



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY
STATE CONTRACTING STANDARDS BOARD

Final & Approved
Minutes

Friday, December 11, 2020 Meeting of the State Contracting Standards Board
Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference

Members Present:

Lawrence Fox, Chair – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Alfred Bertoline – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Lauren Gauthier – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Albert Ilg. – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Donna Karnes – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Stuart Mahler – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Robert Rinker – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Brenda Sisco – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference

David L. Guay, Executive Director - ex-officio Board member – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference
Xholina Nano, Staff – 2020-2021 UConn Graduate Intern – Via Microsoft Teams Video Conference

1. Call to order

Meeting called to order by Chair Lawrence Fox at 10:03 A.M.

2. Approve the Minutes of the November 13, 2020 Meeting

Motion made by Robert Rinker and seconded by Lauren Gauthier to approve the minutes of the November 13, 2020 Board meeting. All voted in favor.

3. Report from the Sec. 4e-36 Contested Solicitations and Awards Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Robert Rinker reported that no matters were pending before the Subcommittee.

4. Privatization Contract Committee Report

Committee Chair Lawrence Fox reported that no matters were pending before the Committee.

5. Work Group Reports

a. Report from Audit Work Group

Executive Director David Guay reported for the absent Audit Work Group Chair Thomas Ahneman.

- 2nd notices for the FY 2019 Audit were sent on Friday, November 13, 2020
- All FY 2018 Compliance Reports have been sent out to the agencies.
- All appropriate FY 2018 Compliance Reports have been sent to the Appropriations Committee, the Government Administration and Election Committee, the appropriate Committee of Cognizance for each agency, the State Library, the Senate Clerk, the House Clerk, and the Office of Legislative Research per Public Act No. 19-136.
- Currently preparing to send out the request to the FY 2017 audited agencies for an update on the status of the Board's recommendation.
- Currently preparing to send out to all agencies a communication of our findings concerning, CEE's, results-based accountability and training.

Executive Director Guay requested a vote to ratify and formalize the FY 2019 Audit Extension tentatively provided to the Department of Public Health.

Motion made by Stuart Mahler and seconded by Robert Rinker to ratify and formalize an extension for the FY2019 Audit of the Department of Public Health (DPH). All voted in favor.

b. Data Analysis Work Group

Data Analysis Work Group Chair Alfred Bertoline stated that they have been quite busy.

Mr. Bertoline reported the Work Group is continuing its work on a benchmarking study and has met with Professor Mohamad Alkadry, Department Head of the UConn Department of Public Policy. The Work Group is in the process of obtaining data from the Core-CT system. The Work Group reviewed the benchmarking criteria in the draft questionnaire to the agencies. Chair Bertoline reported that the benchmarking criteria will be refined and again when the data is acquired.

Chair Bertoline reported that an informal request to the Office of Policy and Management for assistance with the STARS Analytical Tool for the Core-CT data came back with a negative response.

Data Analysis Work Group Chair Bertoline motioned seconded by Robert Rinker that the Board pursuant to the provisions in Connecticut General Statute Section 4e-3, request that the Office of Policy

and Management, as the holder and manager of the analytical tools for examination of Core-CT financial data, provide the following information:

For the last five completed fiscal years, by agency.

- Total number of purchasing orders (1)
- Total number of change orders (2)
- Total number of purchasing orders issued by other departments under delegated authority (3)
- Total value of purchasing orders (4)
- Total value of purchasing orders issued by other departments under delegated authority (5)
- Total value of purchasing undertaken through a p-card program (6)
- Total procurement spending (7)
- Total number of letters of interest to determine the field of suppliers available and interested (8)
- Total number of letters or proposals of qualification used to prequalify suppliers (9)
- Total number of requests for quotes (10)
- Total number of requests for proposals (11)
- Total number of competitive negotiations (12)
- Total number of emergency contracts (13)
- Total value of emergency procurement (14)
- Total number of sole source contracts (15)
- Total number of sole source contracts over formal threshold (16)
- Total value of sole-source contracts (17)
- Total number of protests (18)
- Total number of protests determined in agency's favor (19)

For the last five completed fiscal years, by agency, what percentage of procurement spending "falls into" the following general categories?

- Goods : _____ (1)
- Services : _____ (2)
- Construction : _____ (3)
- Other (please, specify) : _____ (4)
- Total : _100%_____

For the last five completed fiscal years, by agency, long-term contracts - information regarding agency contracting practices:

- Length of initial contract (in months) (1)
- Length of the extension (in months) (2)
- Number of extensions allowed (3)

Sec. 4e-3. Exercise of rights, powers, duties and authority relating to the procurement policies of the state by the board.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 14 upon request by the board, each state contracting agency, including institutions of higher education, shall provide the board, in a timely manner, with such procurement information as the board deems necessary. The board shall have access to all information, files and records related to any state contracting agency in furtherance of the board's duties, as described in this section and sections 4e-4 to 4e-47, inclusive. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the board's disclosure of documents that are exempt from disclosure pursuant to chapter 14.

Stuart Mahler asked a question about the origins of the list. Executive Director Guay replied that it came from Professor Alkadry's prior national studies. He further stated that some of that information is not in Core-CT, but the list is a full ask and we want as much information as possible. Explaining that he would expect to go back to Carol Wilson and the BizNet system and finally the questionnaire would go out to the agencies for a three-pronged approach.

Donna Karnes commented that she thought it was STARS we were looking for data and someone from OPM would go into STARS and provide the information. Explaining we have access to Core-CT data, Chair Bertoline explained that Core-CT is not functional for analytical analysis, that is the reason for going to OPM to go through STARS.

Brenda Sisco asked if this was an FOI request? Executive Director Guay explained that it is under the authority the Board has under C.G.S. Section 4e-3. Ms. Sisco commented that this is a monumental task, suggesting getting bits and pieces at a time. Ms. Sisco asked if this was the same issue that someone from OPM recently wrote us back, that we need to go to each agency for the information? Executive Director stated it was the same issue.

Chair Fox stated he understood Ms. Sisco's concern. Chair Fox added that our understanding is that some of the data is not in Core-CT and thus unable to be pulled from Core-CT using the STARS analytical tools and we are not asking OPM to compile that data by hand, so our assumption is that it is not a monumental task. Chair Fox further added that someone who understands the STARS system has to query it.

Chair Fox asked Mr. Bertoline to explain to the Board and all those watching or listening in why the data is necessary. Mr. Bertoline explained that the Data Analysis Work Group wants to do a benchmarking study based upon Professor Alkadry's previous national studies. Mr. Bertoline further stated that the Work Group's thought is to first take Connecticut as a whole and compare it to the national statistics and see where Connecticut falls, which allows the Board to pursue areas of concern. Then with data from each agency we can do a state-wide study of internal benchmarking, agency against agency.

Before the vote Ms. Sisco offered that she is not in favor of such a big ask and will vote no. Ms. Sisco believes OPM will have a big problem along with going into a Legislative session, and we should be realistic with our request.

Chair Fox expressed that he would be supporting the motion, his assumption in supporting the motion is that the STARS tool makes this request easy, Chair Fox added that if he is wrong OPM will tell us. Chair Fox further added that he is assuming that this is not a big work burden and the information will be powerful information to help us focus on where we can improve procurement in the State of Connecticut.

Lauren Gauthier offered to split the difference, asking If we have or can have access to the STARS system. Ms. Gauthier noted that then we wouldn't have to have OPM do this for us. Mr. Bertoline responded that we could have access, but the complexity of the system and the learning curve for the Board is beyond what we can do and OPM has the experts.

Chair Fox called for a vote on the motion that the Board pursuant to the provisions in Connecticut General Statute Section 4e-3, request that the Office of Policy and Management, as the holder and manager of the analytical tools for examination of Core-CT financial data, provide the information requested.

Voting yes:

Lawrence Fox, Chair
Alfred Bertoline
Donna Karnes
Stuart Mahler
Robert Rinker

Voting no:

Lauren Gauthier
Brenda Sisco

Abstaining:

Albert Ilg

Motion passed four in favor, two opposed and one abstention.

6. Report of Special Committee on Dillon Stadium contracts

Chair Fox introduced the agenda item, that is before the Board is the final report and asked for a motion prior to discussion.

Motioned made by Lauren Gauthier and seconded by Alfred Bertoline to approve the report.

Chair Fox asked Robert Rinker to inform the Board of what was received from CRDA and what is new in the final report from the draft.

Mr. Rinker began by expressing thanks to Chair Fox and Executive Director Guay for their leadership in the matter. Mr. Rinker also thanked the members of the special committee, Lauren Gauthier, Brenda Sisco, Jean Morningstar and Alfred Bertoline as a late addition.

Mr. Rinker directed the Board to the additional recommendation added to the report.

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.

Mr. Rinker directed the Board to the response to the draft from CRDA and an attachment from CRDA Chairperson Suzanne Hopgood.

State Contracting Review Board

Role of CRDA Board during Dillon Work

{Read by CRDA Chair Suzanne Hopgood at [CRDA's]Board Meeting 11-19-20}

For the record, it's important to note that the CRDA Board was fully engaged with the decision to go forward with the demolition and preliminary design work for Dillon Stadium recognizing that the work was critical for public safety but also the construction schedule. The building was partially condemned and a public safety hazard and there was also a real possibility that we would lose the first season of soccer if the work were held up much longer. On more than one occasion, staff presented the ongoing issues and overall dilemma to the appropriate Board committee and other members in full session.

There is no surprise here. First, the Hartford City Council approved the deal and all terms were agreed to by all the parties; secondly, we had a contract with the city to build the stadium with its own performance expectations; and third, we had conversation with then State Budget officials and were planning on asking for an amendment to the state bond commission if it was determined to be necessary.

Its admittedly difficult to balance process and project, but that is why a quasi-agency, with some business assessment, is assigned projects as difficult as Dillon. One final note: all dollars are accounted for and in fact, the Board specifically asked our independent auditors, Cohn Reznick, to report back to the Board on this project. Dillon has now been in use for nearly two years contributing to the renewal of the neighborhood and the city.

Mr. Rinker noted that he considers it a little rewrite of history. Adding what occurred here was originally there was going to be tri-partite agreement that included CRDA. But that did not happen, there were term sheets in place that were never finalized. The finalization did not take

place until February of 2019 after the expenditure, according to the Auditors of Public Accounts, of four million dollars.

Mr. Rinker led the Board through a review of the CRDA responses to the draft report. 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.

Mr. Rinker commented that CRDA said that Dillon Stadium was in such a dilapidated condition that they had to move quickly because it was a public safety hazard. Mr. Rinker added that if it was a public safety hazard, why not just put a fence around it and that responsibility was the City of Hartford. Mr. Rinker made a comment about the RFP, that if the stadium was in such a dilapidated condition and you had only a thirty-day turnaround, what was the due diligence that the proposers could possibly do without knowing what condition the stadium was in.

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.

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.

Stuart Mahler praised Mr. Rinker and the committee for writing the report and recommends approval.

Lauren Gauthier commented about the section where CRDA disagreed with the Board concerning the ABA recommendation on weighting. Ms. Gauthier did some research and OPM does recommend weighting and at least a minimum of seven weeks in response time for an RFP.

Albert Ilg commented that this whole thing could be avoided if the city of Hartford had approached the Hartford Building Commission. Mr. Ilg also complimented the committee and praised Chair Fox.

Donna Karnes added her praise to the committee and the leadership of Chair Fox.

Brenda Sisco added that as a member of the committee she wanted to give kudos because we have been working on this report for a long time and it is nice to have a final report. Ms. Sisco recognized the work by Mr. Rinker in drafting the report and thanked Ms. Gauthier for her work.

Chair Fox asked to make a few comments before the Board votes.

Chair Fox stated this investigation and report was very challenging for the Board. The Board was really handicapped by not having a Board staff attorney. The statute that created the Board contemplated much more staff to investigate these types of things. We didn't have a Chief Procurement Officer, which the statute calls for and made it complicated to take on such an investigation. Chair Fox expressed that the regional development authorities and the quasi-publics from his prospective perform a very important part of economic development for our State. So much economic development is regional and having one table where all the

stakeholders is extremely important for the success of our State. The idea of nimble means having the table where everyone has a place should be the definition of nimble. Nimble should not mean having bad procurement policies, nimble should not mean an uneven playing field, nimble should not mean sacrificing the due diligence needed to protect the taxpayers. Nimble should mean one table where it all gets discussed is nimble.

Chair Fox explained that what happened in the reconstruction of Dillon Stadium is fortunately the stadium got rebuilt. Chair Fox added, the way it was done was not right, the RFP was not right and it was not good for the State; it reduces the confidence of the people of our State and the integrity of these processes and that's bad in a time when we need to build trust in government.

Chair Fox stated that our State has a culture of not taking competitive bidding seriously. He added the Board discovered this when the Board's Data Analysis Work Group under Al Bertoline conducted their studies in 2018 and 2019. Chair Fox further stated the Board needs to say to the agencies of the State and to the quasi-public agencies that we need to get to a culture of the importance of competitive bidding as a critical part of how we do procurement.

Chair Fox concluded by stating. If the Board approves this report, it is our intention to bring this to the attention of the Legislature and the Governor to find out how we instill a culture of transparency and competitive bidding in Connecticut.

Stuart Mahler expressed his agreement with Chair Fox's comments

Chair Fox asked for a vote on the Motion made by Lauren Gauthier and seconded by Alfred Bertoline to approve the report. All voted in favor.

7. Complaint received concerning the Connecticut Port Authority

Executive Director Guay explained that the complaint was filed by Mr. Kevin Blacker and supported by more than dozens of communications concerning the Connecticut Port Authority and the construction or reconstruction of the New London State Pier. Mr. Blacker requests that we look at the contracting by the Port Authority.

Chair Fox explained our normal process is to look at every complaint and take an initial look. Chair Fox informed the Board that he will have Executive Director and Xholina Nano take a first look and report back to the Board.

8. Other Business

Stuart Mahler asked the Chair to include on our next agenda a visit from Paul Hinsch of the Office of Policy and Management, Procurement Policy Development Coordinator. Chair Fox directed Executive Director Guay to reach out to Mr. Hinsch and invite him to meet with the Board through a letter to Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management.

9. Public Comment

Alyssa Peterson addressed the Board concerning the Dillon Stadium Report.

Christopher Fryxell addressed the Board concerning the Connecticut Port Authority.

Kevin Blacker addressed the Board Concerning the Connecticut Port Authority.

Steve Farrelly addressed the Board Concerning the Connecticut Port Authority.

10. Adjournment

Motion made by Robert Rinker and seconded by Alfred Bertoline to adjourn. All voted in favor, the motion passed, and the meeting adjourned at 11:18 A.M.

Respectfully submitted: David Guay