



SEN. EMILY ANN CAIN, SENATE CHAIR
REP. CHUCK KRUGER, HOUSE CHAIR

MEMBERS:

SEN. ROGER KATZ
SEN. DAVID C. BURNS
SEN. MARGARET M. CRAVEN
SEN. CHRISTOPHER K. JOHNSON
SEN. EDWARD M. YOUNGBLOOD
REP. PAUL T. DAVIS, SR.
REP. ANDREA M. BOLAND
REP. H. DAVID COTTA
REP. LANCE E. HARVELL
REP. MATTHEW J. PETERSON

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE
GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY
March 14, 2014
Accepted March 28, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Sen. Cain, called the Government Oversight Committee to order at 9:08 a.m.

ATTENDANCE

Senators:	Sen. Cain, Sen. Katz, Sen. Burns, Sen. Craven, and Sen. Johnson Absent: Sen. Youngblood
Representatives:	Rep. Kruger, Rep. Davis, Rep. Boland, Rep. Cotta, and Rep. Peterson Joining the meeting in progress: Rep. Harvell
Legislative Officers and Staff:	Beth Ashcroft, Director of OPEGA Wendy Cherubini, Senior Analyst, OPEGA Etta Connors, Adm. Secretary, OPEGA
Executive Branch Officers and Staff Providing Information to the Committee:	Linda Pistner, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General Dr. Sheila Pinette, Director, Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention Debra Wigand, Director, Division of Population Health, Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention Andrew Finch, Sr. Program Manager, Division of Population Health, Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention Lisa Sockabasin, Director, Office of Health Equity, Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention Christine Zukas, Deputy Director, Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention

INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The members of the Government Oversight Committee introduced themselves for the benefit of the listening audience.

SUMMARY OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2014 GOC MEETING

The Meeting Summary of February 28, 2014 was accepted as written.

Chair Cain asked if there was objection to taking items out of order. Hearing none, the Committee moved to **Unfinished Business, Follow-up on Healthy Maine Partnerships' FY 13 Contracts and Funding.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- **Follow-up on Healthy Maine Partnerships' FY13 Contracts and Funding**

- **GOC Questions to Maine CDC current and former employees**

Chair Cain said the GOC subpoenaed six individuals to come before the Committee today to answer questions related to the Healthy Maine Partnerships' FY13 Contracts and Funding Report that was completed by OPEGA in December 2013 and revised in January 2014 after public comment and work of the GOC.

For the purposes of today's GOC meeting, Chair Cain wanted to remind the Committee and those at the meeting that the purpose of the Committee's inquiry is to gather sufficient information to understand the root causes and factors of what occurred in order to better assess the GOC's possible actions. The Committee's scope is to further obtain information that was contained in, and issues and concerns arising from, OPEGA's Healthy Maine Partnerships' FY13 Contracts and Funding Report in relation to Maine CDC's decision to change the structure for the delivery and the funding for the Healthy Maine Partnerships, the process used and decisions made in selecting the lead HMP, and the maintenance of documentation supporting that effort. Specifically, the GOC is interested in:

- To what extent DHHS's proposed actions on OPEGA's recommendations, or other action they have taken, are sufficient to address issues and root causes or whether DHHS should be required to take additional action, and if so what those actions should seek to address;
- To what extent there may be need for establishing State-wide laws, policies, procedures, and guidance for situations where agencies are making selection and funding decisions among competing entities without an RFP, including what documentation should be generated in such situations;
- What specifically may need to be covered or addressed through the records retention working group the AG's Office has suggested;
- To what extent this represents a situation where the intent of FOAA was frustrated, or actual violation of FOAA occurred, that potentially warrants putting additional clarification and penalties in the FOAA, or enhancing reporting avenues for potential FOAA violations; and
- To what extent there are violations of expected ethics, accountability and transparency that might warrant consideration of establishing/enhancing ethics policies and reporting avenues for potential ethics violations.

Chair Cain said that is the scope the Committee put together at their prior meetings for the purposes of today's inquiry and asked if there were any questions related to the scope. There were no questions.

Chair Cain said the Committee received requests to do the questioning in executive session from five of the six people who the Committee subpoenaed. The Committee needed to take up that request first so they could move ahead with outlining the procedures for the remainder of the meeting.

The Committee specifically received requests from Sheila Pinette, Christine Zukas, Lisa Sockabasin, Debra Wigand and Andrew Finch for executive session. Chair Cain asked Director Ashcroft to lead the discussion of the request.

Director Ashcroft thought it might be helpful for her to outline for the Committee what it would mean if they went ahead with taking testimony in executive session in terms of other implications for them as members, and for the release of testimony that would be taken in executive session.

Under the Legislative Investigating Committee Statute which is governing this proceeding, if a witness so requests, that witness's testimony must be taken in executive session unless otherwise decided by Committee action, so the GOC will need to take a vote on that. Testimony that is taken in executive session cannot be released in any manner if that witness objects to the release of that testimony. Normally we will be doing an audio recording and here we are also going to be preparing full written transcripts of the testimony. Neither the audio recording nor the written transcript would be able to be released if that witness objects. It would also affect what the Committee is able to deliberate in public after hearing such testimony. Any Committee deliberations that involve discussion of testimony given in executive session would itself have to occur in executive session in order to maintain the confidentiality of that testimony. However, the Committee should reach its conclusions in public session, and so the line between what can be discussed publicly, and what cannot, might be a little challenging. We have Chief Deputy Pistner available as legal counsel to help navigate that challenge should that become necessary. If the testimony is taken in executive session only the witness and their counsel, the Committee members and their staff and counsel, which includes herself, Chief Deputy Pistner, and Etta can be present. All others, including the media, would need to leave the room. Committee members and staff should know that they would need to keep any information they hear in executive session confidential. In other words, it would not be anything for discussion in any public arena or outside of this room. Those are the implications for taking testimony in executive session.

Sen. Craven said what she thinks caused a lot of the problem to begin with was a lack of transparency so she would not favor going into executive session.

Chair Cain asked if there were any other comments at this point.

Sen. Burns said he had thought about this an awful lot since the issue came before the Committee and thinks the first statement the Director made is indicative to him as to what they ought to do and that is when somebody requests this, the onus is on them as a Committee to decide some compelling reason as to why they should not go into executive session. From what he has learned here, and what he wants to learn here, the prudent thing for them to do is if they really want to know, and everybody on the horseshoe wants to know who what, when and why, then the Committee should do this in executive session and learn as much information as they can. To suggest that would be a less transparent process, he thinks is absurd. If you look around the horseshoe, both parties and both Chambers are equally represented and if the members cannot be trusted to make these types of deliberations, then they should not have the Committee to start with. These are sensitive issues involving a lot of good people. Some may, or may not have, done things wrong and made errors without intending to do so, he doesn't know. If the Committee wants to get to the bottom of this, they should do it in executive session. He did not want the Committee's process to be used as a forum to settle somebody's litigation and that is what he feels it was headed for. Sen. Burns said it was up to the Committee to make that decision.

Sen. Katz said he found himself in the uncomfortable position of disagreeing with his friend and colleague, Sen. Burns. This really goes to the core of why the Committee even exists to ensure they have transparency and accountability in government and he thinks it would be beyond ironic if they decided to do their work in secret. He thought it would be wrong if the Committee responsible for sunshine in government does its work in the dark. He did not particularly believe that they could get better information from folks if they went into executive session, but that same argument could be used for why they should not. One could argue that Court proceedings should be held in private because maybe they would be able to get to the truth more easily that way, but they don't do that. He has great confidence that the people who are going to testify are going to give truthful answers to the questions no matter what the setting and the Committee that is responsible for transparency, ought to be doing its work in public. He said he will vote to not go into executive session.

Sen. Johnson agreed with Sen. Katz's assessment. There is an important line between what they are attempting to get to in regard to the operation of State government and the questions relevant to the Civil case.

Those individuals who will be coming before the Committee have counsel and they are responsible for advising their client on any questions the Committee asks that, in their opinion, might jeopardize their client in the Civil case. They have the opportunity to not answer. He said there are important matters about the operations of State government the Committee needs to get to the bottom of and they need to do so in a transparent matter if their work and the outcome is to be trusted by the people.

Rep. Davis did not see this as being compared to a court case but more as a deposition and depositions are almost always handled in private. He agrees with Sen. Burns and thinks they need to get to the bottom of this. The people have asked for executive session, they have been subpoenaed, they are not coming here willing, and he thinks the GOC should approve executive session.

Rep. Cotta appreciated the position and opinion of others on the Committee. The issue that bothers him is the timing. He agrees with both Sen. Burns and Sen. Katz, but it is an issue of timing and if the Committee goes forward, they should do so in executive session or wait until the litigation is completed.

Chair Cain appreciated the comments of Committee members. She said the procedures are different for handling testimony in executive session or not and this is a new space for the Government Oversight Committee to be in. It is the first time they have been at this intersection and she thinks they are also at a precedent setting moment. It is a dangerous precedent to set, in her opinion, that when litigation that is external is filed and is ongoing, that somehow the work and obligation of the Government Oversight Committee should be put on hold or deferred. Chair Cain said the GOC's interests are distinct and separate and have a very articulated purpose around transparency, accountability and oversight in government. It was her opinion that they should keep the discussions in public.

Chair Kruger said he was sensitive to the issues that Sen. Burns and Rep. Davis have mentioned, but was in favor of not going into executive session and made the following motion.

Motion: In accordance with Title 3, Section 427, that the Committee take the testimony of Debra Wigand, Andrew Finch, Lisa Sockabasin, Sheila Pinette and Christine Zukas in public session rather than executive session. (Motion by Rep. Kruger, second by Sen. Craven.)

Discussion: Rep. Boland asked if it was possible to have public session, but if there was particular kind of a question that seemed very important to answer, would it be possible to go into executive session on a one at a time consideration. Chair Cain said yes, it was possible and she will go over that shortly. The Committee also has the ability to go into executive session with their legal counsel for the purposes of seeking advice on the Committee's legal rights and responsibilities and that will be available to them over the course of the meeting.

Mr. Uhl, counsel for the Department of Health and Human Services, asked to address the Committee on this motion.

Chair Cain responded that there will be a lot of opportunity for those in attendance to address the GOC. She asked those in attendance to please respect the role of the Committee and understand that every one of the people subpoenaed today will have an opportunity to come before the Committee with their counsel and engage with the Committee, but right now the Committee is in the posture of needing to take a vote on the question of executive session and whether or not to be in public.

Sen. Burns said that, even though the GOC had its own counsel, if this gentleman has some legal advice that he would like to hear what that advice is. If it has to do with the testimony, then he would agree with Chair Cain, but if he wants to offer a slant before the GOC takes a vote on this executive session request then he thinks the Committee should hear from him. He has a stake in this.

Chair Cain said there are a lot of attorneys in the room today who have very serious obligations to their clients and she respects each of them greatly and the responsibilities that they have. They will each have an opportunity to be before the Committee. She is quite frankly concerned that if, right now, at 9:28 we start

having a free for all from the audience that we will be down a slippery slope very quickly. She is inclined to have this vote taken and then get back to regularly scheduled business. She does not presume the outcome of the vote other than the comments that were made by members of this Committee. She thinks it is also important to remind ourselves that we are not a court of law here today. We are a Committee of the Legislature and we as the Committee have a set of statutes that oversee this process and it is important that we respect our own process and remember that we are not a court of law.

Vote on Motion: The vote on the above Motion passes, 7-3. (Voting against the Motion were Sen. Burns, Rep. Davis and Rep. Cotta. Sen. Youngblood and Rep. Harvell were absent at the time of the vote. Rep. Harvell voted against the motion when he arrived at the meeting. Vote 7-4.)

Chair Cain noted that the Committee would now remain in public session and she wanted to take a minute to describe the procedure for today. All proceedings and testimony that are not held in executive session will be broadcast over the internet and are available to televising and filming as is normal protocol and required under FOAA. All questions to the witnesses will come from GOC members or GOC staff and will be posed through the Chairs and Leads of the Committee, unless the Chair directs otherwise, i.e. there will be no questioning of witnesses by other witnesses or their counsel. All witnesses will be placed under oath and then provide any subpoenaed records they have with them prior to their testimony being taken. Testimony will be taken in the following order: Debra Wigand, Andrew Finch, Sharon Leahy-Lind, Lisa Sockabasin, Sheila Pinette and Christine Zukas. After all testimony is taken, the Government Oversight Committee may request and recall particular witnesses for further questions. After all testimony is taken, the Government Oversight Committee will provide opportunity for any witness to offer further clarifying information. The Government Oversight Committee reserves the right to go into executive session during the proceedings as a Committee for the purpose of consulting with our attorney on our legal rights and duties as allowed under Title 1, Section 405-6(e).

Chair Cain opened the procedures up for discussion, questions or comments from the members noting it is the process that had been outlined at prior meetings. She paused to welcome Rep. Harvell and Rep. Boland to the meeting and asked them to introduce themselves.

Sen. Johnson wanted to confirm his sense that grounds for executive session would be those typically provided in statute for public meetings such as a personnel matter or something of that regard, or whether the Committee is open to any grounds for executive session on a question.

Sen. Katz said his understanding is that the GOC's ability to go into executive session is strictly constricted by the times when the law says we can and not just because we want to.

Director Ashcroft said she agreed with Sen. Katz, but the law in Title 1, Chapter 21, does establish executive session at the request of a witness as an allowable reason for executive session. So it's not just the allowances that are in the FOAA law, in this particular case the request to have testimony taken in executive session is an allowable reason that she thinks would stand throughout this proceeding.

Chair Cain reminded members that the Committee can go into executive session, as mentioned earlier or for moments when they need to have legal counsel give them advice.

Motion: In accordance with Title 3, Section 422, I would move that the Committee approve the orders of procedure as just outlined by the Chair. (Motion by Chair Kruger, second by Sen. Katz, passed by unanimous vote 11-0.)

Chair Cain stated again, just to be clear, that, given the circumstances with the Civil suit, questioning of the witnesses by other witnesses or other counsel will not be allowed. She asked Director Ashcroft if she had any other pieces of information for the Committee before they moved into taking testimony.

Director Ashcroft walked the members through the documents they had in their materials including an outline of the procedures to be followed today, draft motions that may be needed for particular situations, and

potential discussion areas and lines of questioning members may want to use when preparing questions for the witnesses.

Director Ashcroft also pointed out a packet of documents each member had that were the same few documents that are in the binder at the podium should it be necessary or helpful to direct the witnesses to look at particular documents for particular questions. She noted that the top page is the list of what documents are in the packet and that the documents themselves are numbered in the top right hand corner.

Director Ashcroft advised that Scott Clark with Legislative Information Services was at the meeting. If the GOC is in a position of moving in and out of executive session there are some technical steps that will need to be taken to make sure that we are properly collecting the record for the proceeding, but not broadcasting over the internet. So if that happened it might require a moment or two to make sure we have that all figured out.

Chair Cain agreed that every possible precaution would be taken to ensure there was no broadcasting of any kind should the GOC move into executive session at any point today. She noted the Committee also would have the ability, if we were going to meet with legal counsel, of stepping into the conference room that connects right outside to this area rather than making everyone leave this room.

The Committee proceeded to the questioning of those individuals subpoenaed with the order being Debra Wigand, Andrew Finch, Sharon Leahy-Lind, Lisa Sockabasin, Sheila Pinette and Christine Zukas. The audio of the meeting has been posted to the GOC/OPEGA website and the starting point of each person's testimony can be found at the following locations on the recorded audio.)

Debra Wigand: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part I, 33:48.

Andrew Finch: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part I, 01:10.

Sharon Leahy-Lind: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part I, 02:23

Lisa Sockabasin: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part II, 00:00

Sheila Pinette: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part II, 30:59

Christine Zukas: 03-14-2014 GOC meeting, Part II, 01:11

- Further Consideration of Possible GOC Actions on Issues and Recommendations

Chair Cain thanked everyone who participated today and the Government Oversight Committee. She noted that next on the GOC's procedure list is a decision on releasing testimony and the form it is to be released in. She asked the Director to explain that.

Director Ashcroft explained that under the Legislative Investigating Committee statute, the Committee is required to vote on release of testimony in regards to whether it is to be released and in what form it is to be released. There is a draft Motion that might be offered here that if the testimony is to be released it will be released in full audio form and in full written transcript form as those are the two forms that we would potentially have it available in.

Under that same statute, for testimony taken in public session, the witnesses must be given an opportunity to object before any testimony is released and, by such objection may, require that any released testimony be only in the form of a full transcript.

Sen. Katz commented that if a transcript means a verbatim transcript of what happened that would imply we'd have to hire someone to transcribe the whole thing. He thinks that could be a considerable expense and that doesn't seem to make sense.

Dr. Ashcroft said that Section 428 of Title 1, Chapter 21 requires that a complete record shall be kept of all investigating committee action including a transcript of all testimony taken. So she takes that to mean we will be doing a transcript. So then there's a question of whether the testimony will be released and whether that transcript shall be the form it is released in, pending possible objections.

Chair Cain confirmed that we are talking about releasing testimony if requests are made for it. Director Ashcroft said that was correct.

Rep. Davis commented that it was all public record, the meeting was open to the public all day, we weren't in Executive Session, therefore its public information.

Sen. Johnson agreed and asked whether the written materials submitted today under subpoena would need to be part of the transcript.

Director Ashcroft said she had not envisioned that a full written transcript would include the subpoenaed records, so she wouldn't envision sending those out to be transcribed. They would be available for release in the form they were provided in, if that was the question.

Sen. Katz asked Chief Deputy Pistner whether she read this law to require that we have a verbatim transcript made of these proceedings.

Chief Deputy Pistner responded that the law does specify a transcript of testimony must be made as part of the complete record that must be kept. She also noted that this law was done in 1975. She was practicing law back then when there were tapes used that were not the same kind of quality as the audio transcript that we have, or the audio that we have of this, and it is expensive to have it transcribed. She suggested asking the counsel for the witnesses if any of them have objection if we just make the recording available to everybody rather than creating a transcript, unless the Committee wants to have a transcript for its own purposes.

Chair Cain polled the witnesses and counsel present as to whether there was objection to releasing only the audio or whether a transcript was preferred. Chair Cain noted that at least one objection was made that a transcript was preferred. She took that to mean that a written transcript would need to be produced.

Sen. Katz said his reading of Section 429 of the statute also gives witnesses who gave testimony an opportunity to object to the release of the testimony. So it seems to say we've got to make a transcript but it seems also to say that its within our discretion to release that. That doesn't seem to make a lot of sense but that's how he's looking at it.

Chief Deputy Pistner said if, in fact, you were going to release some part of the testimony, but not the whole of it that was taken in public session the witness is allowed to say I only want my entire testimony to be released, not just part of it. However, she didn't think in this case there was any intention of releasing any partial testimony.

Chief Deputy Pistner noted the other thing that is confusing about this statute, is that in subsection 2 of Section 429 it says the witness can get a transcript upon paying the cost of preparation.

Chair Cain wanted to clarify, for the purposes of process, that if there was an objection from a witness on whether testimony is being released, that is a decision that then comes before the Government Oversight Committee.

Chief Deputy Pistner clarified that in this instance she was suggesting that we would not need to comply strictly with the requirement of preparing a transcript unless there was an objection to not preparing the transcript.

Chair Cain noted that the GOC just heard such an objection.

Sen. Katz suggested that the witnesses and their attorneys be asked to let us know in writing what their position is within the next seven days and we could sort it out then.

Chief Deputy Pistner thought that would be acceptable.

Chair Cain clarified that Sen. Katz was requesting that the GOC send a letter to the attorneys asking them to let us know whether there is an objection to their clients' testimony being released.

Sen. Katz said he would like to know what their position is with respect to this statute as it relates to their clients.

Chair Cain said she thought that, for the purposes of today, she thinks that still leaves the GOC with the same potential motion.

Director Ashcroft explained that the Motion drafted in expectation of this vote acknowledges that a right to object exists so the language already says "subject to an opportunity for the witness to object".

Chief Deputy Pistner added that one question the GOC might want to address though is whether the Committee is comfortable with making the full audio available should people request that before you make a decision about transcripts.

Chair Cain stated that she thinks it is the Committee's expectation that the audio will be available like any meeting we ever have in public. She asked the Director to confirm that the GOC meetings are always recorded and publicly available.

Director Ashcroft agreed that they were, but said she is not sure what that means in the context of this statute though.

Chief Deputy Pistner suggested the Chair poll the witnesses and counsel present and Chair Cain did so, noting that it was the intention that the full audio file would be available. There was still a question as to whether a full written transcript should also be produced, and whether or not anyone would be requesting a written transcript.

Chair Cain noted that witnesses and attorneys did not object to release of the full audio file. She thinks the language in the draft motion, which is a vote that the GOC needs to take to be compliant procedurally with statute, is still appropriate to cover what has been talked about here.

Director Ashcroft wanted to be clear with everybody in the room that this means we will, if we are asked, immediately after this meeting, release the full audio of this meeting. We will not release it in any partial manner it will be the full file or nothing.

Chair Cain agreed that was the Committee's expectation just like any of our meetings.

Rep. Boland noted that it might also be helpful to have a written version available because we have people who are hearing impaired who would not be able to benefit from just having it in audio. She thinks that is something that should be considered also.

Chair Cain said she was still looking for some possible middle ground here as it seems there are some questions around what is involved to get a full transcript and what the cost would be.

Director Ashcroft stated that OPEGA has sent other testimony out for transcribing before. She can't recall the cost exactly, but she didn't think it was astronomical, although it was a few years ago.

Chair Cain said it seems that we are in a position where we would err on the side of having the transcript done, but if no one requests it then we would have had it done for nothing, with expense.

Director Ashcroft agreed. She suggested making the audio available immediately and if there are requests received between now the next Committee meeting for a full written transcript that could be taken up at the next meeting and the GOC could make a decision on that.

Motion: In accordance with Title 3, Section 429 I move that testimony shall be released either as a full audio recording of the testimony or a full consecutive written transcript, subject to an opportunity for witnesses to object as provided for in Section 429 and a Committee decision on those objections. (Motion by Chair Kruger, second by Rep. Davis, passed by unanimous vote 11-0.)

Sen. Craven said she was very frustrated because of how subjective the weighting was. Healthy Androscoggin had gotten accolades their entire existence, never received any kind of sanctions, yet in CDC's spreadsheet under comments it is noted that Healthy Androscoggin should be doing better. She did not understand the weighting, but said the size of the population, or the needs of the population were not taken into consideration. Sen. Craven also said that the Androscoggin County delegation asked for explanations at least three times from DHHS regarding the process used and no satisfactory response was given.

Sen. Craven said Maine CDC should have been more transparent of what they were doing because of the massive changes to the process and the Programs. They did not issue an RFP or give advanced notice to any of the Healthy Maine Partnerships, including the Tribal Partnership, of their proposed changes.

Sen. Burns suggested that the GOC take no action today on this matter until the Committee members had the opportunity to digest the information they received at the meeting.

Chair Cain clarified for the purposes of the Committee that they did not expect to, as the Appropriation Committee says "put a bow on it" today, but the purpose of the discussion was to allow Committee members to have an initial reaction and if there's any particular thing they may be looking for in the way of additional information that the staff could prepare and collect it for the next GOC meeting.

Chair Cain made some comments that she thought were important for the meeting. First, she said she very much wanted to thank the Committee for the professional way this was handled. She thanked all the members for their patience and for their ongoing ability to dig in on the topic. She thought the questions that came from the Committee members were some of the best questions and reflected how seriously they have all taken this issue from day one and how serious they will continue to take it as they do their deliberations.

Chair Cain also thought that there was work for the Committee to do based on the additional information received at the meeting and perhaps some additional questions to be asked, particularly around the policy and standards in the Department that are already being improved, and the GOC needed to make sure they are improved so no matter who comes in and out of these positions, this kind of situation will not happen again. She said they need to increase transparency and need to get back to a common sense approach. The GOC can definitely do that and can offer constructive recommendations to the Department and to State government based on things they have learned.

Chair Cain also thanked OPEGA staff and Chief Deputy Attorney General Linda Pistner for her incredible advice and counsel in the past several weeks as they prepared for today. She said it was a new territory for the Government Oversight Committee and believes the Committee handled it in a way that established a positive precedent for future Committees should they ever be back in this situation.

Chair Cain thanked everyone who had come to the meeting, even though it was from being subpoenaed, she appreciated them coming. She personally found, and said she thought she could speak for the Committee, that the ability to ask these questions was extremely valuable.

Rep. Cotta asked if the new documents that were presented at the meeting were going to be distributed to the Committee. Chair Cain said OPEGA staff will review the material received at the meeting.

Rep. Davis moved that the GOC meeting be adjourned. Second by Sen. Burns.

Chair Cain asked if Rep. Davis would withdraw his motion and Sen. Burns to withdraw his second so announcements could be made. Rep. Davis withdrew his motion and Sen. Burns withdrew his second.

NEW BUSINESS

- **GOC Discussion of OPEGA Project Priorities**

Not discussed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- **Update on Status of Follow-up Review of Health Care in Corrections**

Not discussed.

- **Update on Status of Draft Tax Expenditure Review Process Legislation**

Not discussed

- **GOC Consideration of Unemployment Compensation Matters**

- **Federal Department of Labor Fact Finding Letter**

Not discussed

- **Pending Request for OPEGA Review of Matters Pertaining to Unemployment Insurance Appeals and Administrative Hearings**

Not discussed.

REPORT FROM OPEGA DIRECTOR

No given.

NEXT GOC MEETING DATE

Chair Cain said the next GOC meeting date was scheduled for Friday, March 28, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 220. The agenda will include the items that the Committee did not get to at today's meeting as well as follow-up on Healthy Maine Partnerships' FY13 Contracts and Funding.

ADJOURNMENT

Rep. Davis moved to adjourn the Government Oversight Committee. Chair Cain adjourned the meeting at 3:24 p.m.