

Government Administration and Elections Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-469 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STATE
Title: CONTRACTING STANDARDS BOARD.

Vote Date: 3/23/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/13/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

The Government Administration and Elections Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

The purpose of this bill is to make various revisions to the State Contracting Standards Board which were recommended by the Board.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):

Changes who must document a competitive bidding waiver on the portal from SCSB to DAS, and removes the exception for purchases under \$10,000

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Garrett Eucalitto, Commissioner, Department of Transportation

Comm. Eucalitto argues the bill would expand existing procurement requirements and slow project delivery, risking delays and higher costs for its \$1.5 billion annual capital program. Additional review by the State Contracting Standards Board would further lengthen an already thorough process. The agency notes that contractor rights notification requirements in Section 3 are unnecessary because CTDOT already provides bid protest procedures in its public manual. For Section 4, CTDOT says many proposed privatization analyses (e.g., cost-benefit and service quality reviews) are already performed, but new requirements—such as workforce impact, equity analysis, and transition planning—would require resources the agency does not have. Overall, CTDOT believes the bill would increase administrative burden, costs, and delays, hindering timely infrastructure project delivery.

Tanya Hughes, Executive Director, CHRO

Ms. Hughes testified that CHRO supports Section 4 of this bill. The proposal requires any potentially privatized state services have a comprehensive analysis of the potential impact on protected classes of employees. Privatization efforts often have the unintended consequence of displacing marginalized workers. We encourage adoption of this equity first framework when making decisions to privatize. Section 5 is of concern. Small contracts such as those between \$10,000 and \$25,000 are vital entry points for small businesses to build a performance history with the state. The current threshold serves as an essential guardrail against discretionary awarding of contracts. We oppose Section 5 of this bill.

Joshua Wojcik, Acting Secretary, Office of Policy Management

Secretary Wojcik has several concerns with this bill. Section 1 would empower the SCSB to request potentially unlimited resources without consideration to the fiscal needs and constraints across the entirety of the state government. Section 2 would allow the SCSB to set a minimum on the number of full-time employees required to comply with its current statutory obligations. Section 3 causes additional reporting and duplicative efforts on agencies affecting contracting timeliness, loss of small businesses with their limited resources to contest, and destabilization of awarded contracts due to increased successful contestations. Section 4 adds additional requirements to agencies that will result in substantial delays in the process of contracting for services currently provided in-house and presents a substantial barrier for Executive Branch agencies. For these reasons, he opposes this bill.

Greg Daniels, Executive Director, OGA-SCSB

Mr. Daniels testifies that SCSB supports the bill, stating it makes targeted improvements to procurement without changing the overall system. Key provisions include Clear bidder-rights notices to improve fairness and reduce disputes; stronger disqualification rules to prevent contractors from evading bans by restructuring; updated small-purchase waiver threshold (from \$10K to \$25K) with required documentation and public posting to enhance transparency; enhanced privatization business cases, including workforce and equity impact analyses; minimum staffing and budget protections to ensure SCSB can effectively perform oversight; The Board says these changes improve transparency, consistency, and accountability. However, it requests a technical amendment to Section 5 to clarify waiver posting requirements, ensure consistency in thresholds, and assign posting responsibility to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS).

Rochelle Palache, Chair, OGA-SCSB

Ms. Palache states that The State Contracting Standards Board (SCSB) supports several proposals to strengthen accountability, transparency, and consistency in state contracting. Key proposals include Closing a loophole in disqualification rules by defining “substantially the same entity,” preventing banned contractors from re-entering under new names; Requiring formal notice of bidder rights, ensuring consistency and protecting due process; Securing budget and staffing protections (minimum five staff) to strengthen SCSB’s oversight capacity; Enhancing privatization reviews by requiring analysis of impacts on protected-class workers; Aligning statutes by updating the small-purchase waiver threshold to \$25,000 to match existing law. However, SCSB raises concerns about waiver posting requirements, citing inconsistent thresholds and lack of access to the State Contracting Portal, and recommends further clarification.

Joseph Thompson, AVP and Chief Procurement Officer, University of CT

Mr. Thompson's testimony raises UConn's strong concerns with Section 4, arguing it would create significant administrative burden without improving outcomes.

Key issues of concern are expanded business case requirement language could require full analyses for *all* privatization contracts—including routine renewals—creating ambiguity, duplicating past work, and delaying contracting; new analysis requirements with mandates for protected-class impact, workforce impact, and detailed transition plans are complex, subjective, and resource-intensive, requiring new expertise and significant HR involvement. operational impact that would slow procurement, increase costs, and strain staff, potentially requiring additional hires at agencies like UConn. Our recommendation is restoring the current trigger limiting when business cases are required and narrow or remove the new analysis requirements to avoid unnecessary burden while preserving transparency.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Travis Woodward, President, CSEA SEIU Local 2001

Mr. Woodward supports this bill emphasizing that it strengthens the State Contracting Standards Board's ability to oversee procurement. His key points are that Section 1 protects the Board's funding by allowing it to recommend its own budget and establishes a minimum staffing level of five employees, addressing past understaffing and improving effectiveness. Section 6 prevents disqualified contractors from bypassing bans by changing their business name or structure, protecting taxpayers and ensuring accountability. He highlights the Board's past impact—such as identifying significant cost savings and improving oversight of privatization—and argues the bill will enhance efficiency, accountability, and cost control in state contracting.

Ed Hawthorne, President, CT AFL-CIO

Mr. Hawthorne explains that the State Contracting Standards Board (SCSB) was created to ensure integrity and oversight in state contracting, following past corruption scandals. It oversees procurement, construction contracts, and privatization decisions involving billions in public funds. He supports SB 469, stating the bill strengthens transparency and accountability by requiring clear notice of bidder rights, promoting fairness in the procurement process, ensuring adequate staffing for the Board, improving its oversight capacity, enhancing privatization review requirements and expanding contractor disqualification standards, ensuring better decision-making and contractor integrity. Overall, the bill is viewed as a practical step toward a more transparent, fair, and accountable contracting system for Connecticut.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Anonymous 88, 89, and 95

These three are opposed to the bill for generic reasons.

Reported by: Cindy Panioto

Date: 3/31/26