Government, Administrations and Election Committee
Testimony – March 9, 2012

Support for SB 5361, AA Prohibiting the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority from Retaining a Municipal Liaison

Good morning Chairman Slossberg, Chairman Morin and members of the Government, Administration and Election Committee. My name is Brian Anderson. I am the lobbyist for Council 4 AFSCME, a union of 35,000 public and private employee members.

I am here to testify in favor of **H.B. 5361, An Act Prohibiting the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority from Retaining a Municipal Liaison.**

After the Enron debacle, in which CRRA lost almost a quarter billion dollars of ratepayer money, the General Assembly passed a law to prohibit CRRA from hiring a contract lobbyist. This was passed because it was believed that having a contract lobbyist, something else no other state agency has ever used, made CRRA look unethical and because the lobbyist was involved in scandalous activity. After this, CRRA created a government relations liaison position on staff, similar to other state agencies. And in the end, though CRRA claims that it is a "quasi-public agency," its enabling legislation clearly shows that it is an entity of state government.

A few years later, CRRA President Tom Kirk, created a "municipal liaison" contract. The "municipal liaison" appears to be an attempt to skirt the contract lobbyist ban law. This appearance is so strong that West Hartford mayor and member of CRRA's board, Scott Slifka, brought it to the attention of the board as a matter of concern. CRRA's minutes report Mayor Slifka as saying that inspite of an Office of State Ethics ruling that the arrangement does not violate state law that "he is still uncomfortable with the idea of hiring anyone based on the statutes" – meaning the lobbying ban statute. Certainly, there is a poor appearance created by hiring a law firm that is also well-known for being a powerful lobbying firm. Though the law firm appendage and the lobbying appendage are supposed to be separate, our members believe that it is not possible for this separation to be guaranteed.

Since CRRA has a large staff it would seem that the "municipal liaison" is a waste of

-MORE-

ratepayer money. Might not the CRRA staff legislative liaison be able to perform this function, and at less cost? And since CRRA is supposed to provide towns with a service, has it not been set up to liaison with towns as an overall staff function? CRRA has privatized out the ownership or management of three of its four facilities, yet it still maintains an over 50 members staff. This is very close to the size of the staff when it was actually managing the facilities that it privatized out

Creating this "municipal liaison" position for a contract firm, seems to follow a string of CRRA behavior that is questionable. We have submitted documents chronicling CRRA's poor management and reporting. CRRA has also made statements to the General Assembly that have been proven to be patently untrue. President Kirk wrote to the General Assembly that "No one will lose a job..." as a result of his privatization of the Mid-Connecticut Project's operation. Our union explained to Mr. Kirk how it would and Mr. Kirk did not argue with our explanation, knowing full well that layoffs would result. But this did not stop him from giving incorrect information to the legislature. We have submitted a copy of this letter. CRRA staff also told legislators that workers at the Mid-CT Project would be paid the same and receive comparable benefits as the MDC workers had. The pay and benefits are lesser.

Mr. Kirk testified explicitly that he opposed privatization at the Mid-Connecticut Project at a Legislative and Program Review Committee hearing in September, 2008. He said repeatedly at the hearing that he opposes the privatization of this facility, including saying "With private control, a supply-constrained market will allow Connecticut capacity to be used for other states' waste, leaving Connecticut consumers dependent upon and paying more to ship their waste to environmentally less desirable landfills hundreds of miles to the west."

In a case of taking an action directly opposite to what he told the legislature, Mr. Kirk signed a contract to privatize the operation and management of the Mid-Connecticut Project to NAES a Japanese corporation's subsidiary. NAES has never run a Refuse Derived Fuel plant, such as the Mid-CT Project, before. The only trash to energy plant that it has ever run was in Oklahoma. It stopped operating the plant in less than two years time, after which the operation was given over to Covanta corporation. Two year ago the CRRA let two of the four resource recovery facilities, that it was supposed to control, slip into private ownership. The CRRA recently announced that it will transfer ownership of the Lisbon waste to energy plant to the Covanta corporation in 2015. Now, due to CRRA's action or inaction, two private corporations with troubled histories run most of Connecticut's resources recovery infrastructure.

After having repeatedly asked, including before committees of the General Assembly for Mr. Kirk to publicly report on what is annual pay, perks and benefits are, we still have not received a discernible answer. CRRA appears to operate, as a government agency, in secret. I would be happy to answer any questions.

CRRA meeting, 12/22/2011, Minutes

RESOLUTION REGARDING EXTENSION OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT LIAISON SERVICES AGREEMENT

Director Damer requested a motion on the above referenced item. The motion was made by Director Stein and seconded by Director Martland.

> **RESOLVED:** That the President is hereby authorized to exercise the Authority's option to extend an agreement for municipal government liaison services with Brown Rudnick, LLP for the period from January 2, 2012, through October 31, 2012, substantially as presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Damer said this resolution concerns non-lobbying activities, however there has been much discussion by the Board about what lobbying and non-lobbying are and what CRRA is constrained from doing. He said CRRA is allowed to do lobbying. Director Damer said this Board can and should lobby administratively and legislatively for things which CRRA collectively and individually feels is important. He said CRRA can hire people to lobby both in and outside of the organization. Director Damer said CRRA is constrained from hiring an outside contract lobbyist to lobby on its behalf. He said some of the confusion has come from that prohibition. Director Damer said the question of what a government liaison representative does has also been broached; he noted that Mr. Ritter is present to answer any of the Board's questions.

Director Stein said this is the only contract CRRA has which involves a retainer rather than a cash oriented hourly rate as compared to the other public relations services CRRA uses. Director Damer said the question of whether CRRA could hire a person who is a known lobbyist or works for a lobbying firm, or does lobbying for that firm for the municipal government liaison services agreement has also been broached. He said CRRA had received confirmation from the State Ethics Office stating that is perfectly acceptable to do, as long as that line is not crossed.

Mr. Kirk said presently CRRA is in the third year of a three year contract with Mr. Ritter. He said based on the concerns of the Board management has not exercised the third year extension. Mr. Kirk said management is recommending renewing the third year of the contract. He said management bid this contract out again, in error, with another year left on the agreement. Mr. Kirk said that RFP was thrown out after the results were in. He said if the Board was so inclined another RFP will go out in the future if management recommends continuing with these services.

Mr. Kirk said this contract is unusual in the regard that it is a retainer arrangement and most of CRRA's consultants work on an hourly basis and are in a stable. He said management is able to utilize the consultant's services whenever needed.

Mr. Kirk said the position is important, especially over the next few years as CRRA transitions to a new business model in terms of keeping the member towns as customers, as opposed to project members. Mr. Kirk said Mr. Ritter has worked for CRRA for six years and his presence was particularly valuable in recent years. He said the most prevalent issues included the Hartford Landfill negotiations and closure as well as issues regarding the Environmental Justice Hartford region. He said most of CRRA's problems from a municipal standpoint tended to be in the central Hartford area, in addition to issues in the Bridgeport region and the satellite regions, where Mr. Ritter has assisted as well.

Director Stein asked management to describe Mr. Ritter's duties in the coming year, and how they relate to the stable of public relations firms, and Mr. Nonnenmacher's responsibilities. Mr. Nonnenmacher said CRRA is entering a new business model. He said until now CRRA had long term contracts with the municipalities, some of which had gone on for as long as 27 years. He said CRRA is now offering towns a menu of options which includes contracts for as little as three years. Mr. Nonnenmacher said Mr. Ritter was heavily involved in developing the options offered to the member towns as well as in the outreach to those same communities. Mr. Nonnenmacher said Mr. Ritter has been instrumental in reminding local officials of impending deadlines. He said Mr. Ritter has been great counsel in the past and will continue to do so as CRRA looks to site future facilities.

Mr. Nonnenmacher said in recognition of the State Solid Waste Management plan CRRA has plans for future projects such as compost facilities. He said it is CRRA's job to provide such a facility and to work on removing organics from the waste stream in order to achieve the plan's aggressive recycling goals. Mr. Nonnenmacher said Mr. Ritter was instrumental in repairing CRRA managements' relationship with its host community, Hartford, after the Enron debacle. He said Mr. Ritter was instrumental in arranging meetings with Hartford representatives and providing a natural background which in turn made CRRA's closure of the Hartford Landfill go smoothly. He said CRRA is still working on ongoing projects, and management would prefer would prefer to utilize Mr. Ritter in negotiating the host community benefits with the City of Hartford.

Mr. Ritter said he has been associated with CRRA in some fashion for the last twenty years. He said in terms of ethics there is nothing more important to him than ensuring his personal integrity is above reproach. Mr. Ritter said the question of whether he is a lobbyist and serves in a non-lobbying role has been clarified by the Ethics Committee.

Mr. Ritter said he has served CRRA in governance issues. He said he negotiated the original agreement with One Chane and later was heavily involved in strategy when CRRA and One Chane were involved in litigation. Mr. Ritter said he was able to change the courtroom venue and serve as a good witness given his institutional knowledge. He said he also spent a substantial amount of time on further strategy without billing or charging a retainer as he felt his contract with CRRA prevented him from adding on additional billable hours.

Mr. Ritter said he dealt with the allegations by Senator McKinney's office concerning the validity of certain CRRA Board of Director's appointments. He said calling the Attorney General's office is a typical issue he would deal with, in addition to his work addressing the permit issues on Murphy Rd. Mr. Ritter said he does not lobby but he does provide advice and input and looks forward to working on the host benefit negotiations in the future.

Mr. Ritter said it is inefficient for people in this profession to be paid hourly because his work can often benefit more than just CRRA and may involve another client as well. He said with his experience it may take him five minutes to accomplish a task another person may take almost a month to accomplish.

Mr. Kirk said looking forward management will have the opportunity to return to more of its original goals after Mid-Conn moves into the direction that many of the other projects have gone. He said Mr. Nonnenmacher, who has been heavily involved in MSA outreach to the towns, will be able to

focus back on the public sector issues such as citizens, recycling education improvements, development of composting facilities, and other non-municipal issues. Mr. Kirk said that shift will leave an opening in municipal outreach which will be filled by Mr. Perras and by CRRA's consultants.

Director Damer said there are going to be some critical issues in the coming year which CRRA will not be able to anticipate. He said a quick reaction to those issues is where Mr. Ritter's value lies. He said Mr. Ritter has the highest level of credibility and has great contacts with some of CRRA's most important communities. Director Damer said in the years he has been on the Board he feels CRRA has gotten its value out of the municipal liaison contract. Director Martland agreed. He said there are often issues which emerge at the last possible moment as in the Franklin Landfill opposition. Director Martland said similar actions were taken by MDC.

Director Slifka asked if this vote is symbolic as there is no requirement that management needs a certain number of votes in order to take action. Ms. Hunt said that management has not traditionally taken contract extensions to the Board. She said this was brought forward because several Board members posed questions and concerns. Mr. Kirk said management does not require eight affirmative votes to take action. He said a majority of votes would be sufficient to provide management with the direction needed.

Director Slifka said he agrees with the comments concerning Mr. Ritter. He said he does not feel that this resolution is unethical, and that he respects the decision of the Ethics Commission, and appreciates the lengthy discussion which was held on this subject matter. Director Slifka said in spite of this, he is still uncomfortable with the idea of hiring anyone based on the statutes. He said as a municipal official he felt the legislative solution to the Enron issues was a clear dividing line between CRRA and lobbyists. Director Slifka said despite the good intent he is still troubled by the fact that he does not think CRRA is living within the spirit of what the law intends. He said it is symbolic that CRRA is making an affirmative decision to not adhere to the spirit of this law.

Director Martland said that he has been on this Board for ten years. He said one of the problems CRRA has faced in the past when dealing with the legislature is although as a Board member he can approach a particular issue on his own behalf, there are times when he does not have the background needed. Director Martland said it is very important when pursuing something in the best interest of CRRA to have the background that Mr. Ritter has, especially with the legislature and the municipal towns.

Director Painter said he believed much of the concern over this issue arose when there was some confusion on what specifically was meant by "lobbying". He said he was satisfied after the Ethics Commission noted "in no way does the contractor attempt, nor does management ask the contractor to attempt to solicit municipal officials to lobby the general assembly or executive branch on CRRA's behalf". He explained it is essential that CRRA has a person on board, like Mr. Ritter, to talk to the communities. Director Painter said CRRA needs someone active and alert who can react quickly and advise CRRA on how to better respond to its communities.

Director Kelly said CRRA needs to gather its resources to be more effective and to that note she is very pleased that Mr. Perras is on board towards CRRA's goal of being more effective in the future. She said she is in favor of continuing this relationship with Mr. Ritter because it is a good value.

Director Kelly recommended in the future that management figure out what this position can offer within the constraints of the law, as a good value to CRRA and how it can be managed in order to build up internal resources.

Director Damer said this vote is advisory in nature and non-binding. Ms. Hunt said the contact has already been executed.

The motion previously made and seconded was approved by roll call. Director Auletta, Director Bingham, Director Damer, Director Griswold, and Director Martland voted yes. Director Kelly abstained. Director Slifka and Director Stein voted no.

Directors	Aye	Nay	Abstain
Louis J. Auletta	X		
Ryan Bingham	X		
David Damer	X		
Timothy Griswold	X		
Dot Kelly			X
Ted Martland	X		
Donald Stein		X	
Scott Slifka		X	
Ad-Hocs			
Steve Edwards, Bridgeport			
Mark Tillinger, Bridgeport			
Bob Painter, Mid-Ct			
Steve Wawruck, Mid-Ct			

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PURCHASE OF TWO SECONDARY SHREDDER 1250 HP MOTORS FOR THE MID-CONNECTICUT WASTE PROCESSING FACILITY

Director Damer requested a motion on the above referenced item. The motion was made by Director Martland and seconded by Director Stein.

> **RESOLVED:** That the President is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with Associated Electro-Mechanics Inc. to purchase two new 1250 horsepower secondary shredder motors to be located at the Mid-Connecticut Waste Processing Facility, substantially as presented and discussed at this meeting.

Director Damer said this resolution was discussed at length at the Policies & Procurement Committee meeting. He said last year the Board voted to buy new shredder motors which are crucial in the process stream. Director Damer said management was having terrible availability and failures at a high rate, due mostly to the motors' size. He said efforts to convert the 1,000 horsepower (hereinafter referred to as "hp") motor to the 1250 hp motor on the same frame caused technical problems and further failures.

Submitted to GAE Committee by Council 4 AFSCME. 3/9/12

nd southern Connecticut. As you can read in a comprehensive memo to the CRRA board posted on our e (at http://bit.ly/eQo7F2), this process was meticulously thorough and fair. The new contract, recently ated and now in effect, when coupled with replacement of additional expiring agreements, results in proximately $120 million in savings for cities, towns and their citizens over 15 years of operation. CRRA will be able to reduce trash disposal fees, currently $69 per ton, by as much as 10 percent or even more.

This is how public contracting is supposed to work: Attract a wide spectrum of bidders, thoroughly scrutinize proposals, select the bidder that will provide the best service at the lowest cost, and, importantly, demonstrate to the public in a transparent, open manner how the results were determined.

Regrettably, AFSCME is severely mischaracterizing this competitive process and its results. It is important that you know the facts:

- CRRA has owned and managed the Mid-Connecticut facility since it opened in 1988 and will continue to own and manage it after this contractor replacement. The facility is presently operated for CRRA by a number of contractors including Covanta Energy Corporation, which runs the power generation facilities, and the Metropolitan District Commission, which runs the waste processing facility. **Referring to a change of contractors as privatization is nonsensical.**
- Each employee of the present contractors **is guaranteed a job at his or her same salary with the new contractor. No one will lose a job as a result of our changing contractors.**
- The CRRA Board of Directors does not dissolve at the change of administrations. Its 11 volunteer members are appointed by legislative leadership and the governor to four-year staggered terms. Our competitive process to select a new contractor was made according to a schedule determined by the needs of the facility and the expiration of the existing contract.

It is discouraging to hear AFSCME continually misrepresent the facts about CRRA and its board, employees and statutorily-mandated responsibilities. I am available to meet with you at your convenience to discuss this issue or any other CRRA or waste and recycling issue. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. Thank You.

Sincerely,

Thomas D Kirk

Thomas D. Kirk, President
CRRA

January 11, 2011 letter sent to members of the CT General Assembly.

Thirty Council 4 AFSCME members have been laid off by this privatization

Marianne L. Carcio
Executive Assistant
Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority
100 Constitution Plaza
Hartford, CT 06103
(860) 757 7792

Back to document

ProQuest

THE MISSING EARTH-MOVER: BEYOND PILFERING PENS * TRASH AGENCY APPARENTLY ISN'T KEEPING A CLOSE EYE ON ASSETS

Anonymous. *Hartford Courant* [Hartford, Conn] 18 Feb 2010: .13.

Abstract (summary) Translate [unavailable for this document]

According to a story first reported by The Courant's Jon Lender, the stolen equipment included a nearly new $29,000 Bobcat S205 Skid-Steer loader, purchased in May 2009 by the CRRA, along with related equipment: an $8,100 backhoe attachment, a $3,200 auger...

Full Text

The Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority is obviously not vigilant enough in protecting the assets provided by ratepayers.

Sometime last October, $45,000 of earth-moving machinery belonging to the quasi-public trash-disposal agency was taken from its property in Hartford to Massachusetts, advertised on craigslist and then sold to a New Hampshire landscaper for $34,000. An employee, Richard Kowalski, who was fired a few weeks after the incident, was subsequently accused of stealing the machinery and has been charged with first-degree larceny.

Incredibly, for several days after the equipment was taken, CRRA officials were oblivious to the fact that it was gone. It looks as if inventory control is not the Hartford-area garbage authority's long suit.

According to a story first reported by The Courant's Jon Lender, the stolen equipment included a nearly new $29,000 Bobcat S205 Skid-Steer loader, purchased in May 2009 by the CRRA, along with related equipment: an $8,100 backhoe attachment, a $3,200 auger drive unit and a $4,700 pallet fork attachment.

The trash agency found out that the equipment was missing only because the landscaper who bought it gave its serial number to a Bobcat company representative. The company traced the serial number; realized the equipment had been sold to CRRA only six months earlier, and contacted the trash agency. CRRA President Thomas Kirk then called the police.

The equipment was recovered, but the story is disturbing nonetheless for CRRA's lax oversight. Who's minding the shed?

Other government and quasi-public agencies should take heed.

(Copyright The Hartford Courant 2010)

Indexing (details)

Subjects:	Earthmoving equipment
Title:	THE MISSING EARTH-MOVER: BEYOND PILFERING PENS * TRASH AGENCY APPARENTLY ISN'T KEEPING A CLOSE

Auditors rap CRRA over late reports

By Don Michak
Journal Inquirer

The state trash authority failed to comply with Connecticut statutes by waiting between three and 12 months to alert authorities about "incidents" involving its handling of funds or resources and by not posting several reports for public viewing on the Internet, the state auditors say in a new report.

In their latest review of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority, the auditors said all quasi-public agencies, including CRRA, are required to promptly notify them and the state comptroller of any unauthorized, illegal, irregular, or unsafe handling or expenditure of funds or breakdowns in the safekeeping of resources.

But they said that in five of the seven such "incidents" they discovered in examining the CRRA's records for the 2007 fiscal year, it took between 107 and 352 days for the agency to make the required disclosures.

The auditors said those matters involved a total of just over $6 million, including $3.9 million for "system expenses" that had not been transferred by the agency's bank/trustee and $1 million that had been credited to the incorrect account.

The auditors rapped the agency not only for its delay in making the required reports — writing that "the definition 'promptly' is not 100 to 350 days" — but also for failing to follow its own procedure, which states that agency management shall meet on a monthly basis to determine whether activities are reportable.

CRRA officials responded that they had enacted "a definitive procedure for notifying state agencies when a circumstance may arise," and that it could take some time to develop a meaningful filing, according to the auditors.

Agency officials also said they disagreed with the auditors' take on the statute and that reporting on a monthly basis may not be prompt.

The CRRA also told the auditors that its failure to post reports to the Internet in some cases resulted from an administrative oversight due to changes in personnel and their responsibilities.

Elsewhere in their review, the auditors said the CRRA needed to separate stuff duties involving billing and collection to ensure proper internal control over revenue and questioned its designation of "unrestricted net assets" that resulted in a deficit for the agency's Bridgeport and Mid-Connecticut trash-to-energy projects.

The auditors characterized both of those matters as "significant deficiencies in internal control over financial operations and compliance with requirements."

The CRRA in 2006-07 had total operating revenues of $180.5 million and total operating expenses of $206.3 million, ending the period with an operating loss of $25.8 million and a net income loss of $12.5 million, according to the report.

CRRA Asks Ethics To Weigh In On Municipal Liaison Contract With Former Speaker

by Christine Stuart | Oct 24, 2011 4:29am
(2) Comments | Commenting has expired
Posted to: Legal, Local Politics, State Capitol

username ☐ Auto-login on future visits
password Forgot your password?
submit

(Clarified 4:02 p.m.) Eight years ago following the loss of $220 million to Enron Corp., the General Assembly decided the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority couldn't hire outside lobbyists to lobby state officials. But a recent contract extension for a "municipal liaison" position has raised questions, again, about quasi-public agency's activities.

The municipal liaison contract initially went out to bid in May before being pulled from the board's agenda in September after CRRA officials discovered it had one more year left on the current contract.

That contract belongs to Brown Rudnick LLP, where the position of municipal liaison is held by former Speaker of the House Thomas Ritter. Ritter and his lobbying/law firm, which also holds legal contracts with CRRA, was expected to be awarded the three-year municipal liaison contract again if the item hadn't been pulled from the agenda. The only other firm to bid on the $84,000 contract was Tremont Public Advisors LLC, a company run by Matthew Hennessy, former chief of staff of Hartford Mayor Eddie Perez.

West Hartford Mayor Scott Slifka is a new member of CRRA's board, and he says he is concerned that even having a municipal liaison contract may violate the spirit of the 2003 law.

A municipal liaison, according to the scope of services in the RFP, is expected to provide CRRA with insight and outreach to its member towns, but Slifka is concerned that allowing a registered state lobbyist to hold the contract may blur the line.

"Frankly, I have serious reservations about the potential conflict of this RFP with the statutory ban on CRRA hiring lobbyists effective Jan. 1, 2003 (Public Act 02-46, I believe)," Slifka wrote CRRA President Thomas Kirk on Sept. 19 — 10 days before the last board meeting.

The item was pulled from the agenda on Sept. 29, after CRRA says it was discovered there was still a year left on the current contract.

"It was a paperwork screw up," says Paul Nonnenmacher, spokesman for CRRA. "To be honest, the gentleman handling the contract retired this summer and was making sure everything got tied up before he left."

Kirk says the CRRA had created a job description for the liaison that should avoid conflict with the law.

"Regarding the statute prohibiting CRRA from having a lobbyist, the board has historically shared your concern and insistence that CRRA stay far away from the line between legislative liaison and lobbying," Kirk replied to Slifka on Sept. 19. "This particular contract RFP has in the past attracted lobbyists to bid, but it is specifically designed to be a liaison with the towns/cities, and the contractor is prohibited from working the legislature or governor's office."

Asked to describe the services he provides CRRA as its municipal liaison, "I do whatever they ask me to do," Ritter said last week in a phone interview. I don't lobby and I don't believe anyone ever suggested I do. The contract I signed two years ago says I cannot lobby."

Ritter is a registered state lobbyist, but he said he doesn't believe anyone ever accused him of lobbying in his capacity as CRRA's municipal liaison.

However, there are emails from the end of the legislative session in June that show Ritter contacted the Attorney General's

office regarding the appointment of new members to the board by legislative leaders . Further, the emails show Ritter offered to draft language to amend **legislation** concerning the appointment of members to CRRA's board.

The legislation died on the Senate calendar, but the June 1 email seems to show how close the line is between lobbying and municipal liaison.

Kirk said Ritter can't communicate with the legislature because that's getting "too close to the line of lobbying. The same goes for the Attorney General."

Despite this statement, the string of emails shows Ritter on one occasion reached out to Nora Dannehy, deputy attorney general to get clarification on the appointment of a member of CRRA's board.

"Nora Danahy [sic] called me this morning," Ritter wrote in a June 13 email. "While they don't offer legal opinions to quasi-state agencies. I explained that this was more a review of legislative action. She wants to be helpful and will get back to me shortly after she does a bit more review."

The email string between Ritter and members of CRRA's administration and board asks for her opinion in the matter.

In an effort to clear up the municipal liaison situation and fend off questions from the losing bidders firm, CRRA's legal counsel, Laurie Hunt, asked the Office of State Ethics to weigh in on the matter more than a week ago.

In the letter Hunt asks two questions:

"Does the prohibition preclude the Authority from contracting for legal services with a law firm which provides lobbying services to other clients (but not to the Authority)?" and "Does the prohibition preclude the Authority from contracting for Municipal Services with a law firm which provides lobbying services to other clients (but not to the Authority)?"

The Office of State Ethics is expected to issue an opinion shortly.

But even if the office finds CRRA is in violation of the statute, the law doesn't include any enforcement provisions, so it's difficult to know what, if anything, will happen next.

Tags: CRRA, Thomas Ritter, Thomas Kirk, municipal liaison, lobbyist, lobbying, quasi-public