

**Kirk Carr**

62 Prospect Ridge, D4  
Ridgefield, CT 06877  
Kirk.carr@gmail.com  
(203) 505-5818

**CERTIFIED**

**December 15, 2025**

---

**To:**

**Senator Sujata Gadkar-Wilcox, Co-Chair**  
**Representative Lucy Dathan, Co-Chair**  
**Government Oversight Committee**

**CC:**

Senator Rob Sampson, Ranking Member  
Representative Devin Carney, Ranking Member

Connecticut General Assembly  
Legislative Office Building  
300 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106

---

**RE: Request for Legislative Oversight — Ridgefield ACT LoCIP Expenditure & OPM Misinterpretation of CGS § 7-536(i)**

Dear Senator Gadkar-Wilcox and Representative Dathan:

I write to respectfully urge **Connecticut General Assembly Government Oversight Committee** to examine a matter involving the Ridgefield Board of Selectpersons, the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), and the potential misapplication of **Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP)** funds to a politically sensitive expenditure that may violate both statutory and ethical safeguards. The issue transcends one transaction—it exposes ambiguity in the statutory framework and raises questions about accountability, transparency, and oversight.

---

## **Background**

In August 2025, the Town of Ridgefield submitted a LoCIP application seeking a LoCIP authorization of \$230,000 for roof repairs to a town-owned theater building leased by a local nonprofit, **ACT of Connecticut**, whose board includes the spouse of Ridgefield's long-serving First Selectperson, Rudy Marconi. The expenditure was executed without Board of Finance review or a public referendum as required for all capital expenses that exceed \$100,000 by the Ridgefield Charter. The Ridgefield Board of Ethics issued a **probable cause finding** of conflict of interest.

OPM has failed to approve or to deny the application, and despite multiple inquiries and a pending FOIA request (OPM ID #25-113), has not clarified the status or rationale. Most recently, OPM Communications Director Chris Collibee stated the project was handled “via a grant, not an entitlement,” thereby implying that as stated separately by Yvonne Addo that the usual requirements under **CGS § 7-536(e), (f), and (g)** do not apply due to **subsection (i)**. However, the project remains absent from the official list of LoCIP-approved projects as of the latest December 8, 2025 report.

This interpretation, if correct, would allow LoCIP funds to bypass normal accountability measures and transform the program into a discretionary fund with little or no oversight.

---

## Issues Warranting Oversight

### 1. Ambiguity in CGS § 7-536(i):

The June 2023 amendment added subsection (i), stating:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g)...”

OPM appears to misinterpret this as a blanket nullification of all statutory guardrails for qualifying projects. However, legal scholars generally interpret *notwithstanding* clauses narrowly, applying only to the specific provision or context at issue. This broad reading represents an overreach and conflicts with OPM’s LoCIP Guidelines dated February 2025.

### 2. Failure of Transparency and Due Process:

The project was not subject to a referendum, public bid, or independent Board of Finance approval. OPM has provided inconsistent and opaque explanations. The Ridgefield public and the State’s taxpayers are left uninformed and unprotected.

### 3. Potential Ethical and Legal Exposure:

The spouse of the First Selectperson sits on the nonprofit board, which benefited from the lease revision and roof repair. Though the conflict may not be financial, it raises concerns under both Ridgefield’s Charter Section 11-9 and CGS § 1-85, for which Ridgefield’s Board of Ethics issued its “probable cause” finding.

### 4. Systemic Risk:

If this interpretation stands unchallenged, LoCIP could be used statewide to fund politically motivated, non-competitive projects under the pretense of statutory authority—without disclosure or financial controls. Even if this case is isolated, it sets a precedent that undermines the intent of LoCIP.

## Requested Action

I respectfully ask the Government Oversight Committee to:

- **Clarify legislative intent** behind CGS § 7-536(i), including its interaction with subsections (e), (f), and (g),
- **Review the use of LoCIP funds** for non-competitive, non-publicly approved projects not on the town's Capital Improvement Plan under vague "grant" language,
- **Assess whether OPM's discretionary practices** are consistent with the program's purpose and the Assembly's legislative expectations,
- **Examine whether legislative reforms** are warranted to close potential loopholes and to restore transparency.

---

## Supporting Documentation

The following documents are linked in this memorandum emailed separately:

- [Probable Cause Finding of Conflict of Interest by Ridgefield's Ethics Board](#);
- [Affidavit to OPM and Auditor of Public Accounts](#);
- [Ridgefield ACT Roof LoCIP Application](#);
- Ridgefield Capital Improvement Plans FYs [2024](#), [2025](#), and [2026](#);
- Lease agreements for [ACT](#) and [Theater Barn](#);
- [Town meeting minutes](#);
- [ACT's IRS 990 Form \(2024\)](#);
- [OPM correspondence](#) and [conflicting public statements](#);
- [Response to OPM](#);
- [LoCIP Authorization List December 8, 2025](#)

Additional documents and video-recorded statements by the First Selectperson are available online here: <https://www.ridgefieldrecord.com/page-7/>.

---

I make this request as a concerned citizen, not as a partisan. Transparency, fiscal stewardship, and statutory fidelity are shared responsibilities—especially when discretionary authority appears unchecked. I appreciate your time and leadership and stand ready to assist or testify as needed.

Sincerely,

