

## Legislative History for Connecticut Act

### PA 15-151

HB5660

House	5457-5461	4
Senate	3137, 3141-3143	4
Commerce	329-334, 468-472	11
		<b>19</b>

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public  
Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives  
Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2017

**H - 1217**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2015**

**VOL.58  
PART 16  
5254 - 5587**

/kc  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 27, 2015

Absent and not voting 9

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

The bill, as amended, has passed. [gavel]

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 258.

CLERK:

On Page 12, House Calendar 258, Favorable  
Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Commerce.  
House Bill 566 - excuse me, 660, AN ACT CONCERNING  
THE RETURN OR USE OF UNUSED GRANTS AWARDS FROM THE  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

HB5660

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Representative Perone.

REP. PERONE (137<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk  
put it beautifully. Essentially, this - I move for  
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable  
Report and passage of bill.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Question's on acceptance of the Joint  
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the  
bill. Will you remark, sir.

REP. PERONE (137<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Essentially, the bill requires the Department of

/kc  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 27, 2015

Economic and Community Development to include in its grant the date that the grant must either be returned unused grant money or applied for authorization to use grant money for another purpose. Through you.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you, sir. Further on the bill that's before us. Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151<sup>st</sup>):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like the good gentleman, the Commerce Chairman stated, this is a good bill for the taxpayer. I want to thank him for bringing it out. And also Representative Lavielle for bringing this forward. It does as he stated. It requires the money that's being granted to be spent for that purpose or returned or coming back for reauthorization for a different use.

Thanks, and I urge passage of the bill. Thank you.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you, sir. Further on the bill that's before us? Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143<sup>rd</sup>):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Obviously I rise in very strong support of the bill. I want to

/kc  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 27, 2015

thank the Chairs, including my good colleague from Norwalk, Representative Perone and Representative Camillo for their support of this bill. And I think it will go a long way to helping the DECD keep track of and manage the unused funds that are - that remain after it's provided a grant or some other financial assistance to companies in Connecticut.

And it will also provide transparency and accountability to taxpayers concerning how their funds are being used for economic development. And finally, it will help to assess the return on investment of taxpayer dollars in business expansion and job creation. So thank you very much. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you, madam. Further on the bill that's before us? Representative Boukus.

REP. BOUKUS (22<sup>nd</sup>):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to refer to the Department of Economic Community Development as to the area in which they wish to put this caveat on that it be awarded within a year. There are many other agencies that

/kc  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

446  
May 27, 2015

also provide grants. And I just offer that information to you.

But the other thing is this report that you've recognized from 2011, I found since that time that the Department of Economic and Community Development have done an excellent job in making sure the funds are not spent for anything other than it was intended. And I just offer to you, I'd be more than happy to hear from anyone that is seeing otherwise in the last four years because I would like to look into that myself. Thank you.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Thank you, madam. Further on the bill before us? Further on the bill before us? If not, staff and guests to the Well of the House. Members, take your seats. The machine will be open.

CLERK:

[bell ringing] The House of Representatives is voting by roll. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please return to the Chamber immediately.

[pause]

/kc  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 27, 2015

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

H.B. 5660

Total Number Voting 142

Necessary for Passage 72

Those voting Yea 142

Those voting Nay 0

Absent and not voting 9

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

The bill is passed. [gavel] All right.

Mr. Clerk, is there anything further business on your desk?

CLERK:

Yes. Favorable report. Substitute Senate Bill 1078, AN ACT CONCERNING AFFORDABLE AND RELIABLE ENERGY.

REP. SHARKEY (88<sup>th</sup>):

Representative Aresimowicz.

**S - 688  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2015**

**VOL. 58  
PART 10  
2993 – 3245**



/t1  
SENATE

151  
June 2, 2015

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 18,  
Calendar 566, House Bill 6138. I'd like to place that  
item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF:

On Calendar Page 23, Calendar 606, House Bill 5660.  
I'd like to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF:

On Calendar Page 30, Calendar 645, House Bill 6943.  
I'd like to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 24,  
Calendar 610, House Bill 7050. I'd like to place that  
item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 18,  
Calendar 571, House Bill 5092. I'd like to place that  
item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

/tl  
SENATE

155  
June 2, 2015

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6915. Page 4, Calendar 383 -

THE CHAIR:

Hold on a minute. Mr. Clerk, you're gonna have to use your microphone so we can hear you, please. I apologize. Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 382, House Bill 6915. Page 4, Calendar 383, House Bill 6723. Page 5, Calendar 390, House Bill 6317. Page 5, Calendar 437, House Bill 6771. Page 5, 438, House Bill 6772. On Page 6, Calendar 439, House Bill 6259. On Page 8, Calendar 480, House Bill 6910.

On Page 8 also, Calendar 481, House Bill 6978, and on Page 9, Calendar 500, House Bill 6579. On Page 10, Calendar 502, House Bill 6868. Page 11, Calendar 511, House Bill 6937. Also on Page 11, Calendar 513, House Bill 6986, and on Page 12, Calendar 515, House Bill 6902.

Also on Page 12, Calendar 521, House Bill 6971. On Page 12 again, Calendar 522, House Bill 6834. Page 12, Calendar 518, House Bill 6770. On Page 13, Calendar 524, House Bill 6997. Also on Page 13, Calendar 525, House Bill 6984, and on Page 14, Calendar 530, House Bill 6977.

Also on Page 14, Calendar 531, House Bill 6994. Page 15, Calendar 535, House Bill 6730. Page 17, Calendar 552, House Bill 6884. Page 17, Calendar 557, House Bill 6155. On Page 18, Calendar 564, House Bill 7000. Page 18 again, 566, House Bill 6138. Also on Page 18, Calendar 571, House Bill 5092, and on Page 19, Calendar 577, House Bill 6853.

On Page 20, Calendar 585, House Bill 6571. Page 20, Calendar 578, House Bill 6852. On Page 23, Calendar 606, House Bill 5660, and on Page 24, Calendar 609, House Bill 5257. Page 24, Calendar 611, House Bill 7060. Page 24, Calendar 610, House Bill 7050. On Page 25, Calendar 617, House Bill 6020.

/t1  
SENATE

156  
June 2, 2015

On Page 26, Calendar 619, House Bill 6750. Also on Page 26, Calendar 620, House Bill 6745. Page 27, Calendar 627, House Bill 5101. Page 29, Calendar 635, House Bill 5110. Also on Page 29, Calendar 641, House Bill 6967. On Page 30, Calendar 645, House Bill 6943, and also on Page 30, Calendar 642, 6707.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We're adding - we have to add one more. Hold on for one second, please.

[pause]

THE CLERK:

On - and the last item is on Page 19, Calendar 576, House Bill 6976.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call - hold on a minute. There's a question. Senator Kelly, you have a question? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President. That last item on Page 19, the Clerk called 576, House Bill 6976. Was it supposed to be 57 - Calendar No. 575, 6975?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President. And thanks to Senator Kelly for the - catching that. Yes, it is Calendar 575, House Bill 6975.

THE CHAIR:

6975.

THE CLERK:

/tl  
SENATE

157  
June 2, 2015

And that is Page 19, Calendar 575, House Bill 6975.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any other corrections anybody has? If not, at this time, Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote on the Consent Calendar. The machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.  
Immediate roll call on today's Consent Calendar has been ordered in the Senate.

[pause]

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted. The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, please call a tally. You wanna call on the Consent Calendar? Yes, it's closed. It's closed on the machine here.

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar

Total Number Voting	36
Necessary for Passage	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Absent/not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. [gavel] Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF:

Thank you, Madam President. Before we adjourn, I'd like to yield for any points or announcements.

THE CHAIR:

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**COMMERCE  
1 – 536**

**2015  
INDEX**

REP. LAVIELLE: I am here this morning to testify in support of House Bill 5660 which is an ACT CONCERNING THE PROPER USE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE and I did not identify myself. I am Representative Gayle Lavielle 143rd District, which is Wilton, Norwalk and Westport.

The impetus behind this bill was very simply an audit report from the public -- from the Auditors of Public Accounts that came out this November on the DECD and it replicated some of the findings of an audit report from two years previously and before I say anything, I know that often when we introduce bills like this that are designed to improve agency procedures, very often the agency will come back and say 'You can't do that to us. That's going to ruin the way we function. We didn't do it. Its going to constrain the way we operate.' And actually I think that this proposal would be helpful to the DECD.

It actually helps it do what it's trying to do anyway and the audit found a couple of things. One was that when grants or other types of funding -- funding mechanisms have been used to give funds to businesses that sometimes they are in excess of the needs for the project that was used in the application and then instead of having the business refund the money, the business has been allowed to keep the money and use it for something else, usually, I understand, a related project but that's not always clear.

Secondly, when there are excess funds and they're not used for anything else, sometimes it has taken up to three years for those funds to be refunded to the DECD. So the idea here would be two fold. One, to require businesses, if they do have excess funds and they would like to use them for a related project, that they be allowed to do it if they submit a clear application for the use of those excess

funds and if its approved by the DECD, just so that it's on record what they're being used for, why, and if taxpayers want to know what it was, it's available.

Secondly, that a time limit be specified for the return of unused funds and I believed the audit indicated that in -- that the -- in the period that they covered and the samples they used those amounts varied of funds that were returned after the span of one year was between \$17,000.00 and \$43,000.00 or something like that. So, that there be a specified time limit for the return of the funds. I suggested here for example one year, but that might be too short, not sure. That's essentially it and I think really that this would help DECD to enforce what they're already trying to do if this were clear in statute, it would help them manage available funds, assure the appropriate and transparent use of taxpayer dollars and also it would help assess the return on the investment of taxpayer dollars in business expansion and job creation because any funds unused would be returned in a reasonable amount of time. Thank you very much.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Thank you very much and also for this bill. I have not seen the audit report but I'm certainly going to look at it now.

REP. LAVIELLE: I've attached the three related pages to the testimony for your reference.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Easy read. Thanks. Yes, Representative Camillo. And then Chair Perone.

REPRESENTATIVE CAMILLO: Thank you Madam Chair. Good morning, Representative. I just have one quick question and then a comment. When was the audit --did you say when the audit was performed?

REP. LAVIELLE: It was --the report was delivered in

November of 2014 and there is a link to the whole report in my testimony.

REP. CAMILLO: Okay thanks. So, it's relatively recent. I'm trying to find something negative with this but I really can't. I think it's a great idea. Certainly when we're looking at all these deficits, present and future, and tax payers money is out there, it thing it's a win for everybody. So, I salute you for bringing this bill forward.

REP. LAVIELLE: Thank you.

REP. PERONE: Welcome back. Been saying that a lot this morning. Great to see you. I'm sorry I missed your testimony last week in another bill.

I just -- just off my initial reaction when I saw this was -- I keyed in on the word proper in the title and the reason I did was because of the-- just basically its open to interpretation and I was thinking more and more about it and I -- what really struck me was -- first of all, I like the concept of seeing that - it just seems to make a lot of sense, returning money that's not used.

I think what I'm struggling with is the framework that would be applied to this concept where for exam -- which treats all entities the same when in fact you have some businesses that are very capital intensive you have some businesses where they're not going to meet capital as much capital until further down the pike so they might need to hang onto the money they get from the DECD longer. So, I guess in that sense, did the audit report make any allowances for different entities, different kinds of businesses that have different you know cash flow needs throughout the life cycle of their starting up?

REP. LAVIELLE: Well, there's quite a dialogue in the audit report between the auditors and the DECD



because in certain cases, DECD responds and then the auditors come back and the -- I think the spirit -- first off I would note, and I always find this amusing, you know (inaudible) with the titles -- the bills. Certainly, proper is open to interpretation. I'm not sure that I would have chosen that word myself but the spirit of this really is, if you've applied for a project and that project is going to take quite a long time to realize, then you applied for it, you got the approval, you should hang on to those funds until that project is finished. I think that what DECD was indicating was that a project had been closed and it was done and the funds were scheduled to be returned, there was no doubt that they were to be returned. There was no ambiguity and yet they weren't and that was my sense of the read and you know, you can --

REP. PERONE: That certainly makes it much clearer. So, I agree with you. So, I think that's pretty much all I have to -- the only question I had. Representative Becker. Thank you, by the way.

REP. LAVIELLE: Sure, thank you.

REP. BECKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good to see you, Representative again in this room like Representative Berger, spending a lot of time here before. In looking at the actual language of your bill, it appears to me that the only real change that you're asking for is to include all economic development projects rather than only those that are threshold projects.

So, right now, the rules apply to threshold projects and you're seeking to expand it to any economic development project. Is that correct?

REP. LAVIELLE: And let me respond to that exactly the way it happened. I, you know what the process is when you -- and I'm not an attorney like you are,

but when you submit a draft bill to LCO, you put in what you want to say and then they make it refer to the statutes and when I saw the way that the bill was drafted, I had never heard of a threshold project. So this apparently was the easiest way for -- to make this apply in statute as opposed to actually writing it out the way that we had it. I mean, I was specific about the intent of the bill, as you see it sort of written out here on the second page of my testimony.

So, I would not have, myself, thought to phrase it in terms of this happens for threshold projects, I'd like it for all economic development projects, but would my intent be to apply it to all economic development projects? Yes.

REP. BECKER: Well, I appreciate your answer and I appreciate the fact that you're not an attorney. I'm just curious as to -- there's a definition in this statute of threshold project and it sets parameters around that and I'm just curious -- you probably won't know the answer to it, but why that was used in the first place to differentiate projects and why it was those projects that were made subject to these rules and not all projects originally.

So, perhaps the DECD may have some thoughts on that that they can share with us, just to -- if there was a reason why it should apply to only certain projects and not all and I don't know the answer to that as is it here.

REP. LAVIELLE: No, it's a good point and I would love to know and I actually looked up the term when I was writing the testimony and I didn't find anything but the, you know I'm sure rather than rewriting an entire statute for this, they looked for something to which it could apply that was already there and then it was a simple matter to change the term.

25  
aac/gbr COMMERCE COMMITTEE

February 26, 2015  
10:00 A.M.

REP. BECKER: Very good. Thank you.

REP. LAVIELLE: Thank you for the question.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Thank you, Representative Becker.  
Further comments? Seeing none. Thanks again for  
bringing this to our attention and spending some  
time this morning.

REP. LAVIELLE: Thank you. I enjoyed it. Thank you very  
much.

SENATOR HARTLEY: Thank you, Representative.  
Representative Jesse MacLachlan? Don't - okay,  
we'll get back -- and then Senator Fasano --

So, seeing that we have come to the conclusion of  
our legislator agency list, we will move on to the  
public sign up sheet and alternate if the other  
signed up representatives do visit with us. I  
would like to beg the indulgence of our public  
signees to ask -- to allow Fran Pastore to be with  
us at this time since I know that you're on a time  
schedule and hopefully this will keep you in safe  
driving mode.

FRAN PASTORE: Thank you, Senator Hartley. Good morning  
Senator Hartley, Representative Perone, Senator  
Frantz, Representative Camillo and esteemed  
members of the Commerce Committee.

It is an honor to speak before you today. My name  
is Fran Pastore. I am the President, CEO and Founder  
of the Women's Business Development Council. We  
have been -- I have been actively engaged in women's  
entrepreneurship and small business ownership  
movement for more than twenty years. I've served  
as a member of President Obama's National Women's  
Business Council. I have a long history of working  
with the Department of Economic and Community  
Development in Connecticut and I am currently a

83542

(4)



**State of Connecticut**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
STATE CAPITOL**

**REPRESENTATIVE GAIL LAVIELLE**  
ONE HUNDRED FORTY-THIRD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200  
300 CAPITOL AVENUE  
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

CAPITOL: (860) 240-8700  
TOLL FREE: (800) 842-1423  
Gail.Lavielle@housegop.ct.gov

**RANKING MEMBER**  
EDUCATION COMMITTEE

**MEMBER**  
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

**Testimony in Support of HB 5660**

**An Act Concerning the Proper Use of Economic Development Financial Assistance**

**Commerce Committee**

**February 26, 2015**

Good morning, Chairs Hartley and Perone, Ranking Members Frantz and Camillo, and distinguished members of the Commerce Committee. Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of HB 5660, An Act Concerning the Proper Use of Economic Development Financial Assistance.

This bill would extend requirements already in place for certain types of projects (referred to in CGS section 32-455 as "threshold" projects) to all agreements with businesses that receive economic development financial assistance from the state.

A November 2014 report by the state Auditors of Public Accounts found that DECD recipients were not returning excess funds to the DECD in a timely manner, and that excess funds distributed were in certain cases being used for activities outside the original scope of approved projects.

I refer the Committee to pages 9-11 of the Auditors' report:  
[http://www.cga.ct.gov/apa/reports/Economic%20and%20Community%20Development,%20Department%20of\\_20141125\\_FY2011,2012.pdf](http://www.cga.ct.gov/apa/reports/Economic%20and%20Community%20Development,%20Department%20of_20141125_FY2011,2012.pdf).

The intent of HB 5660 is to:

- Require businesses that do not use all of the funds they receive for an originally approved purpose to make a formal application to the state that must be approved before they can use the remaining funds for another purpose.
- Require businesses to return to the state any unused funds not pending additional approvals within a specified amount of time (for example, one year) following the completion of any projects for which they have been approved.

This would help state agencies manage available funds and ensure the appropriate and transparent use of taxpayer dollars. It will also help assess the return on the investment of taxpayer dollars in business expansion and job creation.

I thank the Committee for its consideration of this proposal.

**CONDITION OF RECORDS**

Our testing of the Department of Economic and Community Development's records noted the following reportable matters.

**Cash Management**

*Background:* DECD disburses grant funds for housing and economic development programs. Assistance agreements between the department and clients require that the clients submit audit reports to the department. After DECD reviews the audit reports and is satisfied with the accuracy of the total grant expenditures, it issues a Certificate of Approved Program Costs and State Funding. The certificates summarize department payments to the client for the specific project, total client expenditures, any adjustments and the amount due to or from DECD. DECD then bills the client for any amounts due.

*Criteria:* Cash management procedures should ensure that payments to clients are based on immediate needs and refunds of overpayments are received as soon as possible.

*Condition:* In our prior audit, we noted that DECD's cash management procedures appear in need of improvement. During the audited period, the department issued 297 Certificates of Approved Program Costs and State Funding that reflected amounts due to DECD totaling \$1,293,995.

The length of time that clients held unexpended state funds before returning them to DECD seems excessive. For the 15 projects we reviewed, the time between DECD's last payment and receipt of a refund was less than one year for three projects, one to two years for eight projects, two to three years for one project, and more than three years for one project. The amounts of the two refunds due over two and three years were \$48,786 and \$17,910, respectively.

*Effect:* DECD clients received funding in excess of their needs and are not returning those excess funds to the department in a timely manner.

*Cause:* The department has not ensured that clients only receive amounts necessary to meet the cash needs of the funded project or that refunds of overpayments were received in a timely manner.

The assistance agreements are worded so that the client only owes refunds to DECD after the certificate is issued. The client does not have the responsibility for refunding at the end of the budget period or

*Auditors of Public Accounts*

---

upon project completion.

We were informed that instead of receiving a return of funds, it is much easier for the department to allow the grantees to hold the funds, and suggest to the grantees that they may want to expand the funded project with those DECD funds or use the DECD funds for another project. This circumvents the established procedures for processing applications and review of payments to clients.

*Recommendation:* The Department of Economic and Community Development should improve its cash management procedures by only disbursing funds for immediate needs and reducing the time to receive refunds of overpayments. Re-wording assistance agreements should be considered to require earlier refunds. (See Recommendation 1.)

*Agency Response:* "The Department does not agree with this finding.

DECD funds a variety of projects that include multi-million dollar construction developments, downtown infrastructure improvements, acquisition of machinery and equipment, training and other activities. These projects can take several months and even years to complete. In order to meet the scheduling requirements of our funding recipients, there are many cases when DECD will advance funds based on an applicant's project schedule in order to ensure timely payments to vendors and to maintain project schedules. When funds are advanced to a client for a short term, they are based on the eligible expenditures being funded by a particular program. A second advance will not be approved by the Department until the client has provided documentation to the Department that initial advance has been expended or certain milestones are reached.

There are certain programs that require an applicant to match state financing with other sources of funds that may be provided to a project over the entire budget period, which in some cases can take longer to expend. In those cases, however, DECD cannot perform a financial closeout of the project until it is completed, and at that time would determine if funds were due back to DECD.

With regards to remaining project funds, DECD does consider requests to reallocate remaining funds from a project for activities that are related to the original scope of a project. However, DECD would not have its funding recipients retain funds for a new project that has not been reviewed or approved. Any new project would require review and appropriate approvals, which could include bond commission.

*Auditors of Public Accounts*

The Department recognizes the fact of the time involved to receive the return of funds by clients identified by the Auditors as lengthy. The Department also recognizes that there are no established legal or regulatory requirements that unused State funds must be returned within a certain time period. Therefore "timely" becomes a matter of interpretation or circumstance. However, the Department ensures that funds owed to the State are returned. The Department believes that its cash management system provides reasonable assurance that excessive funds are not disbursed to a client and that a client provides a refund to the State as soon as practicable depending on the needs of the project."

*Auditors' Concluding  
Comments:*

We consider a period of over one year to over three years to be excessive for the refund of monies owed to the state. Twelve project overpayments of the 15 (80%) reviewed were not refunded to the state until over one year later.

**Monitoring of Unused Bond Allocations**

- Background:* DECD finances a variety of economic, housing and community development projects using state bond funds approved by the State Bond Commission. The State Bond Commission requires that all unused balances from prior approvals be returned to the unallotted balance under the fund and section of origin once a project is completed or cancelled.
- Criteria:* Written policies and procedures for bond-funded projects should include procedures to monitor unexpended balances from bond-funded projects that are completed or cancelled.
- Condition:* In our three prior audits, we found that the department had not implemented formal policies and procedures to address the administration of unexpended balances on bond-financed projects. Our current review revealed that this condition continued.
- Effect:* The lack of written procedures for monitoring unexpended balances on bond-funded projects lessens the department's assurance that unused bond funds are being returned to their original funding source in a timely manner.
- Cause:* DECD had drafted policies and procedures but they were never approved by the current commissioner.
- Recommendation:* The Department of Economic and Community Development should