## Government Oversight Committee: On Deck List (As of 4-28-17)

	Торіс	General Scope
1	Commission on Indigent Legal Services	Effectiveness of the Commission in meeting its     mission
		Economical use of resources
Additional Information		
•	review. Concerns expressed in the request relate to application of financial eligibility requirements in assigning court-appointed attorneys, attorney billing practices, and billing and collection efforts for citizens with assigned attorneys who are required to pay a portion of the attorney fees.	
•	LD 1433, An Act To Create the Office of the Public Defender and Amend the Duties of the Commission on Indigent Legal Services, was introduced during the 127 <sup>th</sup> Legislature. This bill came out of Committee with a divided report. The Ought Not To Pass report was accepted by the House and the bill did not become law. There is an initiative in the current biennial budget bill, LD 390, Part A, that proposes to do the same thing as LD 1433. It can be expected, therefore, that discussion about the Commission will occur at the Appropriations Committee at some point. The proposed budget amounts for the proposed Office of the Public Defender are \$16,364,733 General Fund and \$793,497 Other Special Revenue Funds for FY18, and slightly more for FY19. Proposed budget amounts for the Commission on Indigent Legal Services are \$8,300 General Fund for each of	

the two fiscal years to cover the Commission's revised role.

		Торіс	General Scope
2	F	ndependent Living Services (multiple programs) Responsible Agencies: Department of Labor (DOL) Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Other Additional I	<ul> <li>Alignment of programs and resources with needs of eligible client population;</li> <li>Efficient use of resources;</li> <li>Compliance with State and federal program and funding requirements;</li> <li>Coordination among programs;</li> <li>Effectiveness of programs and services in support of independent living</li> </ul>
		Additional in	monnation
•	exp ma it o Alth	ff the Work Plan and add it to the On Deck List. hough the original review request was specific to the	ng for Independent Living Services and that federally ents are not being followed. The 128 <sup>th</sup> GOC voted to take Independent Living Services Program administered by the
	bro Cor thro ind		g independent living services would be of value. ntends to encompass the multiple programs delivered ered funding, that provide products or services to assist ependently in their homes and communities. These
•	OPEGA's initial research on the Independent Living Services (ILS) Program administered by BRS produced the following information on that program:		
	0	The program assists people who have significant di communities. The program is also an advocacy prog	sabilities to live more independently in their homes and gram for people with disabilities and their families.
	0		et to the availability of funds. The ILS Program is primarily Designated State Entity (DSE) to receive the grant by 's Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC).
	0	Maine to receive the federal grant. The federal state evaluate the implementation of the State Plan and	esponsibility for developing Maine's State Plan for , and approved by, the federal administrators in order for ute also requires the Council to monitor, review, and communicate with the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) specific disability populations and issues under federal
	0	The SILC is incorporated as a Section 501(c)(3) org currently has nineteen members appointed by the C Executive Director.	
	0	provide certain deliverables associated with the feo	ontract that requires SILC to perform certain activities and leral grant. The most recent two contracts include from the federal grant and the remainder from other
	0	in South Portland and Bangor and is currently the o	der a sole source contract with DVR. Alpha One has offices nly entity certified as a Council for Independent Living (CIL) deral ILS Program requires that the services under the ILS of Alpha One is a member of the SILC.
	0	was comprised of \$89,690 in General Fund and \$3	rough September 2016 was for \$475,000. The funding 85,310 Federal Funds, which included \$310,310 from federal Department of Health and Human Services.

- All ILS Program services are carried out through an Independent Living Plan that is mutually agreed upon by the client and an IL counselor. The four core services that every Alpha One office provides are:
  - Individual and Systems Advocacy
  - Information and Referral
  - Individual Independent Living Skills Training
  - Peer Counseling
  - The ILS Program can also purchase products and services to help clients be more independent in their home and/or community
- There is a maximum lifetime expenditure of \$5,000 allowed for each eligible individual served by the ILS Program. The ILS cannot pay for services that are traditionally provided by other state, federal or private agencies. Products and services that support independent living might also be available under other programs administered by DOL's Bureau of Rehabilitation Services and/or DHHS. According to DOL, the ILS Program is designed to be the program of "last resort".
- Individuals found eligible for the ILS Program are prioritized into four categories (Priority 1 being the highest priority). According to DOL, the Program has traditionally had a wait list for services for individuals in Priority categories 3 and 4. Alpha One regularly reports to DVR various performance metrics associated with the wait list, clients served and time to serve.
- According to DOL, in the fall of 2015 Alpha One and SILC discussed concerns about the wait list with the Governor. Alpha One estimated that another \$700,000 in funding would be needed to eliminate the wait list. Following that, DOL worked with DHHS and DOE to explore options for addressing the wait list. This led to a review of current wait list clients, and their needs, by DHHS to determine whether those needs could be met under other programs the clients were already enrolled in.
- As of June 2016, DHHS had reviewed 206 clients on the ILS Program wait list as Priority 3 and 4 and compared them to consumers enrolled in DHHS programs for Chapter 11 and Sections 12, 19, 63 and 96. DHHS found that 93 of those 206 were already enrolled in one of those programs and approximately 62 of them were, or may be, eligible to get some or all of their needs met under these programs, or other programs. DHHS and DOL were in the process of running an updated ILS program wait list against a master file of DHHS programs with components that may cover the needed products and services. This included MaineCare, MaineCare Waivers and Adult Protective Services.
- The 126th Legislature established the Commission on Independent Living and Disability to evaluate the needs of disabled Maine citizens, review existing available resources and services, and develop recommendations regarding expansion of citizen access to particular resources. The Commission's final report in December 2014 made recommendations in eight areas: transportation, education funding, reporting, building codes, public housing, employment, insurance and telehealth/assistive technology. There were no specific recommendations related to the ILS program. LD 949, which implements some of the recommendations from the Commission's report, was passed in the most recent legislative session following an override of a gubernatorial veto.

	Торіс	General Scope			
3	Maine Power Options	Effectiveness of program in meeting its intent			
	Responsible Agency: Maine Municipal Bond Bank Maine Health and Higher Education Authority	<ul> <li>Effectiveness and transparency of Request For proposal and contractor selection process for electricity supply</li> </ul>			
		Public transparency of MPO activities and decisions			
	Additional Information				
•	• The 128 <sup>th</sup> GOC added this topic to the On Deck List after considering a request from a GOC member.				
•	• In 1999, the Legislature passed legislation directing the Maine Municipal Bond Bank and the Maine Health and Higher Education Authority to create an aggregation program to purchase electricity, fuel oil and other commodities on behalf of governmental units (such as municipalities, schools, and sewage and water districts) and other not-for-profit entities in the State. Maine PowerOptions (MPO) was created as an energy-purchasing consortium that serves as an aggregator for Maine's local governmental and non-profit organizations. Maine Power Options group-purchasing programs are designed to increase the buying power of eligible participant organizations for the purchase of fuel oil and electricity. MPO has approximately 820 members statewide.				
•	recommendations for improvements to the program years to select an electricity provider who will offer the				
•	In August 2013, the State's Office of Policy and Management reviewed the MPO Program and reported the results to the Governor's Office in a Draft Advisory White Paper. OPM concluded that: • MPO could not provide evidence demonstrating cost savings for participating members;				
	<ul> <li>MPO could not provide evidence demonstrating</li> <li>Oversight of the program was weak;</li> </ul>	cost savings for participating members,			
	<ul> <li>o the electricity supply contract was a concern; an</li> </ul>	d			
	<ul> <li>MPO participants had numerous alternatives otl</li> </ul>				
		ici than wi o available for procuring chergy.			
•	draft white paper was provided to the Governor's off	EGA that they had no further involvement with MPO after the ice. The Director of the Governor's Energy Office to whom the Governor's Office and OPEGA has no further confirmation			
•	As an energy aggregator, MPO is licensed by the Pub did not receive any calls from consumers in 2016 re	lic Utilities Commission. The PUC reported to OPEGA that they lated to MPO.			
•	In a conversation with OPEGA, the Maine Public Advo and the overall value of the program.	ocates' office did express some concerns with transparency			
•	ranges between \$0 and \$500 based on the entity's	ontracting with the supplier. The one-time membership fee annual electricity expense. The fee is waived if annual ip is voluntary and members are free to explore other options			
•	contracts, as members choosing to participate in the	ate how much its members spend on electricity through its e program select the rate and term which best suit their 6 calendar year electricity consumption by its members, which			
•		of MPO is also not published. MPO points out that favorable pricing, and the legislation that created MPO does not			

• The contracted supplier pays \$19,000 per month to MPO as part of the supplier agreement, which funds the administrative costs to run the program.

mandate cost savings.

	Торіс	General Scope	
4	Public Utilities Commission Responsible Agency: Public Utilities Commission (PUC)	<ul> <li>Assessment of extent to which the PUC independently assesses risks and costs associated with ensuring safe, reasonable and adequate electrical services</li> </ul>	
	Additiona	I Information	
l C l r	<ul> <li>The 126<sup>th</sup> GOC added this review to OPEGA's Work Plan in April 2014 on a 7-4-1 vote after considerable Committee discussion of whether additional work was necessary following OPEGA's 2013 report on the Public Utilities Committee. The review was carried over on OPEGA's Work Plan until 2017 as there were insufficient resources to complete the review given other GOC priorities. The 128<sup>th</sup> GOC voted to move this topic off the Work Plan and onto the On Deck List.</li> </ul>		
• Some 126 <sup>th</sup> GOC members had concerns that the PUC had a tendency to rely on information and analyses provided by the utility companies while disregarding testimony and other information provided by experts on the opposite sides of the matter the PUC was considering. There was also concern that the PUC had not been sufficiently responsive to LD 131 directing the PUC to research and provide a report to the EUT Committee on measures to mitigate the effects of geomagnetic disturbances and electromagnetic pulse on the State's electricity transmission system.			
• 1	• The review is intended to be a study of a sample of cases that have been considered by the PUC.		
	Торіс	General Scope	
5	Publicly Funded Programs for Children Birth to Five Years Responsible Agencies: Department of Education (DOE) Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS	overlap, and coordination, in the State's current programs for children birth to five years	
	Additiona	I Information	
rep res	• The GOC of the 125th Legislature voted this topic On Deck in September 2012 during its consideration of OPEGA's report on Child Development Services. The intention was that OPEGA and the next GOC would review the reported results of the children's task forces that were currently meeting on this topic and consider whether further review of this topic area was needed to identify overlaps and gaps in services.		
of pro	• The 125 <sup>th</sup> Legislature passed LD 568 which had called for creating a stakeholder group to conduct an assessment of this nature including, but not limited to, Child Development Services, public prekindergarten programs and six programs administered by DHHS Bureau of Child and Family Services. That bill was vetoed by the Governor, and consequently, the stakeholder group was not created.		
De Int	<ul> <li>In testimony before the GOC in 2012, DOE described two groups doing work on Birth to 5 learning that the Department felt would cover the area of focus given for this topic. Those groups were the State Agency Interdepartmental Early Learning Team (SIEL) and the Maine Children's Growth Council (MCGC) Sustainability Committee.</li> </ul>		
20	• The Work Plan for SIEL had deadlines on several tasks set at end of June 2013, end of Dec 2013 and end of June 2014. It appears that one of SIEL tasks was to review the results of the MCGC Sustainability Committee and the deadline associated with that task was end of June 2013.		
	January 2017, OPEGA asked DOE to provide informa at came from them. No response has been received	tion on the status of these efforts and any results or reports to date.	
Pre the	<ul> <li>Public Law 2013, Chapter 581. An Act to Establish a Process for the Implementation of Universal Voluntary Public Preschool Programs for Children 4 Years of Age was enacted in the 126<sup>th</sup> Legislature. It established a process for the implementation of public preschool programs including providing start-up, operational, and grant funding and directing the Commissioner of Education to promulgate rules.</li> </ul>		

	Tania	Concercl Coope	
6	Topic State Law Enforcement Agencies' Undercover	General Scope     Approval process for undercover operations	
	Operations	<ul> <li>Oversight of undercover operations</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Controls on the length of the operation</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Funding for undercover operations</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The role of the Attorney General, if any, in Approval or oversight</li> </ul>	
	Additiona	I Information	
Some state law enforcement agencies include undercover work as part of their law-enforcement efforts. The requestors are interested in whether the general policies, procedures, and practices for these activities are ensuring that the operations, while remaining confidential, are carried out in a way that respects the rights of individuals so that citizens will have confidence in the integrity of such operations.			
OPEGA recently requested additional information on this topic from the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Marine Patrol, the Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife, the Department of Agriculture (Maine Forest Service) and the Secretary of State (BMV Office of Investigation). The only response was from the Department of Public Safety saying that the request would be forwarded to the Governor's Office.			
	Торіс	General Scope	
7	Substance Abuse Treatment Programs in Prison System Responsible Agency: Department of Corrections (DOC)	<ul> <li>Effectiveness and/or cost-effectiveness of programs in rehabilitating participants and reducing recidivism</li> </ul>	
	Office of Substance Abuse (OSA)		
	Addition	al Information	
<ul> <li>This topic was added to the On Deck list as the result of a citizen's 2009 request for a review of two specific programs – Correctional Recovery Academy and the Intensive Outpatient Program.</li> </ul>			
• The Maine Department of Corrections offers substance abuse treatment programs at all of its secure adult facilities, including the Maine State Prison (MSP), Maine Correctional Center (MCC), Mountain View Correctional Facility (MVCF), and Women's Center (WC). Additionally, programs are offered at the Bolduc Correctional Facility (BCF) and Women's Reentry Center (WRC). The Department partners with Correct Care Solutions (CCS) and Day One to provide these services.			
• In 2016, the male prisoners admitted into the Department's institutions had the following substance abuse treatment need:			
		tance abuse treatment; tance abuse treatment;	
• In 2	<ul> <li>45% were assessed as needing outpatient subs</li> <li>21% were assessed as needing residential subs</li> <li>33% were assessed as not needing substance a</li> </ul>	tance abuse treatment; tance abuse treatment;	
• In 2 trea	<ul> <li>45% were assessed as needing outpatient subs</li> <li>21% were assessed as needing residential subs</li> <li>33% were assessed as not needing substance a</li> </ul>	tance abuse treatment; tance abuse treatment; abuse treatment; tment's institutions had the following substance abuse tance abuse treatment; ance abuse treatment; nce abuse treatment;	

- Residential Substance Abuse programs
  - The Correctional Recovery Center (MCC) is a 12 month residential substance abuse treatment program, provided by Correct Care Solutions, that has the goal of reducing prisoner's dependency on drugs and alcohol. The Correctional Recovery Center utilizes a therapeutic community structure, which emphasizes routine, structure, and peer-accountability. Upon completion of the program, prisoners either transfer to a minimum security facility or are released to the community. Across the last 18 months, this program has graduated 55 prisoners.
  - The Substance Abuse Unit (MVCF) opened in July 2015 and is a 12 month residential substance abuse treatment program, provided by Day One, focused on reducing prisoner's dependency on drugs and alcohol. This unit utilizes a modified-therapeutic community structure, which emphasizes routine, structure, and peer-accountability. Upon completion of the program, prisoners either transfer to a minimum security facility or are released to the community. Since it opened, this program has graduated 54 prisoners.
- Outpatient Substance Abuse programs
  - The Department offers evidence-based outpatient substance abuse programming at all of its adult facilities (excluding Downeast Correctional Facility). These programs are delivered by Correct Care Solutions.
  - The primary outpatient substance abuse program utilized is Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Substance Abuse, a curriculum developed by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute. This program is approximately six (6) months in duration.
  - The Department offers other outpatient substance abuse programs to both male and female prisoners. Seeking Safety is an outpatient program that addresses both trauma and substance abuse, and may be offered to male and female prisoners. At the female facilities, Co-Dependent No More is also offered.
  - At the minimum security facilities (excluding Downeast Correctional Facility), Living in Balance is also offered to address substance abuse treatment needs in a more flexible manner. This open-enrollment curriculum is focused on substance abuse recovery and is able to be individualized based upon the prisoner's substance abuse treatment needs, allowing for the flexibility needed at a minimum security facility. The program has upto 47 different program lessons to be included in the program delivery.
  - In 2016, 518 male prisoners and 181 female prisoners successfully completed outpatient substance abuse treatment while incarcerated.
- As of July 2012, MDOC entered into a contract with Correct Care Solutions to provide both medical and behavioral health services to the adult and juvenile populations. In July 2015, Correct Care Solutions began providing substance abuse treatment services across the Department's adult facilities. The substance abuse treatment services provided by Correct Care Solutions are paid for by the DOC (general funds), with support from the DHHS SAMHS Office (general funds).
- Also in July 2015, the juvenile facility at Mountain View was repurposed into a secure adult correctional facility
  focused on providing treatment programs to male prisoners. Day One, the previous provider of juvenile substance
  abuse treatment services at this location, was retained and began offering the substance abuse treatment services
  at the Mountain View Correctional Facility, including the Substance Abuse Unit. The services provided by Day One
  are paid for by the DHHS SAMHS Office.