards that does not require the disclosure of weight of selection. The Board remains committed that in this process where there were objectives of the RFP and selection criteria that the CRDA should have followed ABA's model procurement code in adopting weights.

Recommendation #6 – CRDA does not opine on the recommendation.

Recommendation #7 – CRDA agrees with the Board's recommendation.

Recommendation #8 – CRDA accepts the Board's recommendation.

Recommendation #9 – CRDA does not opine on the Board's recommendation regarding OPM's role in releasing funds to CRDA and the requirement for a contract to be in place with a professional sports team. CRDA does state that it does in its procurement process state upfront the requirement regarding political contributions. SCSB commends CRDA for this upfront disclosure. The Board will not speculate why the principal of HSG went ahead anyway and made these contributions. It is sufficient to say that the delay in executing the contracts combined with desire of the HSG to expedite the rehabilitation

process must rest with HSG and not CRDA. If HSG wanted to expedite the process, it should have followed the direction of CRDA regarding political contribution.

CRDA does not opine on the SCSB recommendation regarding OPM's release of bond funds. The Board would note that the funds were released upon the request of CRDA.

Recommendation #10 – CRDA believes that it was appropriate to sole source the contract to JCJ Architecture based upon their experience and expertise with Dillon stadium. CRDA stated the law allows sole source contracts when the cost to CRDA of competitive selection process would outweigh the benefit of such procedure. While JCJ Architecture may have been the best contractor for the project, the Board believes an open and transparent procurement process serves the need of the public and except in extraordinary and emergency circumstance should the competitive process not be the regular course of conduct. CRDA's own policies on procurement were ignored in this circumstance. The Board in two reports noted the high level of non-competitive contracts in state service and such high level should be the exception and not the rule.

Recommendation #11 – CRDA points to its response in recommendation #10 as dispositive to the Board's recommendation, the Board continues its position regarding its recommendation regarding competitive procurement.

Recommendation #12 – CRDA agrees to the Board's recommendation.

Exhibits

- 1.1 – Civic Mind, LLC’s contest to the Board dated October 24, 2018 and
- 1.2 – Civic Mind, LLC’s contest to the Board dated December 14, 2018

- 2 – CRDA’s recommendation of HSG to the City on December 1, 2017

- 3 – Timeline of events

- 4 – Letters between CRDA’s Executive Director Freimuth and Hartford’s Mayor Bronin regarding RFP

- 5.1 – Newspaper article on the arrest, conviction and imprisonment of former developers Duckett and Anderson
- 5.2 – Newspaper article on the arrest, conviction and imprisonment of former developers Duckett and Anderson

- 6 – HSG’s response to the RFP

- 7 – Civic Mind, LLC’s response to the 18-001 RFP

- 8 – Bond Agenda item for Dillon stadium on February 16, 2018

- 9 – City’s Common Council Term Sheets for Dillon Stadium

- 10 – Undated CRDA file memo

- 11 – HSG- CRDA understanding regarding JCJ architects

- 12 – CRDA’s Deputy Director and General Counsel Lazzaro advice on State Contracting Reporting – SEEC Decision Sections 37-39

- 13 – SEEC’s Decision on Mandell self-reporting

- 14.1 – Hartford City Council’s approval of initial agreement with CRDA and HSG, April 10, 2018
- 14.2 – Hartford City Council’s approval of amended license agreement, February 13, 2019

- 15.1 – Letter from SCSB Chairman Lawrence Fox to OPM Secretary Melissa McCaw
- 15.2 – Email from Gareth Bye, Director of Legal Services for OPM to Mr. Fox and Mr. Guay dated August 28, 2019
- 15.3 – CRDA request for Bond allotment dated April 4, 2018
- 15.4 – Memorandum from OPM Secretary Barnes requesting approval of allotment transfer to Governor Malloy dated April 12, 2018
- 15.5 – CRDA Audit – Auditors of Public Accounts dated August 2, 2019
- 15.6 – Email from State Auditor John Geragosian dated August 6, 2019 with attachments

- 16 – Newfield Construction contract

- 17 – City/CRDA construction and license agreement
- 18 – Minutes of the SCSB meeting of August 9, 2019
- 19 – AG Dillon Stadium Report Draft transmittal letter
- 19 – APA Dillon Stadium Report Draft transmittal letter
- 19 – CRDA Dillon Stadium Report Draft transmittal letter
- 19 – OPM Dillon Stadium Report Draft transmittal letter
- 20 – November 9, 2020 CRDA Email Ext Request & Response
- 21 – December 2, 2020 CRDA Response to SCSB Report Draft
- 22 – October 27, 2020 APA Response to SCSB Report Draft