

**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES
THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2006, 2:00 P.M.
21 GRAND STREET
HARTFORD, CT 06106
4th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**

MINUTES

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

John Lobon, Chair
Benjamin F. Rhodes, Jr., Secretary
Lillian Brown
Larry Conaway
James L. Griffin
Edward Mambruno
George Marshall
Gloria Mengual
Andrew M. Norton

STAFF PRESENT

R. Hamisi Ingram, Executive Director
Raymond P. Pech, Assistant Director
Robert Brothers, Jr., Managing Director & Commission Attorney
Michael Fryar, Curriculum Manager
Donald Newton, Chief of Field Operations
Cheryl Sharp, Interim HRO Regional Manager
James Flynn, HRO Regional Manager
Epifanio Carrasquillo, HRO Regional Manager
Zenaida Colon, Fiscal Administrative Supervisor
Lena Ferguson, Regulations & Legislative Specialist
Gloria Sparveri, Affirmative Action Program Manager
Alvin Bingham, Contract Compliance Supervisor
Neva Vigezzi, Affirmative Action Program Analyst

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

I. CONVENE MEETING:

Lobon: Good Afternoon. I would like to have a moment of silence if we can in memory of **Ann Eady**, CHRO employee who we just recently lost to sickle cell which is a very tragic disease that inflict a number of people and hopefully as cancer and others that there will be a cure one day for that dreaded disease itself. So, I would just like to ask for a moment of silence, thank you. Thank you very much. I would like to convene the meeting for the State of Connecticut, Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities Regular Commission Meeting, at 21 Grand Street, Hartford, Connecticut in the large hearing room, Thursday, May 11, 2006, to order at 2:00 p.m. Secretary Benjamin Rhodes.

II. Review and Approval of the Transcript of April 13, 2006 Regular Commission Meeting:

Rhodes: I would like a motion to approve the minutes.

Griffin: So moved.

Marshall: Second.

Lobon: Motions been moved and seconded. Any changes? Hearing none. All those in favor?

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" None. Hearing none the minutes have been approved. Executive Director.

III. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: R. Hamisi Ingram

Ingram: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all I would like to welcome **Lillian H. Brown**, our newly appointed Commissioner. We're happy to have her. She is from Waterbury and we look for great things from her and look forward to a very long, close working relationship.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Brown: Thank you.

Ingram: In addition to that I would like to announce a save-the-date notice that our annual North Star Awards would be August 19th of this year. And our intended keynote speaker is **Morris Dees** co-founder of the Southern Law Poverty Center. So, look in your mail for our notice it should be coming out soon. Now, for my report I'll start with our affirmative action program manager, Ms. **Gloria Sparveri**.

Sparveri: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, welcome to the new members of the commission. My name is **Gloria Sparveri**. And I am the affirmative action program manager. My report today will be brief. I am continuing to make progress on the five projects that I presented to you at the last meeting. My primary focus is on the upcoming partnership training that we are sponsoring along with the Permanent Commission on the Status of Women, which is scheduled for June 8th and June 20th being conducted at the LOB. This will be the very first training of the newly legislated annual 5-hour mandatory training for Affirmative Action Officers, Attorney Generals, Attorney General Designee that will be provided together with PCSW, our agency and them. We are attempting to incorporate the most effective, concise and comprehensive training by adding in some new areas of need and interest. We started by forming a focus group to learn what issues were common obstacles or shared areas of concern. The feedback we received indicated a need for more detailed training regarding "FOIA: freedom of information act, specifically, which documents and/or what information can be requested under FOI and which cannot. And, also how the release of certain investigative documents can have a negative impact on the ability to conduct future investigations. We are very excited about this training and certainly any Commissioner that would like to attend are welcome to join us! Thank you!

Lobon: Thank you Gloria. Any questions for Gloria? Thank you very much.

Ingram: Mr. **Bingham**.

A. Agencies Proposed Affirmative Action Plans:

Staff Recommendation: **Approval**

1. Department of Consumer Protection
2. Office of the Governor
3. Office of Health Care Access
4. Office of Protection and Advocacy
5. Department of Public Works
6. Department of Veterans' Affairs

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Bingham: Good Afternoon.

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: Good afternoon.

Bingham: The first agency will be the Department of Consumer Protection and here today we have Commissioner **Edwin Rodriguez** and **Nancy Bryant**. If you would, please stand?

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is recommended for approval based on section 46a-68-59(a)(b)(3) and (b) (4) standard. Good faith effort. Short-term goal achievement was 3 out of 7 or 42.9% possible goals. And the total goal achievement 3 out of 7 or 42.9%. The set-aside goal achievement for 2004 - 2005 the SBE goals was \$163,054 dollars and they achieved 135%. The MBE goal was \$40,764 dollars and they achieved 42%. The SBE goal achievement for the fiscal year 2005 - 2006 two quarters reporting the SBE goal \$129,430 dollars and they achieved 29% and the MBE goal achievement was \$32,358 dollars and they've achieved so far 40%. The five-year history the plan has been approved all five years.

Lobon: Staff has made a recommendation to approve the Department of Consumer Protection. May I have a motion, please?

Griffin: So moved.

Lobon: Motion has been moved by Commissioner **Griffin**.

Mambruno: Second.

Lobon: Seconded, by Commissioner **Mambruno**. Any discussion?

Rhodes: Yes.

Lobon: Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Rhodes: The percentages when you look at it in terms of 42.9%, if you stacked them up against the other plans that we are recommending for approval they're kind of low and I want to know why?

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Bingham: I would assume that they would, um, that it was just based on their hires and um obviously they've only, out of 7 possible 3 were met. I mean different agencies, I can get, have some, the reviewer speak to you but, every agency is different and ...

Rhodes: I don't want you to assume I would like to hear from whoever the reviewer is. I think it is Neva.

Bingham: Okay.

Rhodes: Yes.

Viguzzi: I'm **Neva Viguzzi**, affirmative action program analyst. In this situation, this plan was recommended for approval based on good faith efforts. It wasn't based on its goal achievement percentages.

Rhodes: Okay.

Viguzzi: As you see on page 4, it's detailed why every hire did not meet a hiring goal was made. There is the justification if there are goal candidates why those goal candidates were not selected for the position as opposed to a non-goal candidate.

Rhodes: Okay, okay. There is one other question that I want to ask and it is not really pertaining to this agency. It's more so to the fact that we were supposed to use the new census data. Did we ever do that?

Viguzzi: Yes.

Rhodes: We did that?

Viguzzi: In 2006. The 2000 data has been used now for about two years. We are going on our second year of using it.

Rhodes: No, because last year we didn't have it did we? Because we had problems extracting the data...

Pech: I'm **Ray Pech**. I'm the assistant director. You're right. Commissioner there was a problem collating, extracting whatever the data from the 2000 census.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

However, it was accomplished and it has been in use, I want to say, since the beginning of 2005 maybe January or February a year ago.

Rhodes: Okay.

Lobon: Any other questions? Hearing none. Motion has been made to approve and seconded. All those in favor state by saying "aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" None. Hearing none the plan's approved.

Bingham: The next agency is the Office of the Governor and we have here **Vanessa L. Ramirez** the Associate Legal Counsel and **Natalie Shipman**, representing the Office of the Governor, please stand.

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is being recommended for approval based on 46a-68-59 (a) (b) (4) and 46a-68-59 (b) (2) & (b) (3). Short-term goal achievement was seven out of 11 or 63.6%. Long-term goal achievement was ten out of ten or 100%. The total goal achievement was 17 out of 21 or 81%. The set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2004 – 2005. Their SBE goal was \$10,201 dollars; the SBE achievement was 300.9%. The MBE goal achievement was \$22,550 dollars and the MBE achievement was 522%. The set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2005 – 2006 with two quarters reporting the SBE goal \$46,172 dollars, they achieved 11.4%. The MBE goal \$11,543 dollars or 23.1%. Their history their plan has been approved um, one-year conditionally approved and the later, the other three approved.

Lobon: Alright, staff has made a recommendation of approval for the Office of the Governor. Can I get a motion please?

Rhodes: So moved.

Marshall: Second.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Lobon: Motion has been moved by Commissioner **Rhodes** and seconded by Commissioner **Marshall**. Are there any questions?

Norton: I have a question.

Lobon: Sure, Commissioner **Norton**.

Norton: It maybe...

Lobon: Commissioner **Norton**, can you talk in the mic please?

Norton: It maybe for our staff and not for the Governor's staff. And it is a question that I think I will ask again in the Department of Veterans' Affairs. And that is when I, it's just a mathematical under the small business enterprise and minority business enterprise numbers um, in this case the Governor's thing is on page four and five. It says the goals for SBE were \$10,000 for last year and MBE were \$2,500.00, and then the goals next year will be \$46,000 for SBE and \$11,000 for MBE. That is rather a giant jump of quadrupling and I imagine there is some rational explanation um, but I was wondering if you could explain it.

Bingham: Sure, on, um, this past year, DAS and the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, our agency, we worked on a rating and ranking um, Meg and myself we want more inclusion so were, every agency has, they fill out their goals and the put down, they ask for a lot of exemptions. And we went to rating and ranking and this year some of the exemptions that the office asked for wasn't granted therefore we raised the goal.

Norton: Okay, and since we're on the topic but we're not on the agency so Mr. Chairman tell me if I'm out of order but, its right on this topic area. In the Department of Veterans' Affairs I noticed that small business enterprise and minority business enterprise goals for last year were a million two SBE and about three hundred thousand minority business enterprise. Where as next year it's going to be about half for SBE is going it's going to be about six hundred thousand and for minority business enterprise it's going to be about one hundred and fifty thousand. So in this case it comes down by a half and I was wondering, unless you would like for me to wait until that agency is up?

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Lobon: Commissioner, I think we should wait until that comes up.

Norton: Okay.

Lobon: Okay.

Norton: I don't have any other questions.

Lobon: Okay, any other questions from the Commissioners? Hearing none...

Mambruno: I just have a statement.

Lobon: What was that, Commissioner?

Mambruno: For an executive office branch agency I would just like to say that the contract compliance numbers are exceptional. Anytime you have 500% and 300% for any type agency is outstanding. But when you have an office like the Governor that is very difficult to place people because every position is not what you would call particular to any agency I would say that, that show that they are going out and really beating the bushes to grant contracts to minorities and small businesses. So, I would like to thank the Governor's office for that.

Lobon: Thank you, Commissioner **Mambruno**. Any other questions? Hearing none. Motion has been made to approve all those in favor state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" None. Hearing none plan approved.

Bingham: The next agency would be the Office of Health Care Access. Here representing that agency is **Natalie Shipman, Isabelle McKinney**, Commissioner **Kristine Volvo** and Chief of staff **John Blair**, please stand.

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is being recommended for approval based on Section 46a-68-59 (a) (b) (3) and (b) (4) standard good faith effort. There short-term achievement they have um, I mean long-term achievement they, short-term achievement they none, um, there was none. Long-term achievement zero out of one, so zero as far

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

as achievement there was zero. Their set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2004 – 05 the SBE goal achievement was \$24,507 dollars and they achieved 220%. The MBE goal was \$6,127 dollars and the MBE achievement was 723%.

The SBE goal achievement for the fiscal year 2005 – 06 with one quarter reporting the SBE goal was \$26,437 dollars and they achieved 79%. The MBE goal was \$6,609 dollars and they have achieved 279%. The five-year history the plan has been approved all five years.

Lobon: Okay, staff has made a recommendation to approve the Office of Health Care Access. Can I get a motion please?

Rhodes: So moved.

Marshall: Second.

Lobon: Motion has been moved by Commissioner **Rhodes** and seconded by Commissioner **Marshall**. Any questions?

Marshall: I have a question, sir.

Lobon: Commissioner **Marshall**.

Marshall: The short-term goals and the long-term goals, can you speak on that?

Rhodes: Page three of five.

Marshall: Yes, three of five, no short-term goals and no long-term goals. Why is that?

Bingham: I would have to defer to Neva.

Marshall: I am just curious to wonder how come this agency has no goals set.

Viguzzi: Yes, this is **Neva Viguzzi** again. The agency did establish goals with short and long-term timetables. During the reporting period there was only, one hire and that was in the office clerical category in which a goal with a long-term timetable was established. So, there was only, one hire and it was applied to a goal that had a long-term timetable but there were short and long-term goals established but there was only one hire during the reporting period. You can see

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

on page one of two of the charts the goals that were established for the reporting period ending October 31, 2005.

Marshall: Okay, thank you.

Lobon: Any other questions? A motion has been made to approve the Office of Health Care Access. All those in favor state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" Hearing none, plan approved.

Bingham: The next agency is the Office of Protection and Advocacy and we have **Nancy Bryant** and **Gretchen Knauf**, the Assistant Director and the Affirmative Action Officer representing the agency. Please stand.

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is recommended for approval based on 46a-68-59 (a) (b) (2) (b) (3) standard. Short-term goal achievement was two out of three or 66.6% and the total goal achievement was three out of eight or 38%. The set-aside goal achievement for fiscal year 2004 – 05 the SBE goal was \$30,045 dollars they achieved 155%. The MBE goal was \$7,511 dollars and the MBE participation um, achievement was 475%. For the fiscal year 2005 – 06 two quarters reporting the SBE goals was \$24,436 dollars and they achieved 34%. The MBE goal was \$6,359 dollars and they achieved 53%. The plan was approved in 2001,2002 it was approved, 2003 approved by default and 04 and 05 the plans were approved.

Lobon: Staff has made a recommendation to approve the Office of Protection and Advocacy. Can I have a motion please?

Rhodes: So moved.

Lobon: Moved by Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Marshall: Second.

Lobon: Seconded by Commissioner **Marshall**. Any questions?

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Conaway: I just have one question?

Lobon: Commissioner **Conaway**?

Conaway: This says for fiscal year 2004 – 2005 that is a two-year jump verses a one-year jump, and 2005 and 2006 is just two quarters. Are we doing eight quarters verses two is that why there is a big gap?

Bingham: No, we're doing four quarters. The first one gives you the set-aside goal achievement for the total year. We run from July 1st to June 30th so that might be 04 – 05. For the set-aside for 2005 – 2006 they've only recorded two quarters. Next year you will get the full report of what they agency their goal achievement for the full year of 2005 – 06.

Conaway: That's the reason for the big gap?

Bingham: Yes.

Conaway: Thank you.

Lobon: Any other questions? Hearing none. A motion has been made to approve the plan all those in favor state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" Hearing none. Plan approved.

Bingham: The next agency is the Department of Public Works we have **Natalie Shipman** and **Verna Plona** here, please stand.

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is recommended for approval based on 46a-68-59 (2), (b) (3) (b) (4) standard good faith effort. Short-term goal achievement was two out of seven or 28.6%. The long-term goal achievement was one out of one or 100%. Total goal achievement three out of eight or 37.5%. The set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2004 – 05 the SBE goal was \$3,339,604 dollars they achieved 184%. The MBE goal achievement was \$834,901 dollars and they achieved 97%. The set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2005 – 06 one

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

quarter reporting there SBE goal was \$4,223,397 dollars they achieved 71%. The MBE goal achievement was \$1,055,849 dollars and they've achieved 29%. The five-year history the plan has been approved.

Lobon: Staff has made a recommendation to approve the Department of Public Works. Can I have a motion please?

Rhodes: So moved.

Lobon: Moved by Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Griffin: Second.

Lobon: Seconded by Commissioner **Griffin**. Any questions? I would just like to make one comment in relationship to the SBE. Achieving 71% of a goal in the first quarter is awesome that's outstanding. Maybe that number will be 180% again, hopefully but I just wanted to make that comment as well. No other questions. A motion has been made to approve the plan. All those in favor, state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" Hearing none. Plan approved.

Bingham: The next agency is the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Is **Noreen Sinclair** in here? **Noreen Sinclair** and Commissioner **Schwartz** is here.

Lobon: Welcome.

Bingham: The plan is recommended for approval based on 46a-68-59 (a) (b) (2) and (b) (3) and (b) (4). Short-term goal achievement was four out of five or 80%. Total goal achievement four out of five or 80%. For the set-aside goal achievement for the fiscal year 2004 and 05 the SBE goal was \$1,271,434 dollars they achieved 31%. The MBE goal was \$221,903 dollars they achieved 70%. SBE goal achievement for 05 – 06 no quarters reporting um, it was um, their goal is \$594,187 dollars and the MBE goal achievement was \$148,547 dollars and like I said no quarters reporting. The plan was approved in 2000, 2001 it was approved 2002, 2003 approved 2004 approved by default and 05 approved.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Lobon: All right, staff has made a recommendation to approve the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Can I get a motion please?

Marshall: So moved.

Lobon: Moved by Commissioner **Marshall**.

Rhodes: Second.

Lobon: Motion has been moved by Commissioner **Marshall** and seconded by Commissioner **Rhodes**. Are there any questions?

Norton: I have a question?

Lobon: Yes Commissioner **Norton**.

Norton: Again I'm not sure that it's best answered by the Department of Veterans' Affairs or by this department but on page four of four of our handout I don't know if it's the guide for anyone else or not it says that for the last fiscal year that the small business enterprise goals were about a million two, a million three. And the minority business enterprise goals were about three hundred thousand whereas for the fiscal year in which we sit the small business enterprise is about half that six hundred thousand and minority business enterprise is again about half what it was about one and fifty thousand. And I was wondering what calculation. I have to be honest with you I'm actually I guess entirely unfamiliar with the calculation of where you arrive at. Is it, how do you arrive at these numbers like SBE and MBE numbers anyway? Do you take a total of all the outside contracts and purchases that they are going to do and then apply a percentage that should be minority and small business enterprise?

Bingham: No, what is taken is that we look at their entire budget. As a matter of fact it is a format that every agency has to complete. I think it is about six to 12 pages that talks about your total budget then you have certain exemptions, you have your rent, your leases, your automobiles your insurance, your salaries and so forth. So, then you deduct that and then it talks about grants and other funding sources they look for exemptions on that and then they keep on withdrawing. There are certain things that they are exempting for and then there are some things that they petition for exemptions and um, DAS and the commission we review these and then if it fits within the standards they are legitimately exempted and therefore we get the bottom number after that and then we do the goal

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

calculations. This year quite possibly I know the Veterans', oh, uh, I know the Department of Veterans' Affairs is doing a major construction project but I 'm sure that a lot of that is with federal dollars so therefore which the set-aside would not be applicable on. But you can rest assure that we look very close and we really don't try to a lot of agencies ask for exemptions and they are not granted. So, we really go by the letter for the law to get to this number.

Norton: I'm not necessarily suspicious. It is just a big change in the numbers and I can imagine again there is, what is the type of exemption an agency would ask for well that they might grant? Well what does that mean? An agency says that would you exempt this...

Bingham: Well, they could exempt grants. Grants can be exempted I mean it's a part of their budget if it's a federal we can't do it if it's a state they can such as travel, conferences there are a lot of exemptions that chip away from the overall budgeted expense.

Norton: But I mean, and so for example if it was travel and it was subjected to this does this mean say the agency would be requested to go to a hotel that is owned by a small business enterprise or a minority business enterprise?

Bingham: No, no, that is why it would be exempted. Plus also there are three other things I think it is Eastern Bag there are some things that the state has contracted to the overall state has a contract to so therefore if an agency is using that one of the three things that is automatically exempted to.

Norton: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Lobon: You're welcome. Any other questions?

Mambruno: I have one.

Lobon: Commissioner **Mambruno**.

Mambruno: I would like to know why the Department is not in full compliance with the diversity training.

Bingham: Are you talking about the goal achievement?

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Mambruno: No, diversity training. The Department of Veterans' Affairs is not in full compliance.

Bingham: Um, I reviewed that. The Department of Veterans' Affairs has in the past years have waited for a class of, I believe, 25 people to get their diversity, uh, they waited for a class of 25 people to have their diversity training. And they have done this over two-years obviously they are not hiring as many. It was my recommendation that they renegotiate that contract so that they could have a smaller amount so that employees wont have to wait two to three years to get the diversity training, so that was my recommendation.

Mambruno: Is there a way that they can train with other agencies so that they would not have to wait for 25 employees?

Bingham: I believe that every agency contracts and I've asked them, my recommendation and they will be in for technical assistance is to renegotiate that. That was my recommendation and I'm sure Commissioner **Schwartz** and Ms. **Sinclair** will look at it and then they will get back to us and tell us if that is acceptable or maybe they will have another recommendation of how the employees can be trained faster than waiting for two to three years to get the 25 to get the full 25.

Lobon: Commissioner **Griffin**.

Griffin: Yes, just quickly. How do you arrive at what a standard is for diversity training? What is the standard, basically?

Bingham: Well, the standard is that all employees have to be trained in that year and what if that following up on what Commissioner **Mambruno's** question is, is that they haven't for the past two-years they have said that they are continuing to wait to get to this magic number and time is just going by. So, either you are in compliance with training the employees that you had in that year they have fully been trained they have been trained or not and in the past two-years they have said, "no" with an explanation and this year we said it doesn't raise to that bar and were asking to go and do something different.

Griffin: Okay, thanks.

Lobon: Commissioner **Brown**.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Brown: Yes, I would just like to know, I just don't know how to interpret these blank areas in the bottom for achievement and percentage and it's my lack of understanding since I haven't had time to fully digest this. Could you just help me understand why that is blank for the year 2005 -2006?

Bingham: Well 2000, oh, what happens is when they fill out there; when they fill out their set-aside, you're talking about their set-aside? Where there is a blank?

Brown: Yes.

Bingham: The year that they reported in the first quarter they might not have had any contracts that year. So, this is the, so they didn't report. Now the third quarter they will have to justify why they haven't met it. Some agencies meet their goals in the first quarter. It all depends upon contracts and when contracts are signed. Sometimes things go out to bid. Sometimes they have to be re-bided so for various reasons why. But, next time you see them they will have to report on the four quarters and we will have some numbers to substantiate how will they did.

Brown: Okay, just a suggestion. A note to what you just said to me would be much appreciated. For me to look at anything that is blank that I have to make a decision on is a little difficult. So, perhaps when there is a blank or blanks there a little note of explanation would help clarify that.

Bingham: Sure.

Brown: Thank you.

Lobon: Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Rhodes: Yes. I would like to almost tip my hat to the Veterans' Affairs because if you look at, compare them against some of the other agencies in terms of short-term goals, total goals and program goals their numbers are very high and their very impressive. So, I do want to tip my hat to them for that.

Lobon: Any other questions?

Norton: Mr. Chairman, I...

Lobon: Commissioner **Norton**.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Norton: Along the lines of Mr. **Rhodes** uh, Commissioner **Rhodes** compliments, as you know lately when I have been looking at, at least the larger agencies it's kind of hard to hold the very small agencies to as much of a standard maybe, well we do but it is hard, um, but it is so often the case that the number of Black women in agencies far out numbers the number of Black men. And it is almost equal in the Department of Veterans' Affairs. And I just, I don't know if, that's by design or by accident but it's still a good thing and um, I wanted to give credit to the agency because again and I'm not necessarily blaming the agency but agency, after agency, after agency the number of Black men is awfully low. And that's not so true in the Department of Veterans' Affairs and I just felt like pointing it out since I always point out the negative.

Conaway: I agree with Commissioner **Norton**.

Lobon: Any other questions? A motion has been made to approve the Department of Veterans' Affairs. All those in favor state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" Hearing none. Plan approved.

Lobon: All of those who have presented their plans today, what we will give you is an opportunity to escape.

Griffin: You can always stick around.

Lobon: Yeah, but if you choose to stick around then you can stick around but we give you this opportunity to depart at this present moment.

Norton: They are ineligible for the door prize, though.

The following agencies were represented:

- **Diane Donato,**
Department of Transportation
- **Vanessa Ramirez,** Associate Legal Counsel,
Office of the Governor

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

- **Edwin Rodriguez**, Commissioner,
Department of Consumer Protection
Nancy Bryant, Affirmative Action Officer,
Department of Consumer Protection
- **Natalie Shipman**, Affirmative Action Administrator,
Department of Public Works
Verna Plona, Principal Personnel Officer,
Department of Public Works
- **Isabelle McKinney**, Affirmative Action Officer,
Office of Health Care Access
Denise Rodosevich, Staff Attorney,
- **Judy Dickens**, Affirmative Action Officer,
Office of Policy and Management
- **Debra Freund**, Director of Equal Opportunity Administration,
Department of Children and Families
Terri Johnston, Affirmative Action Officer,
Department of Children and Families
Sharon Gaddy, Director of Equal Opportunity Administration,
Department of Children and Families
- **Linda S. Schwartz**, Commissioner,
Department of Veterans' Affairs
Noreen Sinclair, Affirmative Action Administrator,
Department of Veterans' Affairs
Hugo Adams, Director of Safety and
Department of Veterans' Affairs

Lobon: Okay, all of those who are going to depart have departed.

Ingram: Mr. **Newton**.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

B. Field Operations Report

Newton: Good afternoon. For those of you who don't know me my name is **Don Newton** I am Chief of Field Operations. You have my report on caseload statistics in front of you. I will just mention a couple of facts that are set forth in there and then if anybody has any questions I hopefully could entertain them. As far as settlements you will notice that we are just shy of the two million dollar mark of recovering money for person who have filed with this agency in the current fiscal year. By the next meeting you should see that figure over two million dollars, which we have to give a lot of credit to the regional offices and the housing unit for their efforts in mediating complaints.

Norton: Is that a high number?

Newton: Yes and we still have uh, that's only in half the fiscal year basically or three quarters through the fiscal year, I'm sorry. Right now we have 2,291 active complaints. Again our caseload kind of goes up and down with the economy and I think it's kind of increasing which indicates that there has been a lot of adverse personnel actions happening that cause people to seek our assistance in addressing their claims of discrimination. On another note I have been keeping you abreast of the status of our Bridgeport office. You should be happy to note we have a, what we call a hold over lease which means that we are set until February 1, 2007. Hopefully by that date Public Works will have finalized the negotiations and worked with the perspective landlord of the new location to build out the space so that we have adequate facilities in Bridgeport.

Lobon: You sure that's going to happen Don?

Newton: Well, DPW's plan so I'm sure they are going to sail right ahead with it.

Lobon: Okay, I just wanted to know...

Newton: Any questions?

Lobon: Any questions from the Commissioners? Thank you, very much.

Ingram: Ms. **Ferguson**.

C. Legislative Report

Ferguson: Good afternoon. I'm **Lena Ferguson** the Legislative Regulations Specialist. Last month, I reported that the budget reported out of the appropriations commission in March increased our authorized budget count by five positions and increased our line item for other expenses. In the budget that the legislature passed on April 30th and May 1st I believe and signed by the Governor on May 7th the agency received funding for two additional positions increasing our authorized position count to 100 and other funds for other expenses. The funds for other expenses will help facilitate the Bridgeport move once that's approved. Also, the budget allows for the Department of Public Works to carry forward plans to facilitate the move of this agency and the other state agencies in this building to other state owned or leased space.

Also, in the final days of the session the legislature passed an amendment to an act concerning court operations Senate Bill 156 and that amendment requires the judicial department to go ahead and designate a full or part-time affirmative action officer and to go ahead and develop implement and file an affirmative plan with CHRO. Last year we supported a bill, which would have required the judicial department to submit a plan to CHRO that we would have to review and submit to you recommendation for its approval, conditional approval or disapproval. The amendment that was passed only requires the judicial department to designate a full or part-time affirmative action officer, go ahead and develop a plan as it has been as it has been done in the past to comply with federal requirements and just submit it to CHRO. There is no formal action on our part that is required under the amendment. We believe that the co-chairs of the judiciary committee who offered that amendment did it to go ahead to honor the separation of powers issue.

Also, the amendment requires the criminal justice commission to go ahead and designate a full or part-time affirmative action officer and to go ahead and submit a plan in accordance with CHRO regulations to CHRO. Because of the close relationship between the Criminal Justice Commission and the Criminal Justice Division we believe that the commission will go ahead and include its figures in the division's plan, which is already required to file a plan with us. And with regard to the affirmative action regulations and our proposed amendment to amend the affirmative action plan filing schedule. The AG's office went ahead, we submitted it to the AG's office for its review and approval, we received their approval and we went ahead and submitted the regulations to the regulations review committee and that committee should take action on that amendment in June. Once the

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

regulation review committee goes ahead and adopts and approves those amendments to the regulations we will file with the Secretary of State's office upon which they will become effective. And I am working on a legislative summary and once all of the public act numbers are out and once the Governor has signed all of the public acts the summary will be presented to you for your information.

Lobon: Lena. Thank you, very much for the work you have done this year with the legislature. I think I speak for the commissioners, I know it was a heavy load and for you to gather the necessary information for us and as well as for the Commission as well, a job well done.

Ferguson: Thank you.

Rhodes: Thank you.

Ingram: Mr. **Brothers**.

D. Managing Director Report

Brothers: Good afternoon Commissioners, Chair. My name is **Bob Brothers**. I am the managing director and Commission Attorney. I will keep my report as brief as possible so that we can all get out of here at a reasonable time.

Rhodes: Thank you.

Brothers: You're welcome. We've completed we being the legal department for the assistance of staff completed our first rounds of legal updates with all the regional offices that is something we were going to do three to four times a year. We are now starting our second round. Just to give you some raw numbers since it seems to be the realm that we are always talking in. The Commission Counsels office we currently have about 50% of all the cases we are handling are in court. With respect to housing cases about 75% of all of our housing cases are in court. We are also making great strides at reducing the number of reopening requests.

We have two that will be presented to you today and I hope within a couple of months we will be able to present those within 30 or 60 days. Speaking of the reopenings I think Mr. **Perelli** has introduced himself to some of you. I don't know if he has left or not but regarding the **Frank Perelli** reopening, is there anyone here from Garcia the respondent? There is no one here from Garcia, okay. Thank you,

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

that completes my report. Just by a side note **David Teed** couldn't make it here today he gave me his update and I will do that during Executive Session.

Lobon: Okay, very good.

Ingram: Mr. **Fryar:**

E. Curriculum Manager's Report

Fryar: Good afternoon. **Michael Fryar**, Curriculum Manager for the Commission on Human rights and Opportunities. I will also be brief today and just go through the kind of current events of what's going on. I am currently completing the commissioners' handbook as requested. I will be coming before you hopefully soon in order to discuss any available training, any thing that you may require also to provide copies of this I'm page 26 at this point just to give you an idea. It's going to be a little lengthy but it will all be substantive and it will be very, very, hopefully as you view it important. The morale survey was completed I believe you do have some statistics and some data in your packets which I am still compiling and taking a look at that.

Ingram: Actually, they do not.

Fryar: They do not. I apologize. You do not. One of the results of the morale survey however is the fact that we are going to be doing a managers retreat next Friday on the 19th. One of the areas that was pointed out within the survey itself was employee assessment. Staff is not happy with the way it exists. We are going to be doing some assessment training with the management. We are looking at some of the positions and actually flushing some out and really addressing that as a key component. It was the lowest score on the survey itself. Overall however, the morale of the agency is actually very positive rounding out between a 7 ½ and a 8 on a scale of 10. The three different categories one was job satisfaction, one was overall morale and one was value of the job was the category. So the staff itself is actually very positive. There are some key areas that we are looking to have come up in the survey.

We are introducing a investigator trainee position. We are going to be beginning a training sequence. It will begin with intake training. It's a number of positions that will be coming in. **Gloria Sparveri** and I are both involved in developing that program. And the staff recent had one ½ day of mediation training and it was

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

available to any staff that is actually involved in mediation. The feedback was very, very positive and they were excited about it. Any questions?

Lobon: Commissioner **Griffin**, first please.

Griffin: Just, can you give me an idea of how you actually did the staff survey? And what kind of percentage of the staff that participated in that survey? What kind of feedback?

Fryar: Off the top of my head no figures in front of me the survey itself was issued during a full day of training, it was actually Ms. **Sparveri's** training. There were three key topics during that day to bring staff up to speed. It was handed and they were requested to get it back anonymously. If they chose they could send it back in but however they were given the option of dropping it off in the mailbox, sending it inner office with no label. It was also disseminated two separate occasions electronically where they could take it print it out, fill it out. They could type it and return it electronically they could again send it inner office mail or just drop it in a mailbox. Some of the regional offices actually chose to gather a number together and send them all back at once to maintain anonymity. The total if I remember correctly was 56 out of 86 eligible responses. So it was well over 50%. Honestly in a morale survey anything over 20 or 25% is significant. It is difficult to get people to respond if there are satisfied because their attitude is well I have nothing to complain about, I have nothing really to say, why am I going to respond in. So, it was a very positive response it was also a very good response rate and also the response we got were very, very positive.

Griffin: Thanks.

Fryar: You're welcome.

Lobon: Commissioner **Norton**:

Norton: Yeah, when you do a morale survey do you administer it on a Monday morning or a Friday afternoon?

Fryar: It was actually administered over a series of about 3 ½ weeks. So, it was kind of a pick your day kind of thing.

Norton: Okay.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

Fryar: You do look at you know are the responses coming in on Monday a little negative and the ones coming in on Friday a little happy and there really was no day collation to this.

Norton: Thank you.

Fryar: You're welcome. One other thing I did look at while you bring that up any correlation. One of the things that we did look at was length of service. There is a misnomer I think the longer you with an agency the more negative your view may become more static it becomes. There is no correlation. There are people with a number of years and that are very, very happy with being here. So, that's the first thing this survey really did resolve was that length of time has no impact it seems upon your attitude towards the job or your moral with regards to the agency.

Lobon: Any other questions? Commissioner **Brown.**

Brown: yes, I just wondered do you do anything about the other percentages that you know must be negative otherwise or perhaps more negative? Do you do anything about that to try to get to the bottom 56% return is excellent but you know you still got 40 something people there who are unhappy. And how do you, do you have anyway of getting to them? Because you want a happy group, you know what I mean?

Fryar: Sure, there is two ways of looking at. Quite honestly normally the ones that don't respond are happy. Believe it or not the people that do respond tend to be unhappy or tend to have a complaint, especially in an anonymous situation. Not always and that's not it's a general rule as opposed to specific one. There were 30 eligible surveys that did not come back. There's two ways of doing a statistical data. I am not a statistician. I am not one of those. There is a way of extrapolating out of the returns that you have up to 100% and then coming back down to actually represent if the other 30 people responded, this is what their response would have been. I'm not going to attempt to go there. I can't, I don't know the math, I cant do it. I'm going to go based on what we have and other evidence that people who tend not to respond tend to be happier or satisfied. They might not be overjoyed. What ends up happening is some people may not have confidence in a morale survey. Yeah sure I'm going to send in the results but what's going to happen. The goal is to take one or two critical areas and respond to them and actually demonstrate. Yes. You put this on a piece of paper and we're going to do something about it. The next time you come around this won't be the last morale survey we do people will be more likely to respond because they

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2006

actually see the correlation between my response and something actually something happen.

Brown: Okay, because people tend to, I've done lots of surveys and you know they say let's just tell them what they want to hear and let's just get rid of them so that they won't bother me. And you do kind of want to pay attention to those who don't respond.

Fryar: Absolutely.

Brown: Thank you.

Fryar: You're welcome.

Lobon: Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Rhodes: More so for Commissioner **Brown**. Considering what we have been through, when did you take this survey?

Fryar: The survey the last result that I got was about 3 or 3 ½ weeks ago.

Rhodes: Considering what we've been through in the past...

Brown: That's good?

Rhodes: I say 4 months 3 months, that's pretty good. It's a good indicator but also the fact that we're going to do something about the negative part. That is important for all of our employees so I mean considering the past 3 or 4 months that's good.

Brown: Thank you.

Fryar: You're welcome.

Lobon: Any one else want to make comments or ask questions? I just want to say I think that I agree you coming on board has made some changes and thank you for responding to the request of putting the manual together which I think is most important and crucial. I think that it also indicated that the Executive Director bringing in the people that need to be here in order for us to be a collective group, a body of one and to be able to fulfill the mission that we are set forth here and has

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

been legislated to do. So, I commend all of you at this particular point and time in the sense that I think the changes are positive and hopefully as we continue down the road that has some what straightened itself out there are still a couple of bumps here and there but that's okay. I think we can find our way. But I do want to make sure that the staff understands that we are in this together, no one stands alone. We are and will be supportive of and continue to support your efforts in order to make sure as I said before and will continue to say, you don't love me but you are going to respect me.

Ingram: Mr. Chair.

Lobon: Yes.

Ingram: I didn't forget the fiscal report.

Lobon: Okay.

Ingram: Our FAS has some speaking problems this afternoon. I don't know if she can go or not.

Lobon: I see her smiling now.

F. Fiscal Report

Colon: Actually I have a sinus problem and laryngitis.

Lobon: Okay, well then, make it as brief as you need to.

Colon: I will just be very brief. In the personal services area you do see on the CFSR, which is. Excuse me. I meant to say welcome Commissioner's, my name is **Nandi Colon**, Fiscal Administrative Supervisor for CHRO. On the long report, which is the CFSR, which is on the 8 ½ by, 14 I am projecting a very large surplus on personal services. As you know we have positions that have been vacant for quite some time and the money has been budgeted but of course if we don't fill those positions we wind up surplus those monies.

Lobon: Right.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

Colon: Down below in the OE section which is the other expense section I am projecting a deficit there and part of the reason for the deficit is attributed to the local and long distance line item. In particular to the new phone system that was installed in Waterbury, Rowland center quite some years ago when that building went up I was just informed about two weeks ago Mr. Ingram, that the cost of what they call a call accounting system was being absorbed by the Department of Office, the Department of Information Technology. They have since; you already know where I'm going. They have since distributed those costs to all the agencies that are housed in that building as a result we were hit with a cost of \$11,000 dollars, which we were not anticipating. And that only covered to the period of December there will be other charges, which I am not yet aware of. I did email DOIT but I haven't got a response back. So they will let me know what the cost would be from January 06 through the end of this fiscal year. I also have been in communication with the Office of Policy and Management about this matter. So they are aware of what's happening and it's statewide. If you have any questions I will try to answer them.

Lobon: Any questions from the Commissioners? Don't over kill it now.

Rhodes: I just want to ask a question in terms of the year 2006 – 2007. This cost for the phone system, which is being allocated, that will be included in our next budget?

Colon: Yes.

Rhodes: That's all.

Lobon: Any other questions from the Commissioners? Thank you very much.

Colon: I would go over the other report but you already know what our vacancies are we still have six vacancies so lets hope that they do get filled right away. Thank you.

Lobon: Thank you.

Ingram: As an adjunct to Ms. **Colon's** report we will be bringing an hearings adjudicator within the next few weeks. And this position will substantially impact our agency in a couple of areas. One, in terms of backlog reduction, secondly, in terms of moving cases along a little bit faster because investigators no longer will have the responsibility of doing all the mediation. And thirdly, in terms of our

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

settlement count, our dollar count should increase. That concludes my report, thank you.

Lobon: Commissioner **Conaway**.

Conaway: Those six vacancies do those include the two that we just picked up with the closing of the legislature? So is there more than six? Would that mean that there are eight vacancies?

Lobon: No, there's just six.

Colon: Those two new vacancies that we just picked up will be reflected in the fiscal year 06 – 07. What I'm reporting here is strictly 06.

Conaway: Current.

Colon: Yes.

Conaway: Thank you.

Colon: You're very welcome.

Conaway: I'm sorry that you had to stand up.

Colon: Quite all right.

Lobon: Commissioner **Griffin**.

Griffin: You mentioned um, I guess a new position on a hearing adjudicator. Do you have a description of that?

Ingram: Yes.

Griffin: Could we possibly have a description just to look at?

Ingram: Sure.

Lobon: Any other questions from the Commissioner's? None, okay, New Business.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Request for two Contract Compliance Exemptions from the Office of the State Treasurer Involving Proposed Contracts with Oaktree Capital Management LLC and with AEW Capital Management.

Pech: Good afternoon Commissioners. For purposes of Commissioner **Brown**, welcome. My name is **Ray Pech**, **Raymond Pech** to be formal but I'm never formal. I am the Assistant Director of the commission. I have a couple of things to present today. My topic seems to be New Business month after month but. The first is a contract compliance exemption request. This one comes from the Treasures office. If you look at the memo that I sent out that was sent out with the packet I actually referenced two but I hadn't gotten to the second one yet. As it turned out I asked some questions of Ms. **LaMar** from the Treasurer's office and as a result of those questions the Treasures office on their own determined that perhaps the entity with whom they were dealing shouldn't have an exemption and maybe shouldn't even be used, so, they are deferring that request, that is a fair statement. So, anyway you don't have that one to act on.

The request before you involves a company in Massachusetts called AEW Capital Management. This is something that certainly I and other state employees should be interested in because what this deals with is the investment of our pension funds and certainly hope that that's a profitable investment so that we can retire and have some money to live on. But AEW is a Massachusetts company that invests in residential property chiefly apartments. Some of which but not many are in Connecticut the rest are out of state. Unlike most of the requests that are before you AEW itself doesn't really want an exemption. They don't mind the language of our statutes. The issue is that AEW inturn has to contract with maintenance folks, with legal folks to do the purchases and so forth for the properties that they acquire, with renovations folks, with repairs all that stuff. Obviously they need to use people local to the community where the complexes are located; it's obvious you are not going to hire a firm in Connecticut to go up to New Hampshire for instance to do lawn maintenance on a complex up there, so the request is on behalf of the folks with whom they contract to do this maintenance work that they be exempted from the language of 4a-60 and 60a. And I have researched it and discussed it with the director and we have no objections, we think that the request ought to be granted.

Griffin: Can I make a motion?

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

Lobon: Yeah, you can make a motion Commissioner **Griffin**.

Griffin: I make a ...

Conaway: So moved.

Lobon: Who's going to make the motion here? Commissioner **Conaway** makes the motion. And seconded by?

Griffin: Second.

Lobon: Okay, motion made by Commissioner **Conaway** and seconded by Commissioner Griffin to approve the request for contract compliance exemption from the Office of State Treasurer involving proposed contracts with Oak Tree Capital Management LL, no AEW Capital Management. Any other discussion?

Norton: I have a question.

Lobon: Question from Commissioner **Norton**.

Norton: So the treasurer is going to throw money at AEW to go invest in some, in this case, properties in Massachusetts?

Pech: I think several states.

Norton: Okay, the company is located in Massachusetts.

Pech: Right.

Norton: And then they say oh we don't mind and one of the reasons you say is that they don't object at the exemption request will not involve the employment or recruitment of workers within the state in the contract with AEW does not object to the language of our statutes. We give them the exemption now what does it matter if they don't, let's say that they own a shopping plaza in Holyoke or I don't know...

Pech: Okay.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

Norton: Um, they don't object to our statutes, which means our statutes would say you can't discriminate based on race, creed, etc. They don't object which means that they will be bound by that language.

Pech: AEW will be in fulfilling its contract with the state.

Norton: Well, but I mean in any case putting money in their business. So, then they hire a landscaper or a painter or a HVAC consultant or whatever then those people though wouldn't be bound to follow our non-discrimination statutes.

Pech: They would have to follow the statutes in the state in which they are located. And I suspect one of the reasons AEW doesn't have any objection to bind itself is that Massachusetts laws are quite similar to ours in terms of the protection that they offer.

Norton: But Massachusetts would only bind AEW not everyone that they do business with. Well I'm sorry if their business is located in Massachusetts.

Pech: Right, and if it's in Maine. There are statutes in all the local states. Some are stronger than others are. Ours and Massachusetts is probably the strongest.

Norton: So when you say it's a good sign that AEW does not object to our statutes nonetheless they're non-objection only related to their employees and their employment practice right.

Pech: That's correct for the people doing the investing our money.

Norton: But what you're saying is, I guess the upshot is it wouldn't be feasible to demand of them to demand of their subcontractors that they sign up with our language.

Pech: Well they can demand of their subcontractors whatever they like but the bottom line is their subcontractors are out of state. They are going to bound by the laws of whatever state there in and they have to comply with those laws. As a sovereign entity we cannot impose our laws on companies located in the state of Massachusetts.

Norton: I know but we can make...

Pech: That are not doing business here.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

Norton: But we can make any contractor with the state of Connecticut only subcontract with people who would have language in those contracts that offer the same protection as we do.

Pech: Well we could but one of the bases that is in the regs and in the statutes for exemptions is when the work is located out of State and doesn't involve the recruitment of state workers within the state of Connecticut.

Norton: What the point, why would you need that? Why would you need to enter contract language with someone in Connecticut they are already bound by our laws.

Pech: It's just a reaffirmation and besides 4a-60 and 60a contain additional language other than simply you won't discriminate on the basis of all the protected classes. It also can require that the contractor provide the commission with whatever information we may require to review their employment practices. And it also has some small business set aside stuff that is not part of the normal you won't discriminate on this basis kind of language. So there are additional things it's not simply a provision of certain discrimination.

Norton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Lobon: You're welcome Commissioner Norton. Any other questions? Okay, a motion has been made to approve, all those in favor state it by saying "Aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" The "Ayes" have it.

B. Discussion of Naming Subcommittees:

Pech: Next up under New Business is a discussion of subcommittees. This is probably Old Business but I'm following on the legislative report. I wanted to bring your attention again and you don't necessarily have to vote it today, you might want to think on it because the legislative session is done for this session but if you recall back in I believe it was January perhaps December the Commission voted that any legislative proposals that the Commission put forth would be run through

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

you before it went to OPM before they went to OPM. The issue that came up in the session itself in addition to the proposals that we put forth there were a number of proposals on which we were invited to provide testimony not that we put forth the proposal but things in which we had an interest. For instance there was a Bill, there was a Bill that right now under regulations under the Department of Labor in order to qualify for unemployment you must be eligible for quote full-time employment. We've seen for a number of years in fact we are currently in a case that's at the Supreme Court on this issue that, that potentially discriminates or has an impact against persons with disabilities who may not be available full-time work. Who in fact work part-time permanently, got laid off, were contributing or their employer on their behalf was contributing to the unemployment compensation fund, and then they get laid off and they turn around to apply for unemployment and they can't get it because they are not available for full-time work.

So, although we didn't put that forward we were asked to provide testimony on it and we did. And I don't think that was anything that the Commission would find objectionable. And there was some other Bills but the fact remains that if you want to be fully apprised of whatever we are doing at the legislature sometimes we get these calls and know that it is coming up for testimony next week we can't wait for your next meeting to see whether you folks have any problems with us providing testimony on a Bill. So, we really need to have somebody who's Chair of a subcommittee on legislation for instance that we can call and say we have been asked to give testimony next Monday on such an such a Bill do you see any problem? And so as I said you don't have to set this up today because the session is over but certainly hopefully well before the next one starts. You can give it some thought and maybe set up such a subcommittee so that we can proceed. And there maybe there are other subcommittees that you may want to talk about too but that's another topic. And any questions on that?

Lobon: Any questions from the Commissioner's? Thank you, Ray.

Pech: The other only thing I want to point out is under the in think it is in the correspondence section of your mailing you will see a very pretty colorful power point presentation to the State Contracting Board. I just want to give you a very brief overview of what that was about. The State Contracting Board was an out growth through the State Contracting Reform Task Force that was appointed by Governor **Reil** right after she was sworn in. In reaction to the indiscretion shall we say that had gone on prior with respect to contracting and in fact our former Chair **Amalia Vazquez Bzdyra** is the Chair of the contracting (inaudible.) Over the last six-months or so they have invited most of the major agencies that do contracting

to testify before them about their contracting process. We were the last agency to testify and that is what that power point is about. Our presentation was not so much about our contracting practices because frankly we don't contract very much most of our stuff is for services, paper copiers so forth and it is all run through DAS. But as you now we had a very large part to play in the contracting process of other state agencies with respect to contract compliance. So, this presentation was to the board on how we fit in to the overall process, issues we see, you will see there is a lot of pages in there named issues, things that we believe need to be reformed to make contract compliance a more vital part of the process if you will to make sure that we in fact are more and more of the state dollars that go out are being spread evenly among the community one of the various diverse elements of the community. So that's what that's about. I just wanted to explain that and um, that's it for me. Thank you very much.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Lobon: Thank you. Can I get a motion to move into executive session?

Rhodes: So moved.

Marshall: Second.

Lobon: Motion has been made by Commissioner **Rhodes** and seconded by Commissioner **Marshall**. All those in favor?

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

- A. Report on Pending Claims or Pending Litigation:
1. Leonyer Richardson v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV625AVC
 2. Jewel E. Brown v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV223CFD
 3. Femi Bogle Assegai v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV2292JCH

B. Reopening Request:

1. Garcia v. Claywell Electric, No. 0510199
2. Perelli v. John C. Hackley, No. 0650024

C. Personnel Matters:

VI. RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:

Lobon: Okay. Can I get a vote to bring us out of Executive Session?

Rhodes: So moved.

Lobon: It's been moved by Commissioner **Rhodes**.

Norton: Second

Lobon: Seconded by Commissioner Norton. All those in favor state by saying "aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" The "Ayes" have it.

Rhodes: Can we wait till...?

Lobon: Do we have to?

Lobon: Let the record show that there were no votes taken in Executive Session.

VII. VOTE ON EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS:

A. Pending Litigation:

Report on Pending Federal Court Litigation: No Discussion, No vote.

1. Leonyer Richardson v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV625AVC
2. Jewel E. Brown v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV223CFD
3. Femi Bogle Assegai v. CT Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Docket No. 3:02CV2292JCH

B. Reopening Request:

1. Garcia v. Claywell Electric, No. 0510199
2. Perelli v. John C. Hackley, No. 0650024

Lobon: Can I get a motion for **Garcia v. Claywell Electric**, No. 0510199?

Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we reopen that case.

Lobon: Motion has been made to reopen the **Garcia v. Claywell Electric** case. Can I get a second?

Brown: Second.

Lobon: Seconded by Commissioner **Brown**. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor state by saying "aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" The "Ayes" have it. Number two **Perelli v. Hackley**. Can I get a motion?

Rhodes: Mr. Chairman I make a motion that we not reopen that case.

CHRO Commission Meeting
Minutes
May 11, 2005

Lobon: Motion has been made by Commissioner **Rhodes** to not reopen the case.

Mambruno: Second.

Lobon: Second by Commissioner **Mambruno**. Any discussion? Hearing none all those in favor state it by saying "aye."

Mengual, Rhodes, Conaway, Brown, Norton, Mambruno, Griffin, and Marshall: "Aye."

Lobon: "Abstentions?" "Oppositions?" Hearing none the case will not be open, reopened excuse me.

B. Personnel Matters:

Lobon: Personnel matters, I see there are no personnel matters? All right, can I get the favorite one?

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Commission, it was moved by Commissioner **Rhodes** and seconded by Commissioner **Conaway** to adjourn the meeting at approximately 4:19 p.m. The motion carried with Commissioners **Marshall, Brown, Mambruno, Norton, Griffin** and **Mengual** voting in the affirmative.

XI. CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is the official record of the Commission's May 11, 2006 Regular Commission Meeting, and that these minutes were adopted as true, accurate, and authentic by majority vote of the Commissioners present and voting at the June 8, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Commission.

Attest: _____
Benjamin F. Rhodes, Jr.
Secretary

_____ Date