

Testimony of
Jennifer L. Griffith and Sarah A. Carver
before the
Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs
United States Senate
October 7, 2013

Chairman Carper, Senator Coburn, Members of the Committee, good afternoon.

Our names are Jennifer L. Griffith and Sarah A. Carver. The testimony presented herein describes events at the Huntington, West Virginia, Social Security Administration Office of Adjudication and Review, (hereinafter referred to as Huntington ODAR), which we witnessed individually or together.

Huntington ODAR is the third step in the disability process and is responsible for processing claimants' Requests for Hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). The Master Docket Clerk (or Case Intake Technician) is responsible for the receipt, initial review, assignment, processing, and distribution within the office of cases received. The Senior Case Technician is responsible for the preparation of cases for hearing which includes the organization and exhibiting of claimants' files as well as the scheduling of claims for hearing, processing development, preparation of dismissals and finalizing both favorable and unfavorable disability decisions for mailing purposes.

As we prepare to tell you about our experiences and disclosures within ODAR, we will first give you a brief background about ourselves.

Jennifer

Jennifer began working for the Huntington, WV ODAR office in 2001 as a Senior Case Technician. Jennifer changed positions within the office and became one of two Case Intake Technicians within that office. Prior to working for the Huntington ODAR she worked in the private sector as paralegal for approximately 6 years. She has a Bachelor of Arts in Social Science from Shawnee State University. Her career ended at ODAR with what she perceived as a forced resignation due to the constant retaliatory acts by Huntington ODAR management in response to her multiple reports of ALJ David B. Daugherty's misappropriation of claims filed by attorney representative Eric C. Conn. She shortly thereafter filed a complaint with the Office of Special Counsel and later reached a settlement with the SSA after appealing her mistreatment to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Sarah

Sarah Carver (formally known as Sarah Randolph) began her 12-year career at the Huntington ODAR in September 2001. Over the course of her employment with the Administration she has held one position: Senior Case Technician (SCT). In 2006, in addition to her duties as a SCT, she was elected to the position of AFGE 3610 Union Steward for the Huntington ODAR. Prior to her employment there, Sarah was a paralegal in the private sector for 13 years, 8 of which primarily focused on representation of claimants seeking Social Security disability benefits. Sarah is a graduate of Marshall University with a degree in Legal Studies.

From 2001 to 2006 Sarah routinely received performance awards for the quality and production of her work in the Huntington ODAR office. However, in 2006 those awards came to an abrupt stop when Greg Hall became the Hearing Office Director (HOD). Coincidentally, she had been voicing concerns about what she perceived as the improper processing of Social Security claims in the Huntington ODAR while Mr. Hall was an acting HOD, which continued as he was promoted to the HOD position. Not only did she report her concerns with Mr. Hall, she also reported them to other members of Huntington ODAR management throughout the years. She is still currently employed as an SCT at the Huntington ODAR despite many retaliatory actions against her by several members of management. One such act of retaliation was the hiring of a private investigator to have her followed during work hours and non-work hours in an attempt to put a halt on her efforts to disclose the collusion, fraud and corruption within the Huntington ODAR.

When Sarah notified the Agency that she had been invited to testify at this Hearing, she was denied the use of any Official Union or Administrative leave to attend by Debra Bice, Chief Administrative Law Judge for Disability Adjudication and Review in ODAR Headquarters. ALJ Bice issued the following statements in a September 30, 2013 letter to Sarah:

Even though you are not authorized to speak on behalf of the agency and you will be attending in your personal capacity, the agency would like to remind you that any obligations under the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards of Conduct), Privacy Act or applicable agency policy still apply. For example, the Standards of Conduct prohibit Executive branch Employees from allowing “the improper use of nonpublic information to further his own private interest or that of another, whether through advice or recommendation, or by knowing unauthorized disclosure.” 5 C.F.R. 2635.703(a). The Standards of Conduct define nonpublic information, as “information that the employee gains by reason of Federal employment and that he knows or reasonably should know has not been made available to the general public.” 5 C.F.R. 2635.703(b). This definition includes information which is “routinely exempt from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552 or otherwise protected from disclosure by statute, Executive Order or regulation,”

information the agency has designed as confidential, or information that has not been “disseminated to the general public and is not authorized to be made available to the public on request.”

Sarah was informed by ALJ Bice that she will be speaking to you in her own personal and not official capacity, and that she should include a disclaimer in any testimony, written or oral, to prevent any appearance that the agency sanctions her testimony. *See* 5 C.F.R. § 2635.702(b). ALJ Bice provided Sarah with the following disclaimer language suggested by the Designated Agency Ethics Official:

The views expressed in this testimony are mine, in my personal capacity as a private citizen. In this testimony, I do not represent the views of the Social Security Administration or the United States Government. I am not acting as an agent or representative of the Social Security Administration or the United States Government in this activity. There is no expressed or implied endorsement of my views or activities by either the Social Security Administration or the United States Government.

The Events We Witnessed and Reported

In February 2006, Gregory A. Hall became the Hearing Office Director (HOD) of the Huntington ODAR, after several months of serving as its acting HOD. This was a transitioning period for SSA going from an all-paper system to an electronic processing system. At the same time, our concerns increased regarding the lack of integrity in some of the ways Huntington ODAR’s cases were being processed. It is our concern that Huntington ODAR management and Judge Daugherty circumvented SSA policies, procedures and Federal law to massively approve cases. Of equal or greater concern was the symbiotic relationship between Huntington ODAR management, Judge Daugherty and attorney representative Eric C. Conn.

Although we began by voicing our concerns verbally, in 2006 our concerns of misappropriation and circumvention of process were confirmed by the implementation of the E-File process within the agency. With this process more data was available for use than with previously used tracking systems.

Because some claimant representatives, like Eric Conn, have developed large practices, the Social Security Administration through its procedural regulations, known as HALLEX, directed that cases of such representatives be assigned to ALJs within a hearing office on a rotating schedule amongst the ALJs to prevent the representative from developing an improper, biased relationship with a given ALJ. Because of HALLEX requirements and Chief ALJ Charlie Paul Andrus’s directive to rotate cases, as a Case Intake Technician Jennifer routinely assigned Conn claims amongst all judges in the office.

In the course of her duties, Jennifer began to notice that both paper and electronic cases were missing from the dockets. She began to verbally inform her first-line supervisor, Kathie Goforth, and eventually voiced her concerns regarding the missing cases not only to Ms. Goforth repeatedly, but to HOD Hall, Chief ALJ Andrus, and Sarah, as her union representative. In January 2007, Jennifer sent an email regarding her concerns about Daugherty's taking possession of Conn cases before they were properly docketed in the system – a process which had caused her to receive multiple verbal warnings from her supervisor for incomplete docketing and failure to properly docket cases which was the primary function of her position. During this same time period Sarah, as the Union Steward, met with Hall to discuss Conn calling in and/or faxing lists of Social Security numbers to Daugherty, Conn bragging about “having an ALJ in his pocket,” and the number of cases ALJ Daugherty was assigning himself off the docket. Hall informed Sarah that Chief ALJ Andrus was going to call a meeting with all ALJs.

As a Master Docket Clerk and a Senior Case Technician we were often presented with lists from ALJ Daugherty. As a Master Docket Clerk, Jennifer was provided with various lists of Conn cases (computer generated and hand written) requesting the transfer of ownership of Conn cases to him (Daugherty) regardless of whether or not the cases were docketed or assigned to another ALJ. When Jennifer refused to reassign cases that had already been assigned to another ALJ, Daugherty would transfer the case himself. Jennifer informed management of Daugherty's misconduct numerous times both verbally and by written correspondence.

As a Senior Case Technician, one of Sarah's responsibilities was scheduling cases for hearings. The proper procedure for scheduling cases for hearing was to obtain cases by hearing request date (i.e., the order in which we receive cases) from the master docket. However, Judge Daugherty would provide a pre-scheduled hand written list of Eric Conn cases which were out of hearing request date order and sometimes receipted by our office only a few days to some which were only hours old. There would be up to 20 cases a day at 15 minute intervals as opposed to a normal ALJ schedule which would typically consist of approximately 6 to 8 cases per day at 1 hour intervals. Not only was the request for hearing date procedure incorrectly followed, ALJ Daugherty would also remove cases from other ALJ's assignments and reassign them to himself. Ultimately all hearings held by ALJ Daugherty in which Eric Conn was the attorney of record resulted in a fully favorable finding of disability. In most instances, those claimants who did not have Eric Conn as a representative would have to wait up to a year or more for a hearing date.

Also, during the period of time Daugherty was holding Conn hearings – often up to 20 a day – Conn would have his claimants all show up at the hearing office at the same time in the morning, since he knew that the hearing would be bogus and that Daugherty would typically conclude his schedule for the day by 11:00 a.m. We often referred to this as a “cattle call” in a joking manner. Claimants would walk into the hearing room with Conn as their attorney representative and ALJ Daugherty would go on the record with a Court Reporter and Vocational Expert in order to conduct a sham proceeding to make it appear he was performing a bona fide review of the claim, and find the claimant fully disabled. For each of the up to 20 hearings, a court reporter would receive up to \$75 a

hearing (times 20) and the vocational expert who did not testify would receive up to \$130.00 for each claimant on that day. Both court reporter and vocational expert were paid for hearings that were bogus in nature and did not include testimony regarding the claimant's medical impairments or medical treatment history.

In May 2007 emails to HOD Hall and then-Group Supervisor Arthur Weathersby, Sarah requested justification on the hearing request dates of ALJ Daugherty's fully favorable dispositions. She informed them that only nine days into the month, Daugherty had issued 29 favorably decisions and all 29 cases were Eric Conn's. She discussed Judge Daugherty's removal of Eric Conn cases from another ALJ's assignment that had already been tentatively scheduled and she discussed the serious evidence that would substantiate the overt favoritism of Mr. Conn's claimants and management's continuous "sweeping things under the rug with regards to Daugherty and Conn." Sarah closed her email by clearly stating that "the Eric Conn situation is going to bite this office in the butt one day". She further requested management "to open their eyes to the DBD [i.e., Daugherty] and Conn issues and change the way Conn's cases were handled before it became an issue outside this office."

It was shortly thereafter that our office started receiving complaints from other representatives that their cases were not being heard as quickly as Mr. Conn's cases.

Again, in August 2007, it was brought to management's attention that Daugherty reassigned himself cases that had been previously assigned to another ALJ. However, this time, the cases had already been scheduled by another SCT in our office. Daugherty had reassigned the cases to himself, wrote favorable decisions and placed them in a status to be mailed. All of these cases belonged to Eric Conn. When brought to Mr. Hall's attention he immediately instructed the scheduling SCT in our office "not to tell anyone". The SCT immediately reported this to Sarah as the office Union Representative. Sarah immediately responded by having a meeting with Mr. Hall and sending a follow up email.

Both of us sent several emails to management in the months to follow regarding ALJ Daugherty reassigning Conn cases to himself and the scheduling of cases out of hearing request date order. It appeared that due to this constant reporting and the complaints from other claimant representatives in the community, ALJ Daugherty stopped having hearings with Eric Conn. For a period of approximately 2 years, Daugherty continued to reassign himself Conn cases; however, he awarded all Conn's claimants favorable decisions without a hearing, not even a "sham" one.

It appeared to both of us that Daugherty and Conn were able to circumvent the system through close communication with one another. There was no other way Daugherty could have known a request for hearing was pending, prior to the case being docketed, without being provided the claimant's Social Security number. Daugherty and Conn communicated through numerous phone calls, faxes, and emails which we, and others in the office witnessed. Again, we discussed this misconduct with management on numerous occasions. HOD Hall would justify this practice by saying, "Daugherty was

doing nothing wrong,” or “Mr. Conn was providing supporting medical documentation for the ALJ’s and this allowed them to justify favorable decisions.” However, Sarah questioned Mr. Hall regarding the validity of the medical reports and the fact that some of the medical exams took place within the offices of Eric Conn.

After reporting to Huntington ODAR management the collusion of Daugherty and Conn for approximately 1½ years and Jennifer’s multiple grievances, EEO complaints against management, and receiving repetitive retaliation from Huntington ODAR management, at the advice of her physician (due to high blood pressure caused by job-related stress), Jennifer was forced to resign effective November 2, 2007. Jennifer’s supervisor, Kathy Goforth, made clear to her in her annual performance evaluation in October 2007 that it was Goforth’s goal to make sure Jennifer was not employed at the Huntington ODAR by the end of the year and that there was nothing that Jennifer could do about it. HOD Hall clearly illustrated management’s intention to silence us both when he wrote to SSA attorney Howard Goldberg that same month: “Jennifer we are working on and Sarah has already been suspended for 3 days.”

The retaliation at this point was not centered on Jennifer alone. With each disclosure of Daugherty and Conn’s collusion and fraud there were actions by management taken against Sarah in the form of threats, harassment, multiple investigations, reprimands, suspensions, no monetary awards, and lack of promotions.

Soon after Jennifer’s resignation, ALJ Kemper, a judge within the Huntington ODAR office, sent a letter to the ALJ’s Union President regarding Daugherty’s “activities” within the Huntington ODAR office. Jennifer and Sarah provided affidavits for ALJ Kemper as to their knowledge of Daugherty and Conn. Shortly thereafter, Sarah was called into the office of Chief ALJ Andrus and questioned about her involvement with ALJ Kemper’s letter. Chief ALJ Andrus told Sarah that it was none of her business and not to provide ALJ Kemper with any information.

As Daugherty and Conn continued their activities, Sarah continued reporting to management and was again faced with multiple groundless investigations such as alternating the time clock, falsifying government records, insubordination and ultimately a 7 day suspension (which was later settled with the Agency, allowing Sarah to receive her lost pay and the suspension removed from her record). An employee reported to Sarah overhearing a conversation between supervisor Goforth and Daugherty. Daugherty said, “Have you got rid of Sarah yet”? Goforth responded, “We are working on it”.

ALJ Daugherty joined in management’s harassment of Sarah, by sending sarcastic emails and frequently stalking her within the office.

Throughout 2008 and 2009 Sarah continued reporting Daugherty and Conn’s activities. Daugherty and Conn continued their collusion by circumventing the system in their “underground” passage of sending and receiving Conn’s cases both from retrieving cases from master docket and from reassignment of cases which belonged to other ALJs. Sarah began reporting directly to the other ALJ’s within the office when she noticed a

case that had been removed from the ALJ's name. Several ALJs made numerous complaints to Chief ALJ Andrus. However, the activity continued.

It was about this time when Sarah began to notice a trend with regards to Eric Conn's Motions to Dismiss. Every time she would process a motion to dismiss, she would look to see what ALJ was assigned the case. A definitive pattern was found. When Daugherty failed to intercept one of Conn's cases, and another ALJ heard the case, Conn would go off the record with two particular judges (one of which was Chief ALJ Andrus), who would inform Conn as to whether the case would be favorable or unfavorable. Issuing an unfavorable decision at the hearing is against HALLEX procedures and Agency Policy. If the claim were going to be unfavorable, Conn would have his claimant sign a Motion to Withdraw his or her Request for Hearing. This action protected the claimant from an unfavorable ruling and insured that the claimant's back pay date would revert to the Reconsideration denial once the claimant filed a new application and benefits were awarded. This is where Conn and Daugherty's collusion would once again circumvent the system: Conn would notify Daugherty that the claimant had filed another request for hearing. Even though HALLEX directs the same ALJ to be assigned to the second request for hearing in such cases, frequently Daugherty would intercept the case and issue an On the Record Decision, allowing the claimant to receive more back pay. More importantly, it allowed Conn in most cases to receive the maximum in attorney fees.

In June 2010, Sarah and Jennifer met with then-West Virginia Governor Manchin's Chief of Staff, Jim Spears, regarding their concerns and sought the assistance from Governor Manchin. Although Mr. Spears appeared to be quite interested, Sarah and Jennifer were told the Governor had no jurisdiction over this federal matter.

Sarah again reported to HOD Hall that she felt it was inappropriate for Conn to employ physicians to perform examinations within Conn's office. She told Hall of the repetitive use of the same non-treating physicians who provided independent medical reports that Conn provided for practically every one of his claimants. Mr. Hall again justified this activity by telling Sarah that these reports supported Daugherty's favorable decisions and that there was nothing illegal going on. Sarah voiced her opinion to Mr. Hall that she did not agree.

In March 2011, HOD Hall was a recipient of the Chief Administrative Law Judge Honor Citation Award.

April 29, 2011, Sarah questioned management regarding 50 complete and favorable Conn cases, written by Daugherty, that she found sitting in AWPC status (which indicates that a case is with an ALJ to be written). Even though the cases were completed in April, however, they had not been mailed by the end of the month. The cases were being "banked" for the next reporting month. Sarah and other Huntington ODAR employees had observed this practice on several occasions, Sarah had reported it to management on several occasions, and it appeared to be a common occurrence in the

Huntington ODAR. The cases had been written two weeks prior by ALJ Daugherty and held back because the office had already met their monthly disposition goal.

However, after Sarah's email, Chief ALJ Andrus sent a reminder email the same day to the entire Huntington ODAR staff reminding them of the policy to rotate all Eric Conn cases. On May 2, 2011, ALJ Daugherty sent Chief ALJ Andrus an email regarding the 50 cases and explained to Andrus that he had taken 4 cases from ALJ Buel; 6 cases from ALJ Chwalibog; 5 cases from ALJ Dunlap; 6 cases from ALJ Gitlow and 2 cases from ALJ Quinlivan. That same day, ALJ Daugherty sent a second email to Andrus regarding additional cases he had taken from other judges. Again, Huntington ODAR retaliated against Sarah. On May 3, then-Group Supervisor Stephen Hayes questioned her regarding the purpose of sending the April 29, 2011, email, and she was questioned regarding her workload assignments.

Sarah would later report to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that of those 50 favorable Conn cases written by Daugherty, in 14 of those cases, Conn submitted medical reports signed by David Herr, M.D., who claimed to have examined and reviewed the records of 14 claimants all on a single day – March 17, 2011 – in Conn's office.

On May 5, 2011, the Huntington ODAR staff received an email from HOD Hall regarding statistics, praising the office for having the 2nd fastest processing time in the country the preceding year.

Despite exhausting efforts to bring a halt to misconduct and mismanagement at the Huntington ODAR, despite filing several grievances, EEO complaints, OSC complaints, and OIG reports, we had obtained no measurable results. We, and some past and current ODAR employees met with Damian Paletta, a reporter from the Wall Street Journal.

May 18, 2011, the Wall Street Journal published Mr. Paletta's article, "Disability-Claim Judge Has Trouble Saying 'No'," describing Daugherty's high approval rate and linking him to the Conn Claims. Jennifer was quoted in the article.

On several occasions in 2011, both of us reported our concerns to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the Social Security Administration. Both were contacted by and met with OIG fraud investigators several times preceding the article's publication. Following the Wall Street Journal's publication of the Paletta article, a large number of agents from the OIG arrived unannounced at the Huntington ODAR office and interviewed current and former employees. We both cooperated fully in the OIG's investigation, and have complied fully with all requests for information and documents.

Also, following the Wall Street Journal's publication, we were contacted by and met with staff of this Committee's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The Subcommittee staff arrived in Huntington shortly thereafter to interview management and employees of ODAR. Four days after their arrival Sarah and other employees noticed that management had ordered and received numerous shredders which were placed in

management's offices despite having access to locked shred bins located throughout the hearing office for the use of all employees. The constant noise of shredders and the witnessing of management carrying out bags of shredded paper was reported to the Subcommittee and OIG. Subsequently OIG arrived in the ODAR office within ten minutes and confiscated all shredders.

Despite the multiple ongoing investigations at the time, Sarah continued her efforts to report ongoing misappropriation of disability cases. In June 2011, Sarah reported to management cases were still not being heard by hearing request date. At the same time she made a report to Patrick O'Carroll regarding the ongoing retaliation by management. She sent a copy of this report (i.e., she "cc'd" it) to Hall, ALJ Bice, John Allen (then-Acting Chief ALJ), and Tim Morton (OIG investigator). HOD Hall forwarded the email to SSA attorney Howard Goldberg. Sarah was called into Hall's office that same day and was questioned, criticized and harassed for sending the email. The next day, Acting Chief ALJ Allen emailed Hall stating, "when I get in this morning I'll put a call into Judge Bice to discuss the Ms. Carver activities it is becoming more clear to me that this may be our biggest problem". (Judge Allen is the same individual to whom ALJ Bice has instructed Sarah to report any ongoing acts of retaliation. When this email was brought to the attention of ALJ Bice on several occasions, by both Sarah and her counsel, ALJ Bice has failed to address her concerns.)

Huntington ODAR Managers Have Continued to Retaliate Against Sarah

Prior to 2006, when Sarah began to disclose wrongdoing at the Huntington ODAR, she received several performance awards. She is the most senior SCT in the office and, despite 12 years of service, she is the only SCT who has yet to be promoted to any higher position despite being pre-selected and placed on a best-qualified list for each job she applied for within the Huntington ODAR. With each new supervisor who has been assigned to her, Sarah has had to endure several types of retaliation. Management has ostracized her to her coworkers; they have evaluated her work as only average in order to deny her monetary awards; she has had her tires slashed; supervisors have sat directly across from her for the purposes of harassment and intimidation; she has endured multiple unfounded investigations – including two which were used as pretexts to suspend her; she has been constantly monitored (her phone conversations have been listened to, and her emails read); various activities have been timed; and she has been the subject of baseless and unfounded accusations.

Huntington ODAR management warned each new staff employee not to associate or fraternize with Sarah. HOD Greg Hall once remarked to a co-worker that "Sarah will never be promoted, I do not promote troublemakers." Once, when Sarah received a telephone call from the police informing her that her minor child had been involved in an automobile accident, and she received verbal approval from a manager to take leave, she was charged with being AWOL. Management has denied Union Official time requests she has submitted, and has investigated her for sending reports to OIG. Management has intentionally and unlawfully disclosed Sarah's personal information to her coworkers.

Worst of all, perhaps, Huntington ODAR management conspired to employ a private detective to follow Sarah outside the office – during both Flexiplace time and her personal hours – to create a pretext for management to terminate her, as well as to intimidate her as a witness and to discredit her testimony to the OIG and this Committee.

We Have Sued Conn and Daugherty Under the False Claims Act

In October 2011, a few months after ALJ Daugherty retired, we filed a *qui tam* suit against Conn, his law practice, and former ALJ Daugherty under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, *et seq.* As with every prior investigation, we and our attorneys have fully cooperated with the Department of Justice in investigating Conn and Daugherty's wrongdoing. The Department of Justice declined to intervene in our case, however, in December 2012, although it told the court then that its investigation was continuing. We are continuing to pursue that case, which offers the possibility of recovering treble damages and penalties for the government.

Conclusion

When we were hired in 2001, we had great hopes regarding our advancement opportunities within the Social Security Administration. When we witnessed wrongdoing, we thought it was in the agency's best interest to be made aware of it, and so we disclosed the inappropriate symbiotic relationship of ALJ Daugherty and Conn and the questionable medical reports Conn was submitting. We soon found out through various Huntington ODAR managers that this standard of conduct benefited the Huntington ODAR office in not only national statistics but in terms of both prestige and monetary awards. Our concerns were not only ignored but we were punished in various ways as a result of our disclosures.

Who is to be held accountable? It has been our experience that when it comes to management within the SSA ODAR there is no accountability. Every member of management from 2001 to the present involved in misconduct and mismanagement are either still employed, have been promoted, or have been allowed to retire with their full benefits intact, despite our multiple disclosures, the Senate investigation and the OIG investigation. At the direction of ODAR headquarters some of the current management team members have been providing training to other ODAR managers throughout the ODAR regions. (In addition, the current management team has purchased five new soundproof doors at the cost of approximately \$6,000 each, has soundproofed their offices, and has installed video cameras within the employees' workspaces.)

Every employee in the Huntington ODAR, including management, is a public servant and should be held to a higher standard of conduct. Management officials and Judges are no exception. Agency production goals and benchmarks are important, however, they should not diminish the importance of the quality of work we perform for the American people. Changes need to be made in the SSA to allow for timely processing of claims without sacrificing quality. Equally important, a system needs to be put in place

and monitored by an outside source, to assure that SSA leaders are to be held accountable for failing to following the laws, regulations, and SSA policies.

In addition, the absence of a government advocate in the current disability appeals process leave the system vulnerable to the abuses we have witnessed. We believe that a government representative in disability appeals is necessary to protect the interest of American taxpayers and to assure the judicial process within the SSA is being followed.

We realize there is no single solution to the many problems within the SSA, however we will continue our efforts to advocate for changes and to recover public funds.

We are thankful for the opportunity to be a part of this investigation and hearing. The efforts of you and your capable staff have finally shed light on the problems we witnessed and for which we long endured abuse. We look forward to seeing changes made as a result of our continued efforts.