



Regular Meeting Notice & Agenda
Friday, November 8, 2024 - 10:00 A.M.
Location: 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT
Conference Room G009F and *Virtual*

In Attendance:

Rochelle Palache, Chair (in person)
Thomas Ahneman (virtually)
Al Bertoline (in person)
Keith Brothers (in person)
Lauren Gauthier (virtually)
Al Ilg (in person)
Donna Karnes (virtually)
Salvatore Luciano (in person)
Stuart Mahler (in person)
James Marpe (in person)
Jean Morningstar (virtually)
Daniel Rovero (virtually)
Brenda Sisco (in person)

Gregory Daniels, Executive Director, Ex-Officio Member (in person)
Samson Anderson, Research Analyst (virtually)
Aaron Felman, Staff Attorney (in person)
Aleshia Hall, Administrative Assistant (in person)
Carmen Hufcut, Trainer Specialist (in person)
Martiza Lopez, Accounts Examiner (in person)

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 10:06 am by Chair Palache
 - a. **Roll Call of Board Members**
2. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. Approval of the minutes from the October 11, 2024, SCSB Regular Meeting
A motion to approve the minutes as written was made by: Bertoline
The motion was seconded by: Brenda Sisco
The motion was unanimously approved. Luciano and Marpe abstained.
3. **Communications and Petitions**

- a. **Sec. 4e-36 Contested Solicitations and Awards Subcommittee Report** – Stuart L. Mahler
No action to report.

- b. **Privatization Contract Committee Report** – Chair Salvatore C. Luciano

- i. **Privatization Contract Request:** Department of Administrative Services (DAS) Crane Operations Inspector

Department of Administrative Services Director of Procurement Programs and Services Gene Burk reached out to request temporary contracting outside of state service while they continue to recruit for the position of Demotion and Crane Inspector. The Privatization Contract Committee met on November 1, 2024, to discuss the request. Contracting a core government function requires 2/3 vote of the board does not need to be considered. A cost/budget analysis was not required but would reflect a higher cost. The business case shows that the impact of an incident would be extensive. There is no negative impact on minority business. There will be an effort to contract within Connecticut and the U.S.A.

Motion was made by Salvatore Luciano: To authorize DAS, on a non-precedent setting basis for the term of one year from full Board ratification, to execute a supplemental contract limited to the ad hoc performance of the two (2) time sensitive function outlined in the subject DAS transmittal dated October 29, 2024, requiring the technical qualifications of a Demolition and Crane Operations Inspector until the current recruitment is completed and the vacant position filled.

The motion was seconded by: Keith Brothers

The motion was unanimously passed.

- c. **Audit/Data Analysis Work Group** – Chair Alfred W. Bertoline

- i. **Audit/Data Analysis Work Group Report** – Chair Alfred W. Bertoline
As shown in the monthly reports, our progress since July has been slow. Jon (referring to Chief Procurement Officer Jonathan Longman) was playing a key role in this process. He complimented Maritza (Lopez) on doing her best to keep things going and commended her for doing an excellent job, but she is doing this by herself. He explained this is a much larger job than can be accomplished by one person. We are dealing with very complex contracts and typically with the top level of each agency, the executives. To put this all on Maritza is unfair.

To recap the process, we chose 11 agencies to audit in 2024; four of those audits have not been completed. We are one quarter into this fiscal year and have selected 12 audits for this year that have not been started yet. The backlog is growing. We need to get Jonathan back, get someone with his level of talent and experience or do something different. In a meeting in September, we considered bringing other staff members into this process but that is not working well. He is discussing with Greg

about reaching out to Auditors of Public Accounts for assistance in filling the hole in our process. We need Jon back and this should be a high priority for us.

Mr. Mahler asked if it was possible for the individuals on the contracting board to assist. Mr. Bertoline explained that this is not a temporary or small assignment. It is a full-time assignment.

In response to Mr. Mahler's inquiry regarding the status of the DEEP audit, Accounts Examiner Lopez reported that DEEP has responded, the audit report has been completed, and it will be sent to AL Bertoline for finalization. She is working on more audits as well and has a meeting with Mr. Bertoline to seek his input before the next steps are taken.

Additionally, she has been working with Training Specialist Carmen Hufcut and they have created a new document that will be utilized when they reach out to other agencies to move the data collection process along quicker.

Mr. Luciano shares Mr. Bertoline's concern about the audit process. He said 14 people were trained because of the audit process and directed them to be trained. This is central to what we do, and we need to find a solution.

Ms. Gauthier asked how Board members could assist in this process. She said Board members were working on the audits before there were staff, so it would not be new work. Mr. Bertoline appreciates the opportunity, but the work they are doing now is much more involved than what was done before. In the past, we sent a checklist, the agencies completed and returned the checklist, and the Board just reviewed their answers. Now, we are going out there and selecting contracts and examining all the compliance that they had to follow, verifying, and documenting that it was done properly. It is a detailed full-time job that is not practical for Board Members to assist with. The most important thing Board members can do is to respond timely to completed audit reports.

Mr. Mahler did not realize the depth of the audits and that we were looking at actual contracts. He recognizes that they do not have the expertise to do this. Board members cannot be involved as this does not just involve calling someone who completed an audit report.

Mr. Ahneman asked if the process was being reevaluated because what we did in former years is not the same. The process should not be contingent on one man. We should revisit the process and try to get Board members involved. Maybe *water down* the process so it can be a balance between what we did years ago and what we are doing now. Mr. Bertoline explained that where we are now and why is a result of our experience with the past audit process. The current process is a growth from that. We are selecting contracts and going through the complete compliance checklist for every contract and determining if everything was done. If something was not done, we are identifying specific examples and transferring that information over to Carmen so that

she can use the information to tailor and focus develop training programs based upon what is happening in the field. We are going back to the agencies in 60 days and affirming that changes have been made to implement changes to ensure that these things do not happen again. This process is then summarized in an annual report that we want to send to the Legislature. The report will be shared with all agencies to educate them before their audit. Over the three-year cycle, we will audit all the agencies and then go back and start the process again. Over time, we will measure our progress year to year by the elimination of issues throughout the cycles. By the second and third cycles, we should see fully-compliance that will represent great savings to the State. Mr. Ahneman appreciates the current process but recognizes that it is stalled and wants to get the process to a place where we can actually do the work, and we cannot do it without Jon. Mr. Bertoline responded that he has been working with Greg and on continually improving upon this process over the past six months.

Ms. Gauthier noticed on the Staff Report that the Department of Insurance audit was ready for Board approval and asked if it was available for Board review. Mr. Bertoline shared that it will be sent before the next meeting for Board action.

Mr. Luciano offered, as a potential solution, under 4e-8 there is a Contracting Standards Advisory Council that is supposed to meet four times each year. They should have met six or seven times by now, he thinks they met once; there was a scheduled meeting for September that was cancelled. He thinks if people like Gene Burk are on that Council, they can assist us in terms of supplying the required information so we do not need to sort through everything, it would speed up the process. Suggestion number 2 is to have a list of every CPO in every agency, which should be 36 agencies, a maximum of 36 phone calls to the CPOs to ask them for help, as referenced in 4e-5. Under 4e-5b, it explains that participation in education training is required, so they do not have a choice. He thinks those two things should help predigest the information that is needed for the audits to be completed.

ii. **Budget Sub-Work Group Report** – Chair Brenda L. Sisco

Chair Palache shared that she and Ms. Sisco have been doing work on this and they are in good shape, but there is no report to share.

d. **Statutes, Regulations, Policies and Procedures Work Group** – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

i. **Statutes, Regulations, Policies and Procedures Work Group Report** – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

Chair Palache said there is not report for this group; however, she is still looking for a Chair for this work group. Mr. Luciano said that they have talked about this for many years and decided that, based upon the new Supreme Court rulings and the weakening of regulations, although he is unsure how they apply to the State. They apply to the Federal government. We talked about this many years ago and the staff were

supposed to ask other states what they are doing, so we don't recreate the wheel. We were supposed to evaluate if a regulation or a statute makes more sense. He offered to supply the 4e Statute if requested. By January 1st, the Board is supposed to make legislative recommendations. He does not know if the staff have done that, looked around for best practices. If they have, that will help generate a list and we can make an assessment if the regulation or statute makes more sense. Before he volunteers to be the Chair, he would like to know where we are with that, since that was supposed to be ongoing.

Executive Daniels responded that we were not sure that was a directive. In response to the reference to best practices, we have been working with the legislative office to get training on regulations, processes, and whether it is in our best interest to do statutes versus regulations is a matter of assessing the process as we always would. There is nothing is set in stone as to whether a regulation is the best route versus a procedure or a best practice. There is not a *golden rule* that states that one is better than another in any instance. In his opinion the Supreme Court decision would not be interpreted to mean that, nor does he think the justices would interpret it that way. It is just an opinion on a case based upon the facts and circumstances of that case. He appreciates how someone might read it that way as one opinion.

Ms. Sisco agreed that if it says regulations, there should be regulations. She does not recall them being asked to work on best practices but may have missed that. Some of what Mr. Luciano is talking about goes way, way back. We have not done it before, so we need to review what is out there and what is it that we want to move toward providing work on regulations. She does know that in the past, without having a full staff contingent, they did not do any of this. We need to be thoughtful about how we move forward and what do we want to do. Do we want to look at best practices? She suggested that if Mr. Luciano serve as Chair, he can look at what is outstanding and proceed in a manner that is best to get this done. We have an attorney on staff now that can help us move through that.

Mr. Luciano said he does not want to be the chair and thought work was being done on this. Some of this will be easy, 4e-32, disposal of records, the State already has things like which can be adopted. Others are more complicated. He retired for a reason.

Chair Palache returned to her request for a Chair for this very important work group. Once they have a chair, they need to meet to offline some of the discussions and make sure that the directives are clear, and the staff can do what they need to do.

Mr. Luciano stated if they could not move without a Chair, then he would be the Chair.

ii. **Personnel Review Sub-Work Group Report** – Chair James S. Marpe

Mr. Marpe explained that the sub-work group has met. He thanked Ms. Gauthier for her assistance. He apologized for sharing the draft of the evaluation instrument for the Executive Director with the Board just yesterday evening. It reflects the discussions of the past several months and the categories on which the Executive Director will be evaluated, and how they will go about the rating process. They have shortened the list of grades to *Exceeds Expectations*, *Consistently Meets Expectations*, *Partially Meets Expectations*, *Does Not Meet Expectations*, or *There Is No Basis For Evaluating*.

They have added the category of procurement skills to the evaluation criteria which he feels is the most important area of competence for our agency. That is not to mean that you have to be the greatest procurement officer but should certainly understand best practices.

Mr. Marpe believes they are at a point to take action in the evaluation process. He believes the Board members wish to provide input into the process. One step might be for each of us to fill out the form to the extent that they have input on any particular category or line item to have some evaluation. Mr. Marpe proposed that the Chair Palache be ultimately responsible for the synthesis of the initial evaluations and try to bring this together as a first pass. In the synthesis process, they could meet as a Board in executive session to finalize the document. The Board Chair would then administer the evaluation process. He welcomed input but shared that from his experience, having all 14 of them sitting around in a room would not be human resources best practice. Mr. Marpe stated that they have talked about this collectively and should resend the evaluation form which would be returned to the Chairperson who would synthesize them. The question is whether they would meet again as a Board in executive session to be sure that they are 90% in agreement. In the synthesis, there will always be an alternative point of view; however, at some point we need to move on with this. The other point is that this is the first pass at doing this and in all respects it is retrospective. The challenge being that Greg has not had the benefit of us setting those objectives six months or a year ago, so there is a bit of unfairness in that. On the other hand, it gives us a baseline to move forward from. Right now, there is no baseline and that is what he is trying to get to as well.

Ms. Sisco said she is not sure how they should handle that and feels that it is not fair for him to not have had this as a baseline. You are going to rate him when there is a lot of detail in here. She does not know how they are going to handle that.

Mr. Ahneman said the instrument is good, but they have to figure out the process. He suggested that the Personnel work group meet to figure out exactly what the process will be: how they use the tool, how they involve 14 Board members, and how they can do all of this in under two hours. This is not going to be easy, it is a dynamic process. They need to figure out how to handle questions Board members may have when discussing this review tool with the candidate. He thinks the instrument is ready, but that is just one part of this. They need to come up with a process by which they can do this systematically.

Ms. Sisco agreed that it is a good document and agreed with Mr. Ahneman's recommendation to establish a process. She has no problem sharing with the employee that these are the expectations moving forward. Yet, how do they come up with a process for evaluating now. There are things in statute that indicate what the Executive Director should be doing, but this is very detailed. She thinks it is a great document that sets forth expectations moving forward. They should figure out what the procedures are now while laying a foundation for moving forward in the future.

Ms. Karnes sought clarification as to if this was just a baseline and asked if the job description is a way of discussing expectations. She also agrees that they have to figure out the process because 14 people are obviously going to take more than two hours.

At the request of Chair Palache, Mr. Marpe reiterated that the form outlines what our expectations are of the Executive Director on a very granular level. It would be worthwhile collecting the Board members' individual points of view on how the Executive Director, in their view, is performing these steps as a baseline. The alternative is to provide this to Greg now and evaluate in six months or a year. The problem with that is that there is no feedback to say how they feel he is doing right now. He agrees with Ms. Sisco and others that feel it is not fair to evaluate on a set of criteria that he may not agree with or be familiar with. He also does not think there is anything in the instrument that he would be surprised about. Mr. Marpe shared that he has not solicited any input from Executive Director Daniels on this form. That is an interesting part of the process that they have not done. He is proposing that each Board member complete the form and return only to the Board Chair who will synthesize the outcome as he assumes there may be extremes in some of these categories that would be incumbent on the Chair to determine if it is an outlier view or if most agree. That would be the challenge for the Chair. They could then meet as a group and see how it all sorted out. Mr. Marpe addressed Executive Director Daniels as he reminded the Board to keep in mind that *we have no authority on your salary or whether you are here or not; let's get on with giving you the feedback that is important*. They are in a different position than most Boards because they are not here to hire, fire, they have no ability to increase salary, so the best they can do is to provide feedback on how they think he is doing, so that is what he is proposing.

Mr. Bertoline agrees with Mr. Marpe's approach and that they should move forward. He does not agree with the rating classifications of *consistently exceeds expectations* or *consistently meets expectations*. He thinks these categories are difficult to differentiate. Overall make a judgement on if they are operating effectively or exceeding expectations. He would have a problem differentiating between those ratings.

Ms. Sisco asked if State employees get the expectations upon hiring. Mr. Luciano said the evaluation should never come as a surprise. As a new employee you get a six-month evaluation and meet regularly with your supervisor during the probationary

period. If at the end of the evaluation period if you do not succeed, you are separated from State service, not fired. That would not apply to Executive Director Daniels. Then there are promotional and annual evaluations. It is important to remember that an evaluation is not a punishment. It is simply a tool to tell people what they are doing right, what they are not doing right, and how they can do better.

Ms. Morningstar said that is not pervasive throughout the State of Connecticut. That was probably in AFSCME's contracts. At the health center, you get a six-month review. You can be separated at six months, or you can be continued for up to one year. People in UHP or other unions, or higher ed at the health center, can be evaluated at any time. If you get two bad evaluations in a row, you or the union can make a case for more frequent reviews. If you get two bad evaluations, they can move to fire you. If you get a bad evaluation, you do not receive your salary increment for that year. They do not have weekly meetings, and it often comes as a surprise for many people because, in her opinion, management is not doing their job in giving people a heads up.

Executive Director Daniels said that nothing precludes managers from giving regular feedback at any time. Ms. Morningstar confirmed that this is the case. They can give feedback at any time, give you a letter of expectations, or put you on a performance improvement plan. They have all kinds of options. Mr. Daniels said that if you suspect that a leader or manager is not working up to par, if you think they could use some guidance or mentorship, that is something that you would think other leaders or governing bodies would pull someone to the side and work with them on. Ms. Morningstar absolutely agreed.

Mr. Ahneman suggested going back to work group to come up with a process. The tool is ready. He likes Mr. Marpe's suggestion that all 14 people fill it out and submit them to Chair Palache. He explained that 14 people will have 14 different opinions, and the process will go *completely off the rails* if they do not have a structured process to navigate this discussion. There should be time limits, and they will have to take questions. He referenced a recent experience of this being done remotely with systematic responses. They are in a good place. They have a tool, and they are motivated; however, this is the first time. Evaluations goes on an employee's permanent record, so it is not something to toy around with. They should get the opinions and discussions that they need to create an organized process.

In response to Chair Palache's inquiry to Mr. Marpe regarding next steps, he explained that the processes shared reflected one supervisor doing the evaluation. In our case we are dealing with 14 people with 14 differing opinions which is different than what they are used to observing in an evaluation process. He will plan to reconvene the committee to discuss the process. He maintains that the reality is that the Board Chair should be ultimately responsible to provide the feedback to Greg after checking in with the Board members, meaning that everyone completes the form and submits it. This can also be a less formal process because this becomes an FOIA public document. We need to be respectful that sometimes when someone does not

understand the background or the basis for something it can look different than what was intended. As a next step, he will reconvene a meeting of the work group.

Chair Palache confirmed that the work group consists of her, Mr. Marpe, Mr. Ahneman, and Ms. Gauthier. Chair Palache thanked them for leading the process and stated that she is happy to synthesize as they propose if that is what the group decides. She is happy to take the feedback and share it with their leaders. After the work group determines the process, they will proceed accordingly.

e. **Training Work Group Report** – Carmen Hufcut

Ms. Hufcut thanked all who participated in the first Training Work Group meeting on October 20, 2024. Ms. Hufcut shared that during that meeting, they reviewed the timeline and Training Plan. She shared the relationship we have developed with OPM, DAS, and Ethics. She shared that we are going to develop a program and timeline to increase training participation with other agencies to increase participation. With the help of the training group, we are coming up with new ideas to entice other agencies to participate in the trainings. She explained that the Accreditation process is on schedule, and she looks forward to more meetings in the future.

Chair Palache thanked all those who attended that meeting and shared that it was a very productive meeting.

Mr. Luciano repeated that under 4e-5 we should have a list of every procurement officer in the State of Connecticut, which is up to 36 people. Under 4e-5b, their participation, education, and training is required, so he thinks a phone call would be helpful. Schedule training with them and then tell them that everyone else in their department that purchases can schedule training through you (referring to Training Specialist Hufcut). He thinks it is as easy as that. Ms. Hufcut responded that she has done that already. She has reached out to people, she has sent emails. It sounds easy, but she has been reaching out from February through present and can show those emails. She has enticed a lot of people through those emails, and this is all she has gotten. Mr. Luciano said that she should let us help; the chief-of-staff or governor's office would be willing to help since this is required. We should not have to beg people to do this when the statute is clear, so please let us help you. Ms. Hufcut thanked him.

f. **Staff Report**

i. **Administrative and Operations** – Gregory F. Daniels, Executive Director

Executive Director Daniels referenced the challenges we are having in the absence of our CPO. The staff are focusing on figuring ways to keep business moving while thinking of creative ways to work smarter and keep things moving forward. We are endeavoring to assist Accounts Examiner Lopez with audits, while at the same time not allowing other areas of business to fall behind. We are managing and have brainstormed ideas with Mr. Bertoline and Training Specialist Hufcut. We are

keeping the train moving while still building the train. Staff are building the infrastructure of this agency while at the same time keeping it moving. We been here almost two years but have not had a staff for all that time. We lost several staff members and Chairs over the last two years. There has been a lot that has impacted us as an agency. That is not an excuse, it is a fact. We are doing the best we can with the resources we have. We are being creative with our efforts. We have a meeting with scheduled with APA next week to see if there is assistance available from them. We have other meetings and things that we are working on to fill the gaps that he did not want to discuss prematurely. It will take a lot of effort on our part of all the staff to work beyond the scope of what they are currently doing and work collaboratively as a team. He explained that Maritza Lopez is an Accounts Examiner who has often assisted with developing training. Likewise, training supports the audit processes. We have creatively thought about how to incorporate more compelling language into our audit notices and educating the agencies about our training opportunities. We continue to refine notices and try not to be distracted by the noise we are facing. There are a lot of distractions and technology that does not work. It causes disruptions and takes away from our ability to keep moving forward. We are working hard on our part to keep the agency moving and will continue to do so. It is our duty, and he salutes the staff for maintaining morale in a situation where we have lost a central component, our CPO. The staff are willing to chip in and fill the gaps. Our staff are showing up and doing their part. We meet every morning for our daily huddle to be sure we all have our directives and collaborate multiple times throughout the day to get things done. By the end of the day, we are exhausted, but we are getting the work done.

Mr. Bertoline asked when we can anticipate that Jon (referring to CPO Longman) will be back and this whole process will be done. Executive Director Daniels does not have an answer for that but hopes it is soon. He is sorely missed, we need him back, and the role of CPO is critical.

ii. **Legal Update** – Aaron I. Felman, Staff Attorney

Attorney Felman provided an update regarding coordinating with the Attorney Generals' Office establishing a framework to handle significant legal considerations that need to be considered in developing processes in the event that allegations of fraud, waste, abuse, or corruption are identified. If documents are received by the Board or staff members that allege concerns, waste, corruption, we do not want to disrupt any other processes that exist within the Attorney Generals' office, FOIA, APA. This item is ongoing, so it was not included in the staff report, but he wanted to share his efforts with the Board and will share a path forward after it has been developed.

Mr. Luciano stated that 4e-31 refers Notice of suspected collusion or other anti-competitive processes and asked if that was what Attorney Felman was referring to. Attorney Felman confirmed that it is and further clarified that anti-competitive practices are specifically identified in the statute, so that area is completely under the

umbrella of what he is looking into. Additionally, whether it is anti-competitive, corruption, fraud, waste of State funds, abuse of power, once those things are explored, thoroughly, he will have more to share. This will be an ongoing research project.

Mr. Luciano stated that the *drop-dead date* for us to present proposed legislative changes and wants to look at 4e-34 disqualification of contractors, bidders or proposers. The language needs to be fixed. As it reads now, someone who is seen to have issues of corruption or other anti-competitive things can change their name and still be allowed to do business in Connecticut. This is something that we need to fix. He hopes he is looking at as well. The clock is ticking on legislation. There are two other things that he wants to look at as proposed legislation with a July 1st deadline. One is Higher Education and suggestions how they can procure correctly. The other, which has never been done before, is looking at protecting the money we give to cities and towns and making suggestions for their procurement.

Attorney Felman shared that, 4e-34 regarding changing names, is outside the purview of what he is looking into. He is focused on the State side that are covered in some of the other areas of the statute as well as under the Attorney Generals' 2-90 statute, whistleblower, 61. That may or may not be part, but it is on the peripheral. Moving forward, this is a coordinated effort that has been initiated and will be ongoing.

Mr. Mahler referenced the changing of the name and asked Ms. Gauthier to explain the situation that they ran into with that problem in Groton. Ms. Gauthier stated that she did not feel the need to discuss it at this time. It was a legislative proposal that they put in last session. If they cannot figure it out via regulation, then she would recommend putting it in via legislation again. Sal (referring to Mr. Luciano) explained the concern without getting into the specifics of that case.

Attorney Felman clarified that this is fact finding regarding how he can help the Board in the future when we address internal processes and how they will handle information that alleges wrongful conduct. Regarding legislation, that has just been brought up and is not necessarily a part of what he is looking into but is an important part of the Board's mission. This project is in the infancy, fact-finding phase.

Mr. Brothers mentioned his reference a of couple months ago, about legislative issues and most agencies having a legislative liaison. We need to figure this out. Referencing Mr. Luciano's point, these things are important. If we are doing to do something legislatively, it needs to be done the right way. The July 1st deadline is approaching, and we need someone for that who deals with that for this group. There are plenty of people here who understand the legislative process, but this is above and beyond what we can do. He wanted to make that point again.

Chair Palache summarized the discussion that we need to determine a process for our legislative priorities and our plan going forward. Are there things that can be done via

regulation versus legislation, and how we move forward on that, and we need to move on it because we are behind.

Executive Director Daniels asked that if members have any specific legislative initiatives that they need to move on right now, please contact him as soon as possible. The staff have been meeting internally regarding our legislative initiatives. Mr. Luciano stated that they already had 13 points that they had suggested for presented to the legislature. He wanted it to be clear, in the statute, it says that the Board makes the recommendations, not the Executive Director. So, if there are things that Greg (referring to Executive Director Daniels) or the staff wish to see in the legislation, it needs to come to the Board. They cannot ask for seven additional staff members without us (referring to the Board) even knowing about it. He asked if Director Daniels would hand out those 13 points with the Board, especially for the new people who have never seen them because they may wish to add or subtract from them.

Chair Palache said that there are 13 legislative priorities that have been proposed before. She asked that Executive Director Daniels make those available for the next meeting, so they can figure out if that is what they are doing.

Mr. Luciano said that Greg (referring to Executive Director Daniels) seemed confused. Chair Palache recommended that they move on. Mr. Luciano asked Director Daniels if he understood what he was asking about. Executive Director Daniels responded that he understood but did not agree.

4. Old Business

a. Consideration/Action on the draft Proposed Personnel Evaluation Instrumentation for the Executive Director and Chief Procurement Officer positions – Chair James S. Marpe

This item was discussed under the work group report.

b. Committee and Work Group Assignments – Chair Rochelle N. Palache

Mr. Mahler said he has been reviewing the 4e-36 guidelines that are posted on our website; the policies and procedures are very confusing. He shared with Director Daniels prior to the meeting that those who were here from the very beginning, Sal Luciano and himself, knew that legislation did not necessarily address everything in 4e-36. The Chief Procurement Officer and Executive Director were working on those guidelines that have somehow mysteriously appeared on our website. He looked over the guidelines and sees that they need to be revised. There was additional wording added in. He has submitted a draft that he can send out to everybody to take a look at. He has policies and procedures that would replace what is currently on the website. He is sure they will be reviewed and approved by the Board. There have been questions and very fruitful discussions back and forth, but it was too late to put them on today's meeting. He will be speaking on this in

December. There were good discussions between him and the staff. Since we never know when a contested case will be received, they do arise and there is a lot of time constraint with those.

Chair Palache reiterated that it will be discussed at the December meeting.

5. New Business

Mr. Ilg requested a point of personal privilege. He shared that 2025 will be his 20th year on this board and wanted to review the mission of the Board.

- It all started in 2004 with the ascension of Lt. Governor Rell to succeed Governor Rowland who spend time in prison for, among other things, corrupt contracting. Governor Rell, immediately upon taking office, established a reputation for clean contracting, clean elections, and stronger state ethics.
- When she ran in 2008 when she ran on her own, she got 66% of the vote. People really appreciated what she did, and I certainly did.
- She started working on laws to implement modern bidding and purchasing procedures because there weren't any. That law was passed by the General Assembly in the State Government in 2007 and included the creation of a 14-member Board of citizens appointed by the Governor and the legislature, the State Contracting Standards Board, which has been a vehicle to oversee and improve state contracting rules and standards up to this date. By creation and intent, the Board is the watchdog on behavior and on behalf of the Governor and legislature. That is important to know. We are the watchdog on the purchase of goods and services required to provide public service which is about \$12 billion per year.
- On May 17, 2024, the Hartford Courant front page article was about a state official who was arrested for a 22-count federal indictment on charges arising out of the state's school construction financing program. We want to raise the question of *what authority should our Board have?* I think we should move forward on this problem. Over the 20 years, problems have occurred, and we have done a good job. Now we have got another one.
- We have got to do that. We should raise the question *should we get projects that are state funded in which there is an allegation* that would allow us to look at what is going on where there is a state interest or a grant going into municipalities. We don't now and that is something that we need to think about. We certainly are in a difficult position with what has happened recently. We are barred from doing that now, and we may have been able to prevent this, had we had that kind of power.
- We can look ahead and realize that we are talking about \$12 billion of products and services passing that are passing through the \$26 billion budget every two years. It is our responsibility to be sure that we get it right.

Chair Palache thanked him for his input.

Mr. Luciano referenced that the July 1 deadline and the three things they needed to do:

1. What we need to do to carry out our mission.
2. Advice to Higher Education
3. Dealing with money that they give to municipalities, so it is one of the things that we are supposed to look at.

b. Consideration/Action on the DAS' request to execute a supplemental contract for limited services related to crane operations – Chair Salvatore C. Luciano

This item was discussed under the work group report.

6. Opportunity for Citizens to Address the SCSB

There were no requests from the public to address the Board.

7. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 a.m. was made by: Salvatore Luciano
The motion was seconded by: Brenda Sisco
The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Aleshia Hall
Administrative Assistant