



**Statutes, Regulations, Policies & Procedures Work Group  
Notice & Agenda**

Tuesday, January 6, 2025 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.  
Location: *Virtual Only*

**In Attendance:**

Thomas Ahneman, Chair of the SRPP Work Group  
Rochelle Palache, Chair of the State Contracting Standards Board  
Lauren Gauthier  
Roberto Fernandez  
Salvatore Luciano  
James Marpe  
Brenda Sisco

Greg Daniels, Executive Director  
Samson Anderson, Research Analyst  
Aaron Felman, Staff Attorney  
Aleshia Hall, Administrative Assistant

**MINUTES**

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Ahneman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.
  - A. Roll Call of Work Group Members confirmed the attendance as noted above.
2. **Approval of Minutes**
  - A. December 9, 2025, meeting  
A motion to approve the minutes from the December 9, 2025 meeting as written was made by: Salvatore Luciano  
The motion was seconded by: James Marpe  
The motion passed unanimously with abstentions from Roberto Fernandez
3. **Review of Action Items from December 9, 2025 meeting:**
  - A. **Staff Action Items**
    - In advance of the Board meeting on December 12, 2025, **Executive Director Daniels** will update the Legislative Proposals 1 and 2 and disseminate them to the Board members.  
Chair Ahneman confirmed that this was completed as assigned.
    - On December 29, 2025, **Attorney Felman** will distribute the revised Rules of Practice to the Work Group.
      - Chair Ahneman confirmed that this was completed as assigned.

- **Executive Director Daniels and Staff Attorney Felman** will prepare 2026 Legislative Agenda for discussion at the next Work Group meeting with the intention of presenting it to the Board at the January 9, 2026, regular Board meeting.
  - Chair Ahneman confirmed that this was completed as assigned.

#### B. Board Member Action Items

- After receiving revised Rules of Practice from Staff Attorney Felman on December 29, 2025, the Work Group Members are to review in advance of the January 6, 2026, Work Group meeting.
- After receiving the Legislative Agenda from Executive Director Daniels, the Work Group Members are to review in advance of the January 6, 2026, Work Group meeting.

Chair Ahneman is hopeful that the Work Group members completed this assignment.

#### 4. Discussion:

##### A. Final Review of Rules of Practice before elevating to the Board for approval

Discussion:

- **Sec 1-4e 7. Hearing officers**  
At Ms. Gauthier's request, Staff Attorney Felman explained the clarifying statutory language that was provided for context.

##### **Sec 1-4e 7 (2)**

Attorney Felman provided clarifying context that C.G.S. § 4e-176e forbids the investigator in a contested case to also be a hearing officer. Ms. Gauthier recommended that this language be included. Attorney Felman asserted that the language can be inferred. After a brief discussion, Chair Ahneman does not believe it is necessary to provide this area extra attention; therefore, no edits to this section are required.

- **Sec 1-4e-40**  
Ms. Gauthier noted one slight formatting edit.

Having no further recommendations, Ms. Gauthier thanked Attorney Felman for his work on this document.

- **Sec 1-4e-44 General Rule**  
Mr. Luciano shared the possibility that a vendor could potentially request a declaratory ruling from SCSB to document that they had exhausted their administrative remedies prior to pursuing a case in court.

- **Sec. 1-4e-19 Date and mode of filing**

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of installing a dropbox that would be available to the public for filing purposes. Mr. Fernandez explained that other commissions have a drop box available that displays a phone number. When an individual deposits into the box, they are instructed to call the phone number provided to notify the agency of the delivery. Staff Attorney Felman responded to Chair Ahneman's inquiries regarding the physical location of our office area within a secure building. Mr. Luciano asked if the option for USPS mail could be included in the Rules of Practice. Attorney Felman responded that the option could be included.

After a lengthy discussion, it was decided that the section will be amended to reflect the option for USPS mail delivery and the date it the submission is received by the Board will be the date that is used to initiate the claim. Attorney Felman will amend the language accordingly.

Having no more edit recommendations to the Rules of Practice from the Work Group, Mr. Luciano requested that Attorney Felman send the revised document to the Work Group within the next couple of days for their final review. Attorney Felman committed to sending the completed edits to the SRPP WG by close of business January 7, 2026.

## **B. Final Review of Legislative Proposals before elevating to the Board for approval**

### **a. Proposal 1: C.G.S. § 4e-34**

- (g) (1) (2) (3) Evasion of Disqualification Prohibited.

Chair Ahneman sought clarification on the use of the word 'convicted' in this section. It was clarified that the conviction would have been rendered by a separate authority.

Ms. Gauthier expressed concerns about SCSB acting on these cases before a conviction is rendered vs. waiting for the long court process.

Chair Ahneman clarified that we are talking about evasion of disqualification, not disqualifying any vendors. He further stated that he believes that referring to *assets and workforce* is going too far. Businesses are permitted to change their management structures and may be trying to get their business operational again after a disqualification without negatively impacting their workforce.

- (g) (3)

Chair Ahneman is concerned that the present language may leave us open to legal action. There was a discussion that included:

- The reach of our statutory authority and these matters may better be suited to the Attorney General.
- Screening is to be completed at the agency level and then referred to us as necessary.
- We should limit our scope to just clear evasion.
- We should seek to prove malintent and purposeful evasion.
- It is important that the language expand the purview to jurisdictions outside of Connecticut.

After a discussion, the Work Group chose to remove the language “*would constitute grounds for disqualification.*”

Chair Ahneman does not believe that we have the bandwidth to take on this responsibility.

Mr. Luciano believes that 4e-34 is clear and recommended mirroring the existing language. He explained that the legislation is required to ensure that a simple name change cannot allow a vendor to evade the process. Until we get the name change language in place, 4e-34 can easily be circumvented. Ms. Gauthier affirmed that it is a loophole in the legislation that needs to be closed.

Chair Ahneman believes that sections (1) and (2) cover the necessary language and recommended removing (3).

Mr. Fernandez inquired if the State of Connecticut maintains a listing of prohibited vendors. Executive Director Daniels confirmed that it currently does not. He reiterated his report from the previous Board meetings in which he shared that our agency is participating in an interagency effort to create an Excluded Parties Listing that would prevent the disqualified vendor from being paid. Mr. Luciano further pointed to the minutes from the December 2025 regular Board Meeting during which he explained the importance of creating this list. Mr. Luciano stressed that at the present time, there is nothing preventing a vendor from doing business with the State if they change their name. That is the primary purpose of this proposed change.

In response to Chair Ahneman’s recommendation to remove section (3), Ms. Gauthier believes that this will remove the strength of this proposed

legislation. Chair Ahneman asked about the proceedings and mechanisms required for this process and expressed concerns that a contractor wishing to submit a bid to the State will not have time to go through that process and still submit a timely bid. Ms. Gauthier explained that this language is to be included within the existing 4e-34 language and is not intended to be separate legislation.

Attorney Felman explained that the Board could convene to review documents, but it does not necessarily mean that we have initiated a 4e-34 process. If the Board received a referral, it could undergo a review before formally initiating a 4e-34 process. This would need to be clarified in our standard processes.

Chair Ahneman understands that the wording of this section is complicated and we need to ensure that there are ways for contractors to move away from bad actors and still maintain their business. Mr. Luciano referenced several companies involved in current legislation regarding *the Diamatis case* have admitted to wrongdoing. He believes that if any of those contractors attempt to change their names for the purpose of continuing to do business with the State, we will have a current reference for this legislation.

At the conclusion of the Work Group discussion on (2), Executive Director Daniels was instructed to remove the words *assets and workforce* and prepare Legislative Proposal 1 for elevation to the Board for approval at the regular Board meeting on January 9, 2025.

**b. Proposal 2: C.G.S. § 4e-21**

Discussion:

- Mr. Marpe introduced the question of how this proposal applies in an emergency contract situation. He referred to a traffic accident last year that closed I-95 and required emergency repairs in excess of \$25 million to replace a highway overpass. Mr. Luciano explained that the State has flexibility in an actual emergency. It is our responsibility to review to determine if the event was truly an emergency or if it was just framed as one.
- Executive Director Daniels explained this sectional also addresses inflationary cost issues that may arise.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Chair Ahneman recommended elevating Proposal 2 to the Board for approval as written.

### c. Prior Legislative Proposals

A coordinated strategy to advance our legislative priorities included the following discussion:

- Ms. Gauthier recommended expanding the language to include Protection of classes.
- Chair Ahneman recommended focusing the list on the top legislative concerns. Chair Palache concurred over the chat function on Teams.
- Mr. Luciano requested that Executive Director Daniels refrain from requesting additional staff to which Executive Director Daniels confirmed that that is not on the agenda.
- Research Analyst Anderson explained that our budgetary proposals mirror other State watchdog agencies' statutory language and explained the basis for requesting a minimum of five full-time staff members. Chair Ahneman confirmed that we are not looking for more staff members.
- Ms. Sisco recommended that we have a full Board discussion regarding slimming these legislative proposals. Our experience has shown that we have historically gotten our legislation through GAE, but ultimately the bill does not pass. She believes that focusing on our most important issues may be more effectual.
- In response to Mr. Marpe, Ms. Sisco agreed that lobbying legislators, particularly those on the GAE Committee, will be helpful going forward. GAE Chairs Blumenthal and Flexor have both been very supportive in the past.

**6. Old Business: Nothing to discuss.**

**7. New Business: Nothing to discuss.**

### 8. Action Items

#### A. Staff Action Items

- 1) Attorney Felman will send the final clean copy of the Rules of Practice will be sent to the SRPP WG by close of business tomorrow, January 7, 2026.
- 2) Executive Director Daniels will:
  - Legislative Proposal 1 will be edited to remove the words *assets* and *workforce*. Proposal 1 will be prepared for presentation to the Board at the regular meeting on January 9, 2026.
  - Legislative Proposal 2 will be prepared for presentation at the regular Board meeting on January 9, 2026.

- Legislative Proposals to be advanced to the Board will be limited to five proposals, using three prior legislative proposals to complete the list. Legislative Proposals are to be prepared for presentation at the regular Board meeting on January 9, 2026.

**9. Next Meeting:**

Based upon the availability of SRPP Work Group members, the next meeting will be scheduled to take place virtually on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

**10. Adjournment:** At the request of Chair Ahneman,

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:35 a.m. was made by: Salvatore Luciano

The motion was seconded by: Lauren Gauthier

The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Aleshia M. Hall  
Administrative Assistant

DRAFT