

**EXHIBIT 6**

DOCKET NO.:	:	SUPERIOR COURT
X08-FST-CV19-6044650-S	:	COMPLEX LITIGATION
	:	
IJ GROUP, LLC	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
v.	:	JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
	:	STAMFORD/NORWALK AT
	:	STAMFORD
	:	
CITY OF NORWALK, <i>et al</i>	:	
Defendants	:	JUNE 18, 2021

**IJ GROUP, LLC’S RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF NORWALK’S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiff, IJ GROUP, LLC (the “Plaintiff”), hereby responds to the following interrogatories

**INTERROGATORIES**

1. Identify each and every person who answered or assisted in the preparation of your responses to these Interrogatories.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan and counsel**

2. Identify each and every person from IJ Group, LLC who has or is likely to have information or knowledge regarding the allegations in the Complaint.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

3. Identify of each member of IJ Group, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan and Daniel Groff**

4. Identify of each person that has a direct or indirect ownership interest in IJ Group, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan and Daniel Groff**

5. Identify each of IJ Group, LLC's investors.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan and Daniel Groff**

6. Identify whether IJ Group, LLC, or any of its members, are a party to an operating agreement or partnership agreement concerning and/or relating to the management or operations of IJ Group, LLC, and if so, identify each person who it a party to said agreement.

**RESPONSE: Yes. Jason Milligan and Daniel Groff**

7. For each person or entity identified in Interrogatories 3 through 6, identify the following:

a. Identify each such person that is also a member of any of the following entities

(i) Wall Street Opportunity Fund, LLC

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(ii) Komi Ventures, LLC; or

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(iii) Milligan Real Estate, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

b. Identify each such person that that also has a direct or indirect interest in the following entities:

(i) Wall Street Opportunity Fund, LLC

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(ii) Komi Ventures, LLC; or

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(iii) Milligan Real Estate, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

c. Identify each such person that also is an investor of the following entities:

(i) Wall Street Opportunity Fund, LLC

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(ii) Komi Ventures, LLC; or

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(iii) Milligan Real Estate, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

d. Identify each such person that is also a party to an operating agreement or partnership agreement concerning and/or relating to the management or operation of the following entities:

(i) Wall Street Opportunity Fund, LLC

**RESPONSE: None**

(ii) Komi Ventures, LLC; or

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan**

(iii) Milligan Real Estate, LLC.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

8. Identify each person alleged to have critically questioned the proposed redevelopment plan and/or the validity of its findings as alleged in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

**RESPONSE: Jason Milligan. The people reflected in the Meeting Minutes and verbatim transcript of the January 8, 2019 RDA Regular Meeting, provided herewith.**

9. For each person identified in Interrogatory 8, identify all documents and/or communications:

a. Transmitted to Jason Milligan from said person concerning and/or relating to the allegations in the Complaint.

**RESPONSE:**

b. Transmitted from Jason Milligan to said person concerning and/or relating to the allegations in the Complaint.

**RESPONSE:**

10. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that the RDA intentionally mislead the public and members of the Norwalk Common Counsel are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. Further, Thomas Livingston and Douglas Hempstead testified to the effect that they had been misled or that they were not aware of all pertinent facts. Those deposition transcripts and exhibits also are provided. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 10 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

**These facts include that Strauss and the RDA mandated and directed RPA to utilize an improper and inadequate methodology to determine blight, citing the existence of possible lead paint, possible flood blight, brownfields that do not exist; and environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties, and that RDA further ignore a multiplicity of actual relevant factors. Strauss conspired with Harriman by improperly utilizing data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused as a means to an end, and further disregarded**

**an actual study that did not support the RDA's pre-determined conclusions. Further, the RDA relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Strauss lied to elected and appointed city officials and the public relative to field work she claimed she had undertaken in further support of the blight determination, as well as the factors that were considered by the vendors in their blight determinations. RDA members made changes to the Plan without fully informing the Common Council and other agencies and officials and the public, as to the import and effect of the changes, or providing an ability to track or understand the changes without comparing hundreds of pages side by side. Further the mathematical calculations of Harriman are improper, erroneous and misleading.**

**The blight findings were improper and contrary to state and federal statute; the RDA failed to post the Plan on its website per Connecticut statute, the RDA further failed to provide the public with statutorily required notice and to hold proper public meetings. The RDA further failed to redline and provide notice of changes to the Plan after the January 8, 2019 RDA meeting.**

11. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory voluntarily withdrawn**

12. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory voluntarily withdrawn**

13. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory voluntarily withdrawn**

14. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that Harriman intentionally mislead the public and members of the Norwalk Common Counsel are reflected in the deposition testimony of Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 19 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

**These facts include that Strauss and the RDA mandated and directed RPA to utilize an improper and inadequate methodology to determine blight, citing the existence of possible lead paint, possible flood blight, brownfields that do not exist; and environmental**

**contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties, and that RDA further ignore a multiplicity of actual relevant factors. Strauss conspired with Harriman by improperly utilizing data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused as a means to an end, and further disregarded an actual study that did not support the RDA's pre-determined conclusions. Further, the RDA relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Strauss lied to elected and appointed city officials and the public relative to field work she claimed she had undertaken in further support of the blight determination, as well as the factors that were considered by the vendors in their blight determinations. RDA members made changes to the Plan without fully informing the Common Council and other agencies and officials and the public, as to the import and effect of the changes, or providing an ability to track or understand the changes without comparing hundreds of pages side by side. Further the mathematical calculations of Harriman are improper, erroneous and misleading.**

**The blight findings were improper and contrary to state and federal statute; the RDA failed to post the Plan on its website per Connecticut statute, the RDA further failed to provide the public with statutorily required notice and to hold proper public meetings. The RDA further failed to redline and provide notice of changes to the Plan after the January 8, 2019 RDA meeting.**

15. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 22 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support paragraph 22 of the Complaint are contained in the following documents:**

**The various versions of the 2019 Neighborhood Plan distributed to the members of the Common Counsel, the Planning Committee, the RDA Commissioners, and the public, and the changes in those plans from version to version between January 8, 2019 and March 7, 2019.**

**The Meeting Minutes from those agencies between the same dates.**

**The constantly changing blight determinations and the different versions of the blight determinations submitted to the Planning Committee.**

**See Response to Interrogatory #10.**

**Additional facts are reflected in the deposition testimony of Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 22 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

16. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support paragraph 23 of the Complaint are contained in the following documents:**

**The various versions of the 2019 Neighborhood Plan distributed to the members of the Common Counsel, the Planning Committee, the RDA Commissioners, and the public, and the changes in those plans from version to version between January 8, 2019 and March 7, 2019. Further, there were no redlined versions of the Plan as changes were made.**

**The Meeting Minutes from those agencies between the same dates.**

**The constantly changing blight determinations and the different versions of the blight determinations submitted to the Planning Committee.**

**Additional facts are reflected in the deposition testimony of Tim Sheehan and Tami Strauss relating to the changes made to the Plan between January 8 and March 7. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. Further, the deposition of Emily Innis, and the exhibits thereto, reflects certain of the changes to various versions of the blight determination.**

**To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 23 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

17. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

18. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All emails received by the City of Norwalk prior to the March 12 Meeting are in the possession of the RDA. Milligan obtained those documents through a FOIA request.**

19. Identify each person who is alleged to be “in opposition to the approval of the adoption of the plan” as alleged Paragraph 26 of the Complaint.

**RESPONSE: See response to Interrogatories 8 and 18.**

20. For each person identified in Interrogatory 19, identify all documents and/or communications:

a. Transmitted from Jason Milligan to said person concerning and/or relating to the allegations in the Complaint.

**RESPONSE: Responsive documents provided.**

b. Transmitted to Jason Milligan from said person concerning and/or relating the allegations in the Complaint.

**RESPONSE: Responsive documents provided.**

21. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 31 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: The RDA failed to keep public officials and the public properly and honestly informed relative to changes being made to the Plan, including the blight determination. This included who was hired to perform the blight analysis, and the manner in which the various blight analyses were undertaken. Strauss further misrepresented field work being done by RDA personnel in support of the blight determination. See Sheehan and Strauss deposition transcripts, and the exhibits thereto, copies of which are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 31 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

22. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 36 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

23. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

24. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 40(a) through (c) of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

25. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

26. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that the RDA's finding of blight was arbitrary, unreasonable and illegal are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. Those deposition transcripts and exhibits also are provided. To the best of Milligan's current**

**knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 48 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions. See also response to Interrogatory #10.**

27. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that the RDA's finding of blight was made in bad faith and was an abuse of power are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 49 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

28. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

29. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

30. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

31. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: The Plaintiff's damages include having its privately owned real property located within the redevelopment area subject to improper and unlawful oversight by municipal and quasi municipal agencies; property being subject to taking by eminent domain; diminution of value of property; and making it more expensive and time consuming to do business and procure tenants.**

32. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that there has not been a proper blight determination per Connecticut Statute are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 54 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions. See also Response to Interrogatory #10.**

33. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: The blight determinations cite the existence of possible lead paint, not actual lead paint; the existence of possible flood blight, not actual flood blight; the existence of brownfields that do not exist; and the existence of environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties. Further, Harriman's blight determination cites data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused. Further, the RDA, through Harriman's analysis, relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of**

training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Further, the RDA conducted field work and took photographs to support alleged blighted conditions, lied about the extent of its investigation and findings, citing blight conditions that do not exist.

All facts that support or reflect paragraph 55 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 55 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.

34. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** RPA's blight determination cites the existence of possible lead paint, not actual lead paint; the existence of possible flood blight, not actual flood blight; the existence of brownfields that do not exist; and the existence of environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties. Further, Harriman's blight determination cites data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused. Field work and photographs also contain alleged blighted conditions that do not exist.

All facts that support or reflect paragraph 56 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien,

**Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 55 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

35. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 57 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Strauss conspired with RPA by directing RPA to utilize an inadequate methodology to determine blight, citing the existence of possible lead paint, possible flood blight, brownfields that do not exist; and environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties. Strauss conspired with Harriman by improperly utilizing data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused as a means to an end, and further disregarded an actual study that did not support the RDA's pre-determined conclusions. Further, the RDA and Harriman relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Strauss lied to elected and appointed city officials and the public relative to field work she claimed she had undertaken in further support of the blight determination, as well as the factors that were considered by the vendors in their blight determinations. RDA members made changes to the Plan without**

fully informing the Common Council and other agencies and officials and the public, as to the import and effect of the changes, or providing an ability to track or understand the changes without comparing hundreds of pages side by side. Further the mathematical calculations of Harriman are improper, erroneous and misleading.

All facts that support or reflect paragraph 56 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 57 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.

36. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Strauss and the RDA conspired with RPA by mandating and directing RPA to utilize an improper and inadequate methodology to determine blight, citing the existence of possible lead paint, possible flood blight, brownfields that do not exist; and environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties, and to ignore a multiplicity of actual relevant factors. Strauss conspired with Harriman by improperly utilizing data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused as a means to an end, and further disregarded an actual study that did not support the RDA's pre-determined**

conclusions. Further, the RDA and Harriman relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Strauss lied to elected and appointed city officials and the public relative to field work she claimed she had undertaken in further support of the blight determination, as well as the factors that were considered by the vendors in their blight determinations. RDA members made changes to the Plan without fully informing the Common Council and other agencies and officials and the public, as to the import and effect of the changes, or providing an ability to track or understand the changes without comparing hundreds of pages side by side. Further the mathematical calculations of Harriman are improper, erroneous and misleading.

The blight findings were improper and contrary to state and federal statute; the RDA failed to post the Plan on its website per Connecticut statute, the RDA further failed to provide the public with statutorily required notice and to hold proper public meetings. The RDA further failed to redline and provide notice of changes to the Plan after the January 8, 2019 RDA meeting.

All facts that support or reflect paragraph 58 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of

**paragraph 57 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

37. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 35 and 36. Further, the public and Norwalk City officials were confused about the versions and content of the plans they were receiving, as reflected in the depositions of Doug Hempstead and Thomas Livingston. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. Further, the RDA informed the RDA Commissioners and the public that the RPA Contract had been extended to address public concerns, including issues relating to the blight determination, after which the relationship between the RDA and RPA abruptly and immediately terminated, without notice to the public or Commissioners or other officials, and a new consultant was hired without notice based on a 12-year-old contract with a different company.**

38. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

39. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 61 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Public meetings were canceled, special meetings were scheduled, and schedules were shifted to have the RDA meeting immediately follow the Common Council meeting.**

40. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 62 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: All facts that support or reflect that the RDA's actions were intentional and performed with malice and in deliberate disregard for the intent of urban development under Connecticut statute are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 62 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

41. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: A Redevelopment Plan affecting real property rights was unlawfully advanced without proper notice, publication, and public input, and was based on false, misleading and inadequate information and analysis.**

42. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See response to Interrogatory #31.**

43. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 66 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: Harriman acted in concert with the RDA in bad faith to deliberately mislead the public by utilizing an inadequate methodology, never before used by Harriman, to determine blight, by improperly utilizing data from tax assessment records that was cherry-picked, taken out of context, misapplied and misused as a means to an end. Harriman further disregarded an actual study that did not support the RDA's pre-determined conclusions. Harriman disregarded RDA personnel's failure to provide relevant requested information. Further, the RDA and Harriman relied on Simon Wake, an appraiser from the Norwalk Tax Assessor's Office who specializes in residential real estate assessments, to set**

**the standard for the finding of blight under Connecticut law and Federal regulations, notwithstanding Mr. Wake's admitted lack of training and capacity to do so, and having been informed by the Assistant Assessor Bill O'Brien, in the strongest of terms, not to so utilize Mr. Wake. Further the mathematical calculations of Harriman are improper, erroneous and misleading.**

**All facts that support or reflect paragraph 66 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O'Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 66 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

44. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 67 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory #43.**

45. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 68 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory #43.**

46. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 69 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** See Response to Interrogatory #43. See also, “A Model for Quantitatively Defining Urban Blight by Using Assessment Data” by Morgan B. Gilbreath, Jr. See also, the deposition testimony of Emily Innes, Tim Sheehan, Bill O’Brien, Simon Wake, and Tami Strauss, who testified about the use and the propriety/impropriety of Harriman’s use of the singular assessment data point of “depreciation” in support of Harriman’s blight analysis, and ignoring all other data points. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan’s current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 69 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.

47. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** See Responses to Interrogatory #43 and 46.

48. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 71 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** Harriman’s analysis was utilized to unlawfully and improperly support a blight finding. See also, Response to Interrogatory #31.

49. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 72 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory #31.**

50. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 73 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: RPA conspired to deliberately mislead the public by following Strauss's mandatory directive to utilize an inadequate methodology to determine blight, citing the existence of possible lead paint; possible flood blight; brownfields that do not exist; and environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties, and ignore a multiplicity of actual relevant factors.**

**All facts that support or reflect paragraph 73 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Tim Sheehan, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 73 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

51. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 74 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory #50. Further, Melissa Kaplan Macy testified in her deposition that she followed Strauss's directives in connection with the blight finding, and didn't believe the RPA blight analysis supported the statutory public policy that underlies the State's urban renewal statutes. RPA undertook no actual property inspections and undertook no field work in support of its analysis. RPA admittedly did not analyze criteria and information that would have provided a thorough blight analysis. RPA's analysis was a desktop analysis using outdated, false, improper metrics, data and information.**

**All facts that support or reflect paragraph 74 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Tim Sheehan, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 74 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.**

52. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 75 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** The RPA blight determination cites the existence of possible lead paint, not actual lead paint; the existence of possible flood blight, not actual flood blight; the existence of brownfields that do not exist; and the existence of environmental contamination that does not exist on remediated and redeveloped and improved properties.

All facts that support or reflect paragraph 75 of the Complaint are reflected in the deposition testimony of Melissa Kaplan Macy, Tim Sheehan, and Tami Strauss, including those facts cited above. Those deposition transcripts and the exhibits to those depositions are provided herewith. To the best of Milligan's current knowledge, there are no facts upon which IJ Group relies in support of paragraph 75 that are not contained in those deposition transcripts and exhibits to those depositions.

53. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 76 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** Interrogatory Withdrawn

54. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 77 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE:** See Responses to Interrogatories 51 and 52

55. Identify with specificity all facts concerning and/or relating to the allegation(s) in Paragraph 78 of the Complaint, and identify all documents and/or communications concerning said allegation(s).

**RESPONSE: See Responses to Interrogatories 51 and 52**

56. Identify all communications by and/or between Jason Milligan each of the following persons concerning and/or relating to the allegations in the Complaint.

a. Michael McGuire

**RESPONSE:**

b. Kenneth Olson

**RESPONSE:**

c. Meghan K. Gallagher, Esq.

**RESPONSE:**

d. Donna Smirniotopoulos

**RESPONSE:**

e. Lisa Brinton

**RESPONSE:**

f. Frank Farricker

**RESPONSE:**

g. Jason Enters

**RESPONSE:**

h. John Diaz

**RESPONSE:**

i. Daniel Benjamin, Esq.

**RESPONSE:**

j. Nancy Chapman

**RESPONSE:**

57. Identify each expert witness you expect to call to testify as an expert witness at the trial.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

58. For each expert witness identified in Interrogatory 57 above, identify the following in accordance with Conn. Prac. Book § 13-4.

a. the expert witness's field of expertise.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

b. the subject matter on which the expert witness is expected to offer testimony.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

c. the expert opinions to which the expert witness is expected to testify

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

d. the substance of the grounds for the expert witness's expert opinions.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

d. each written report of the expert witness which may be used at trial.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

e. all documents that may be offered in evidence in lieu of such expert testimony.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

59. For each expert witness identified in Interrogatory 58 above, identify the following.

a. All documents, communications and/or information furnished by the Plaintiff (or the Plaintiff's counsel) to the expert witness.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

b. All documents, communications and/or information relied upon by the expert witness in concerning and and/or relating his/her expert opinions in the above-captioned matter, including but not limited to all articles, publications, records, summaries, deposition transcripts, pleadings, discovery materials, codes, rules, and/or standards.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

c. All documents, communications and/or information the expert witness reviewed, referred to, considered, or was made available to, the expert witness for the purpose of informing the expert witnesses' opinions or conclusions in the above-captioned matter, irrespective of whether the expert witness did or did not rely on such documents, communications and/or information.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

d. All documents, communications and/or information the expert witness reviewed which are, in whole or in part, not consistent with the opinions or conclusions of the expert witness arrived at the above-captioned matter, including but not limited to all articles, publications, records, summaries, deposition transcripts, pleadings, discovery materials, codes, rules, and/or standards.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

e. All documents and/or communications maintained, prepared, and/or rendered in connection with the expert witness's retention in the above-captioned matter and his/her investigation and evaluation of this matter.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

f. All documents and/or communications between the expert witness and the Plaintiff (or its counsel) to the extent that document or communications concern and/or relate to the expert witness's compensation.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

g. All documents and/or communications by and/or between the expert witness and the Plaintiff (or its counsel) to the extent that the documents or communications identify facts or data that the expert was provided and that the expert considered in forming his/her opinions.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

h. All documents and/or communications between the expert witness and the Plaintiff (or its counsel) to the extent that the documents or communications identify assumptions that Plaintiff (or its counsel) provided to the expert witness and that the expert witness relied on in forming his/her opinions.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

i. A listing of any other cases in which the expert witness has been retained as an expert in a civil action, arbitration, and/or agency proceeding, within the preceding ten years, and any opinion reports or letters authored in connection with such actions and/or proceedings.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

60. For each expert witness identified in Interrogatory 59 above, identify a detailed list of all publications which the expert witness authored, or co-authored, and the name of the publication in which the article has appeared, or the name of the publisher who has published the article, and enough information about the publication to enable the Defendant, REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF NORWALK, to obtain it.

**RESPONSE: Interrogatory Withdrawn**

**CERTIFICATION**

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing was sent via certified first class and/or authorized electronic mail this 18th day of June, 2021, to the following parties of record, to wit:

BARCLAY DAMON LLP  
545 LONG WHARF DRIVE  
9TH FLOOR  
NEW HAVEN, CT 06511

/s/ 436252  
Jonathan D. Jacobson