STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

September 12, 1989

PRESS RELEASE

On June 26, 1989, Ethics Commission Staff Attorney Rachel S. Rubin filed an amended complaint (Docket No. 89-6), alleging two violations of the Code of Ethics, against Mr. Robert W. Plage. Mr. Plage is the Director of Administration and Property Management in the Office of Facilities at the University of Connecticut. A copy of the complaint, as amended, is attached.

On September 11, 1989, the State Ethics Commission and the Respondent settled this matter by entering into a Stipulation and Order, a copy of which is attached. As part of the agreement, the Respondent must make a payment of $2,000.00. In this case, Mr. Plage had information regarding property available for sale to the University. He was only aware of this through the performance of his official duties. As alleged in the Complaint, Mr. Plage made use of this information which resulted in a competitive advantage in a financial transaction (i.e., the purchase of the property offered for sale to the University). This case marks the first time the Commission has found a violation for the use of this type of "inside" information for personal financial gain.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL:

Rachel S. Rubin, Esq.
or
Alan S. Plofsky, Esq.
State Ethics Commission
566-4472

Phone: (203) 566-4472
97 Elm Street — Rear
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
An Equal Opportunity Employer
STIPULATION AND ORDER

1. The Commission finds the Respondent violated Conn. Gen. Stat. §§1-84(c) and 1-86(a) as alleged in the amended Complaint. However, the Commission finds that the violations were unintentional.

2. For purposes of settling this Complaint, the Respondent does not contest the Commission's findings but Respondent states his actions in this matter were unintentional.

3. The Commission finds that the amount of gain to the Respondent was indeterminable. The Respondent, in settlement of this matter, agrees to donate, within sixty days of the date of this Stipulation and Order, the sum of Two Thousand dollars ($2,000) to the UCONN Children's Cancer Fund or to a like-kind organization subject to the Commission's approval. The Respondent makes this donation as a good faith effort to eliminate any financial gain he may have received and to remove any appearance of impropriety as a result of his actions in this matter.

4. The Respondent waives any rights he may have under Conn. Gen. Stat. §§1-82 and 1-82a, including the right to a hearing in this case, and agrees with the State Ethics Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as authorized by Conn. Gen. Stat. §4-177(c).

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and Robert W. Plage agrees to, this order: In lieu of any other action it is authorized to take with respect to this matter, the Commission
orders the Respondent to henceforth comply with the requirements of Conn. Gen. Stat. §§1-84(c) and 1-86(a). In view of the Respondent's charitable payment, the Commission imposes no additional penalty on the Respondent.

Robert W. Plage  
306 Highcrest Rd.  
Wethersfield, CT 06109

Chairperson, State Ethics Commission

9/5/89  
Dated

9/11/89  
Dated
It is hereby alleged that:

1. Robert W. Plage, the Director of Administration and Property Management in the Office of Facilities at the University of Connecticut, (hereinafter the Respondent) is a state employee as defined in Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-79(m).

2. The University of Connecticut (The University) has the right of first refusal when certain properties located adjacent to or near the University campus are offered for sale.

3. The University declined to exercise its option to purchase property located at 1461 Storrs Road, Storrs, Connecticut (Property).

4. The Respondent, in the course of his employment, learned that the Property was available for sale and that the University did not wish to exercise its option to purchase the Property.

5. Thereafter, the Respondent contacted the Seller for the purpose of purchasing the Property.

6. In order to facilitate the purchase, from the time of this contact until on or about October 14, 1986, the Respondent persuaded the Seller not to place the Property on the open market or seek any other buyer.


8. The Respondent's actions were a use of his public office or position to obtain financial gain for himself and/or his spouse in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-84(c).
9. The properties described in paragraph two are connected to the University utility system for which the University sets a use charge for both commercial and residential property owners.

10. The Respondent's employment duties included establishing new utility rates for the properties described in paragraph two.

11. The properties described in paragraph two include the Property.

12. The establishment of the new rates by the Respondent affected the Respondent's financial interests.

13. The Respondent's actions, as described in paragraphs ten and twelve, were in violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-86(a).

Rachel S. Rubin  
Staff Attorney

Dated June 16, 1999