

Government Administration and Elections Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-462 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT.

Vote Date: 3/23/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/13/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

The Government Administration and Elections Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

The purpose of this bill is to establish the Office of Government Oversight to investigate fraud and waste in state government. There is concern that there is currently not enough oversight to investigate and keep bad faith actors accountable.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

The Judicial Branch

While the Branch respects the intent of the underlying proposal, its overall concern would be that the broad authority granted to the new Executive Director by sections 3 and 4 may implicate separation of powers concerns.

It also requests several amendments to the language:

1. In line 53 clarity on the definition of “annual internal audit program” is needed.
2. In line 79, we would request the word “certifies” be changed to “finds” as the court would not be certifying in this instance.
3. The subpoena process in section 3 could also be clarified. Typically, in civil cases involving the state, the Attorney General is provided with the authority to investigate and issue subpoenas.

4. Clarity is needed regarding the “adequate opportunity” required for the “executive director and the party against whom the subpoena is requested to be heard.

Freedom of Information Commission

The exemption specifically in Section 4 is overly broad and unnecessary, given existing exemptions. Under the proposal, the Office of Government Oversight must act to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in state government; as well as evaluate the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of governmental agencies and private entities that contract with such agencies to provide government services. However, shielding from public disclosure all records of such agency until all inspections, inquiries or investigations have been concluded and all criminal and civil actions have been finally adjudicated or otherwise settled, or at the discretion of the executive director, could undermine confidence in the agency and result in the withholding of important information from legislators, the press, and the public at large.

Consider the recent federal investigation into the state’s school construction office that led to a series of guilty pleas and the conviction of Konstantinos Diamantis, the state’s former deputy budget director. When the federal investigation into alleged corruption became publicly known in the spring of 2022, state officials retained an independent auditor to examine the issue. The audit’s findings were publicly released in January 2023, 16 months before Diamantis was criminally indicted in May 2024. Diamantis was found guilty of 21 counts of extortion, bribery, conspiracy, and false statement offenses in October 2025.

Had such an investigation and audit been initiated by the proposed Office of Government Oversight, records pertaining to the investigation and audit could have remained confidential for years. In addition, to the extent that Section 4 may seek to protect the disclosure of preliminary notes and drafts, trade secrets, commercial or financial information, attorney-client privileged communications, and personnel or medical files, there are already exemptions to disclosure that address these concerns.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Representative Vincent Candilora - House Minority Leader

Establishing the Office of Government Oversight would provide an independent, bipartisan mechanism to investigate fraud, waste, and abuse involving state resources. The office would review findings from state auditors, accept complaints and whistleblower reports, and conduct investigations when taxpayer funds may have been misused. While this bill isn’t the first time it’s been proposed, it’s also not a new idea. In fact, the state once had a similar office that was established over 40 years ago, incidentally, the last time Republicans held a majority in the legislature. Public Act 85-559 established the Office of Inspector General which was almost identical in powers and duties to what is being proposed today. Unfortunately, that office was eliminated two years later when the legislature changed hands and the whistleblower functions were transferred to the Office of Attorney General. This creates a potential conflict.

The proposal would include not only whistleblower provisions, with separate investigatory power but would also include the authority to refer cases to state or federal law enforcement

when appropriate and recommend policy or legislative changes to prevent future misconduct. In addition, the Office would issue regular reports to the General Assembly to ensure transparency and oversight.

Christina D.

The state takes advantage of the minority and needs oversight. There is too much dictator-like actions being done.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Anonymous

Oversight bodies are already in place. This is redundant make the ones we have work better.

Reported by: Diane Young-Rodney

Date: March 31, 2026