

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of Complaint by Thomas Mazzarella, Wethersfield,

File No. 2024-001

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The complaint alleges that James Woodworth, Cynthia Greenblatt, and “Keeping Kycia Green” acted together to expend a significant amount of funds to affect the outcome of the municipal election in the Town of Wethersfield, and James Woodworth and Cynthia Greenblatt failed to register a political action committee for “Keeping Kycia Green” and failed to identify its principals and file financial disclosure statements associated with “Keeping Kycia Green.” After an investigation of the complaint, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. According to the complaint, there was a “Keeping Kycia Green,” group that encouraged electors in Wethersfield to vote for Democratic candidates in Row A during the November 7, 2023 election because the town council wanted to turn the Kycia green area into a gravel parking lot.
2. Based on the complaint, the Commission named James Woodworth, Cynthia Greenblatt, and Keeping Kycia Green as Respondents.

Applicable Legal Authority

3. General Statutes § 9-601 provides in pertinent part:
 - (1) “Committee” means a party committee, political committee or a candidate committee organized, as the case may be, for a single primary, election or referendum, or for ongoing political activities, to aid or promote the success or defeat of any political party, any one or more candidates for public office or the position of town committee member or any referendum question.
 - ...
 - (3) “Political committee” means (A) a committee organized by a business entity or organization, (B) persons other than individuals, or two or more individuals organized or acting jointly conducting their activities in or outside the state, (C) an exploratory committee, (D) a committee established by or on behalf of a slate of candidates in a primary for the

office of justice of the peace, but does not mean a candidate committee or a party committee, (E) a legislative caucus committee, or (F) a legislative leadership committee.

4. General Statutes § 9-601b provides in pertinent part:
 - (a) As used in this chapter and chapter 157, the term “expenditure” means:
 - (1) Any purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit or gift of money or anything of value, when made to promote the success or defeat of any candidate seeking the nomination for election, or election, of any person or for the purpose of aiding or promoting the success or defeat of any referendum question or the success or defeat of any political party;
 - (2) Any communication that (A) refers to one or more clearly identified candidates, and (B) is broadcast by radio, television, other than on a public access channel, or by satellite communication or via the Internet, or as a paid-for telephone communication, or appears in a newspaper, magazine or on a billboard, or is sent by mail...
5. General Statutes § 9-602 provides in pertinent part:
 - (a) Except with respect to an individual acting alone, or with respect to a group of two or more individuals acting together that receives funds or makes or incurs expenditures not exceeding one thousand dollars in the aggregate, no contributions may be made, solicited or received and no expenditures, other than independent expenditures, may be made, directly or indirectly, in aid of or in opposition to the candidacy for nomination or election of any individual or any party or referendum question, unless (1) the candidate or chairman of the committee has filed a designation of a treasurer and a depository institution situated in this state as the depository for the committee’s funds, or (2) the candidate has filed a certification in accordance with the provisions of section 9-604. In the case of a political committee, the filing of the statement of organization by the chairman of such committee, in accordance with the provisions of section 9-605, shall constitute compliance with the provisions of this subsection.

Facts Found After an Investigation

6. In response to the complaint, Respondent Greenblatt provided the following statement:

“There is a bipartisan nonprofit 501(c)3 organization in our Town known as The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. I am a member of that organization by having made a \$100 donation in 2023. The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. is not connected with “Keep Kycia Green” which I view as a slogan. This was made clear at an informational meeting of The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. referenced in the Complaint, which I attended, and the Complainant did not. The statement in the Complaint that Keep Kycia Green is an organization and is connected to The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. is false and was directly addressed in answer to a question from a member of the audience at the meeting. I am generally pro-environment in my views, and the idea of Kycia Farm being developed with grass playing fields versus artificial turf made sense to me. I bought 15 signs for approximately \$165, and sought to express my view that natural grass is appropriate for the Kycia Farm property by giving some of them to persons who had similar views about natural grass fields and wanted a sign and by displaying a sign on my front lawn. I never solicited a donation for Kycia Farm, or any political candidate. The total amount of money spent by me is the \$165 for signs and about \$15 for postcards that I felt would encourage people in Town to become informed on the Kycia Farm development plans. I was not involved in the creation of any website. I did share by email some of the Keep Kycia Green opinions, that were already published and in the public sphere, and that mirrored my own pro-environment views and supported natural grass fields...”

7. As for the signs Respondent Greenblatt stated she purchased, Respondent Greenblatt went on to explain the following:

“I bought signs expressing this belief [pro grass field vs. turf], shared some, got reimbursed for some, total out of pocket for me was \$185, I wrote pro-environment emails and post cards; acted independently and not part of any group, and none of the above was done by Friends of Kycia Farms Inc., it was done by me personally...In supporting natural grass fields, I was not raising money for any candidate or group. My husband and I personally donate to candidates for office but in supporting natural

grass fields NONE of my actions related to the Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. have involved giving of money or in-kind donations to candidates. In supporting natural grass fields, I was not working with any candidates or committees when I expressed my views.”

8. From the investigation and review of the complaint, it appears that The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. and “Keeping Kycia Green” are distinct. A search of the business records contained at the Office of the Secretary of the State of Connecticut revealed negative search results for “Keeping Kycia Green” as a registered business entity with the State of Connecticut. According to the records contained at the Office of the Secretary of the State of Connecticut, The Friends of Kycia Green, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization incorporated in the State of Connecticut.
9. The President of The Friends of Kycia Green, Inc. is Respondent Woodworth. Discussions with Respondents Greenblatt and Woodworth and the Wethersfield Town Clerk revealed that “Keeping Kycia Green” was a popular slogan circulating around the community during the time of the filing of the complaint, and there was limited information to determine whether more than one individual was participating in any alleged “Keeping Kycia Green” group.
10. In response to the Commission’s inquiry into whether The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. spent any money on political campaigns, Respondent Woodworth, as President of The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. explicitly stated, “At no time did the Friends of the Kycia Farm, Inc., spend any funds in any political campaign.” Furthermore, the investigation examined emails from Respondents Greenblatt and Woodworth. Both Respondent Greenblatt and Woodworth state that The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc is not politically affiliated and does not spend funds to support political candidates.

Analysis and Conclusion

11. Based on the information gathered, the Commission determines that Respondent Greenblatt was more likely than not acting on her own when she spent \$185 on postcards and signs prior to the November 7, 2023 election. Further, the amount spent by Respondent Greenblatt was less than a thousand dollars.

12. After investigation, the Commission concludes there is insufficient evidence to support the allegation that Respondent Greenblatt violated General Statutes § 9-602.¹
13. After investigation, the Commission determines there is insufficient evidence to confirm that The Friends of Kycia Farm, Inc. is affiliated or responsible for the alleged “Keeping Kycia Green” group.
14. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there is insufficient evidence to sustain a violation of General Statutes § 9-602 or General Statutes § 9-608 by the Respondents as alleged.²
15. Under the narrow and specific facts, the Commission concludes this matter is dismissed.³

¹ Connecticut General Statutes § 9-602.

² Connecticut General Statutes § 9-602; Connecticut General Statutes § 9-608.

³ Connecticut General Statutes § 9-7b.

ORDER

The following Order is issued based on the aforementioned findings and conclusions:

That this matter is dismissed.

Adopted this 20th day of January, 2025 at Hartford, Connecticut.



Stephen T. Penny, Chairman
By Order of the Commission

File No. 2024-001