Government Oversight Committee: On Deck List (As of 3-28-17)

	Торіс	General Scope
1	Commission on Indigent Legal Services (Motion failed to move to Work Plan but no motion made to take off On Deck)	 Effectiveness of the Commission in meeting its mission Economical use of resources
	Additional	Information
•	• The 128 th GOC added this topic to the On Deck List after consideration of a legislator-sponsored request for 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.	
•	• The Maine Commission on Indigent Legal Services was established by the Legislature in 2009 to provide high quality representation to Maine citizens who are entitled to counsel at state expense under the United States Constitution or under the Constitution or statutes of Maine. The Commission's mission is to protect the rights of Maine's indigent citizens in courts throughout the State by providing oversight, support, and training to assigned private counsel and to contract counsel. The Commission assumed responsibility for providing indigent legal services on July 1, 2010.	
•	 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 127th 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	Independent Living Services (multiple programs) Responsible Agencies: Department of Labor (DOL) Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Other	 Alignment of programs and resources with needs of eligible client population; Efficient use of resources; Compliance with State and federal program and funding requirements; Coordination among programs; Effectiveness of programs and services in support of independent living
	Additional I	nformation
•	it off the Work Plan and add it to the On Deck List. Although the original review request was specific to the Department of Labor's Division of Vocational Rehabilita broader scope to encompass all State programs offerin Consequently, the general scope approved by the GOC is through State agencies, or supported by State-administ individuals with significant disabilities in living more ind	Independent Living Services and that federally ents are not being followed. The 128 th GOC voted to take Independent Living Services Program administered by the tion (DVR), the GOC determined that a review with a g independent living services would be of value. intends to encompass the multiple programs delivered ered funding, that provide products or services to assist lependently in their homes and communities. These
	products and services will be referred to generally as In	
	OPEGA's initial research on the Independent Living Serv following information on that program:	vices (ILS) Program administered by BRS produced the
		isabilities to live more independently in their homes and gram for people with disabilities and their families.
		ct to the availability of funds. The ILS Program is primarily e Designated State Entity (DSE) to receive the grant by e's Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC).
	Maine to receive the federal grant. The federal stat evaluate the implementation of the State Plan and	responsibility 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
	• The SILC is incorporated as a Section 501(c)(3) org currently has nineteen members appointed by the (Executive Director.	
	provide certain deliverables associated with the fee	ontract that requires SILC to perform certain activities and deral grant. The most recent two contracts include from the federal grant and the remainder from other
	in South Portland and Bangor and is currently the o	nder a sole source contract with DVR. Alpha One has offices only 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.
	was comprised of \$89,690 in General Fund and \$3	rough September 2016 was for \$475,000. The funding 385,310 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 (Motion to put on Work Plan failed, but no motion to take off the On Deck List made) Responsible Agency: Maine Municipal Bond Bank Maine Health and Higher Education Authority	 Effectiveness of program in meeting its intent Effectiveness and transparency of Request For proposal and contractor selection process for electricity supply Public transparency of MPO activities and decisions 	
	Addition	al Information	
•	• The 128 th GOC added this topic to the On Deck List after considering a request from a GOC member.		
•	Higher Education Authority to create an aggregation commodities on behalf of governmental units (such and other not-for-profit entities in the State. Maine P consortium that serves as an aggregator for Maine's Power Options group-purchasing programs are design	the Maine Municipal Bond Bank and the Maine Health and program to purchase electricity, fuel oil and other as municipalities, schools, and sewage and water districts) owerOptions (MPO) was created as an energy-purchasing local governmental and non-profit organizations. Maine and to increase the buying power of eligible participant sity. MPO has approximately 820 members statewide.	
•	recommendations for improvements to the program years to select an electricity provider who will offer the		
•	to the Governor's Office in a Draft Advisory White Pa		
	 MPO could not provide evidence demonstrating 	cost savings for participating members;	
	 Oversight of the program was weak; 		
	• the electricity supply contract was a concern; an		
	 MPO participants had numerous alternatives oth 	ner than MPO available for procuring energy.	
•	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 e 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 Adva 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	

- Information regarding potential savings to members of MPO is also not published. MPO points out that favorable terms and conditions also benefit members beyond pricing, and the legislation that created MPO does not mandate cost savings.
- 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.

	Торіс	General Scope
4	Public Utilities Commission Responsible Agency: Public Utilities Commission (PUC)	 Assessment of extent to which the PUC independently assesses risks and costs associated with ensuring safe, reasonable and adequate electrical services
Additional Information		

- The 126th 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 128th GOC voted to move this topic off the Work Plan and onto the On Deck List.
- Some 126th 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.
- 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)	 Strengths and weaknesses, including gaps, overlap, and coordination, in the State's current programs for children birth to five years 	
	Additional Information		

- 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.
- The 125th 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- In January 2017, OPEGA asked DOE to provide information on the status of these efforts and any results or reports that came from them. No response has been received to date.
- 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 126th 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.

	Торіс	General Scope	
6	Substance Abuse Treatment Programs in Prison System	 Effectiveness and/or cost-effectiveness of programs in rehabilitating participants and reducing recidivism 	
	Responsible Agency: Department of Corrections (DOC) Office of Substance Abuse (OSA)		
Additional Information			

- 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.
- 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:
 - \circ $\,$ 45% were assessed as needing outpatient substance abuse treatment;
 - o 21% were assessed as needing residential substance abuse treatment;
 - o 33% were assessed as not needing substance abuse treatment;
- In 2016, the female prisoners admitted into the Department's institutions had the following substance abuse treatment need:
 - $\circ~77\%$ were assessed as needing outpatient substance abuse treatment;
 - $\circ~~2\%$ were assessed as needing residential substance abuse treatment;
 - $\circ~~2\%$ were assessed as needing individual substance abuse treatment;
 - \circ $\,$ 20% were assessed as not needing substance abuse treatment;
- The Department has two residential substance abuse treatment programs for male prisoners, the Correctional Recovery Center at MCC and the Substance Abuse Unit at MVCF. The remaining treatment programs offered across the facilities are outpatient substance abuse programs.
- 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.