

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
A. General Info			
1.	Recipient of Funding	<p>The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs ("DCA"), Sandy Recovery Division ("SRD"), is the direct recipient of funding from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), Community Development Block Grant, Disaster Recovery Program ("CDBG-DR") to address the massive property damage inflicted by Superstorm Sandy. DCA retained several contractors, who fall under the purview of the New Jersey Integrity Oversight Monitor Act ("A-60"), to assist it in managing various programs designed to distribute CDBG-DR funds to eligible New Jersey residents and businesses. These Contractors include the Gilbane Building Company ("Gilbane"), CB&I Shaw ("CB&I"), and the URS Group, which were retained to manage the Rehabilitation, Reconstruction, Elevation and Mitigation Program ("RREM"); Gilbane, which was retained to manage the Landlord Rental Repair Program ("LRRP"); CGI Federal ("CGI"), which was retained to create and manage the Sandy Integrated Recovery Operations and Management System ("SIROMS"), an information technology solution to assist DCA in managing its SRD programs; Hammerman & Gainer ("HGI"), which was retained to manage the housing application process for the SRD's various housing programs; ICF, Inc., which was retained to provide subject matter expertise and staffing augmentation services to DCA; and Cohn Reznick, which was retained to serve as DCA's internal integrity monitor.</p>	
2.	Federal Funding Agency? (e.g. HUD, FEMA)	HUD	
3.	State Funding (if applicable)	None	
4.	Award Type	HUD CDBG-DR Award	
5.	Award Amount	<p>Gilbane (RREM): \$70,424,703; Gilbane (LRRP): \$10,779,408 CB&I/Shaw: \$87,354,921 CGI: \$78,180,131 ICF: \$69,761,055</p>	

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
6.	Contract/Program Person/Title	<p>RREM and LRRP: David Mazzuca, Assistant Director, Housing Recovery Programs, DCA; Terrie Quintero, Senior Contracting Manager, DCA</p> <p>SIROMS and Sandy Grant Manager Module ("SGM"): Joyce Paul, SIROMS Manager.</p> <p>ICF: Elizabeth Mackay, Assistant Director, Procurement & Legal</p> <p>Cohn Reznick: Robert Bartolone, Director, Office of Auditing, DCA</p>	
7.	Brief Description, Purpose and Rationale of Project/Program	<p>RREM provides CDBG-DR awards of up to \$150,000 to eligible homeowners to restore homes damaged by Superstorm Sandy.</p> <p>LRRP provides CDBG-DR awards of up to \$50,000 per unit to owners of rental properties with between 1 and 25 units that require rehabilitation as a result of Superstorm Sandy.</p> <p>SIROMS, developed and administered by CGI, manages all of DCA's Superstorm Sandy funding requests from State agencies, local governments and school districts, as well as all HUD reporting obligations.</p> <p>SGM, a grant tracking system, was developed by CGI. It has replaced the eGrant system developed by HGI.</p> <p>ICF provides strategic advice, program implementation, subject matter expertise and staff augmentation services to DCA.</p> <p>Superstorm Sandy Housing Incentive Program ("SSHIP") covered the completion and processing of housing program applications, and the determination of eligibility and disbursement of funds under the Resettlement Incentive Program, and the RREM and LRRP Programs. HGI was the original contractor selected to manage SSHIP, but prior to the beginning of Navigant's monitorship, DCA and HGI, by mutual agreement, terminated HGI's role as the SSHIP contractor. In May 2015, DCA and HGI entered into a mutually agreed settlement to resolve HGI's performance issues and the amounts billed by HGI and unpaid by DCA. DCA assumed responsibility over HGI's duties at the Superstorm Sandy Housing Recovery Centers, and CGI assumed responsibility for migrating applicant data from HGI's eGrants system to CGI's SGM system. CGI has completed the migration of data from eGrants to SGM, and is managing the data for the RREM and LRRP programs going forward.</p>	
8.	Contract/Program Location	Trenton, New Jersey	

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
9.	Amount Expended to Date	Amounts are based on current invoice totals as of March 31, 2016: Gilbane (RREM): \$48,401,151; Gilbane (LRRP): \$8,244,684 CB&I/Shaw: \$51,453,264 CGI Federal: \$47,761,509 ICF: \$50,012,329	
10.	Amount Provided to other State or Local Entities	N/A	
11.	Completion Status of Contract or Program	Completion Status based on contract values and invoiced amounts as of March 31, 2016: RREM (Gilbane/CB&I Shaw): approximately 65% LRRP (Gilbane): approximately 77% SIROMS/SGM (CGI): approximately 61%* ICF: approximately 72% * In January 2014 HGI was terminated by mutual agreement as a contractor for the RREM program. CGI assumed the remaining responsibility for the IT duties . As a result the total award and amount expended for HGI is no longer considered for purposes of calculating the completion status (see Report Section 11) of the RREM program, and this percentage of completion therefore refers to CGI only.	
12.	Expected Contract End Date/Time Period	RREM (Gilbane & CB&I Shaw): May 22, 2017 LRRP (Gilbane): June 30, 2017 CGI: May 24, 2017 ICF: May 24, 2017	
B. Monitoring Activities			
13.	If FEMA funded, brief description of the status of the project worksheet and its support.	N/A	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
14.	<p>Quarterly Activities/Project Description (include number of visits to meet with recipient and sub recipient, including who you met with, and any site visits warranted to where work was completed)</p>	<p>Navigant's integrity oversight monitoring activity for the First Quarter 2016 focused principally on four areas: (1) reviewing the invoices of the RREM Contractor Gilbane ("the Contractor"), and their hazmat subcontractors; (2) conducting site visits of homes in the RREM program; and (3) continuing our comprehensive technical electronic analysis of LRRP application data to identify potentially problematic files for further review. During this quarter, we conducted 7 meetings or teleconferences with DCA, Housing Center staff and RREM applicants. We also conducted site visits in Atlantic City, Ocean City, Ventnor City, Brigantine, Township of Rumson and Little Silver, NJ encompassing 218 properties.</p>	
		<p>A. Invoice Review:</p> <p>Throughout the Quarter, we continued our review of the Contractor's hazmat subcontractor invoices and related supporting documentation, and continued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Follow up discussions with the Contractor to obtain clarification and supporting documentation to address the potential subcontractor invoice discrepancies that were reported in the prior Quarter's report; (2) Updating our invoice database based on additional support documentation provided by the Contractor; (3) Updating our invoice database to record the additional detailed subcontractor invoices that were missing from the invoice packages initially submitted by the Contractor to DCA; and (4) Our review of subcontractor invoices, hazmat reports and related supporting documentation to identify and track additional potential discrepancies in the subcontractor invoiced amounts. <p>Navigant reported in the prior Quarter's report that we are performing an analysis of invoices submitted by two of Gilbane's hazmat subcontractors which revealed potential findings that we will continue to follow up with Gilbane during the next quarter to obtain the necessary additional supporting documentation and quantify the invoice discrepancies that may result in a credit to the State. Navigant provides the following updates with regards to the following potential findings that were reported in the prior Quarter's report:</p> <p>Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #1:</p> <p>According to our review, this hazmat subcontractor submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.98 million. These invoices were also included with Gilbane's invoice submissions to DCA.</p>	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>Finding A: In our prior Quarter’s report, we reported that our review of this subcontractor’s invoices revealed missing supporting documentation, which identified the specific homes inspected, among other pertinent details. During the quarter, Gilbane obtained and produced to Navigant a complete and legible set of the missing detail invoice pages, which were reviewed and updated in our invoice database. Navigant has received all of the requested supporting documentation for this finding.</p> <p>Finding B: In our prior Quarter’s report, our review of the detailed invoice support provided for this subcontractor determined that this subcontractor included a line item charging \$150 per home for the preparation of an abatement cost estimate for homes that contained asbestos or lead risks. Navigant noted that this was not an approved line item in the subcontractor’s agreement with Gilbane dated August 26, 2013.</p> <p>During the quarter, Gilbane provided a copy of an email with the subcontractor dated July 12, 2013 that included an attachment entitled “Modification No. 1” which included the \$150 per hazmat abatement cost estimate line item. Navigant inquired of Gilbane why this line item noted in this July 12, 2013 document was not reflected in the August 26, 2013 executed subcontractor agreement. Gilbane explained that they mistakenly failed to include the previously agreed upon rates with the subcontractor in the formal agreement because they were focused on getting its subcontractors underway with work as soon as possible to meet the needs to the RREM and LRRP programs.</p> <p>Based on the additional subcontractor detail invoices provided, Navigant determined that this subcontractor invoiced \$174,600 for this hazmat abatement cost estimate. As Navigant reported in the prior Quarter’s report, the \$150 per home line item is a charge that is unique to this subcontractor as it (1) is not included in any of the Gilbane or CBI/Shaw subcontract agreements, and (2) it is not a line item billed by the other Gilbane or CBI/Shaw hazmat subcontractors. Although these other subcontractors typically provided cost estimates in their hazmat reports for homes they inspected that tested positive for asbestos or lead risks, they do not include a separate line item charge to provide this estimate. During the next quarter, Navigant will continue discussions to follow up with Gilbane to assess the appropriateness of this charge.</p>	

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>Finding C: In our prior Quarter’s report, Navigant also identified potential discrepancies in the invoiced unit prices for various types of testing on asbestos and lead samples obtained during the field inspection. These discrepancies ranged from \$1 to \$6 per sample greater than what was authorized in the subcontractor agreement.</p> <p>During the quarter, Gilbane provided July 2013 emails exchanged with the subcontractor in which the subcontractor proposed unit rates that were higher than what was reflected in the formal subcontractor agreement. Gilbane agreed to these rates in their emails, however, these higher unit rates were not reflected in the August 26, 2013 executed subcontractor agreement. As noted in Finding B above, Gilbane explained that they mistakenly failed to include the previously agreed upon rates with the subcontractor in the formal agreement because they were focused on getting its subcontractors underway with work as soon as possible to meet the needs to the RREM and LRRP programs. During the next quarter, Navigant will continue its review of the subcontractor invoices and the hazmat reports to reconcile the invoiced quantities and hazmat sample types.</p> <p>Finding D: In our prior Quarter’s report, we further determined that the subcontractor billed \$500 more per inspector than the authorized \$1,700 daily shift rate for inspections that occurred during the weekend, a \$2,200 daily shift rate. During the quarter, Gilbane provided Navigant with the Modification No.1 document, referenced in Finding B above, that permitted the higher daily shift rate charge for inspections conducted on Saturdays and Sundays. Navigant’s review of the subcontractor invoices noted that the \$2,200 shift rate was invoiced for 84 weekend shifts, for a total of \$184,800, resulting in a weekend increase of \$42,000. During the next quarter, Navigant’s continuing review of these invoices will include steps to reconcile higher shift rate charges. Additionally, Navigant will follow up with Gilbane for additional clarification and supporting documentation for any potential discrepancies identified in Navigant's review.</p>	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #2: According to our review, this hazmat subcontractor submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.1 million. These invoices were also included with Gilbane’s invoice submissions to DCA.</p> <p>Finding A: In our prior Quarter’s report, we reported that our review of this subcontractor’s invoices identified potential discrepancies involving several billings where the subcontractor charged for two (2) shift rates instead of one (1), resulting in a potential double charge per shift of approximately \$1,700 each. This potential over charge is reflected in invoices where the subcontractor billed two (2) inspectors for the same home. During the quarter, Navigant provided examples of such billings to Gilbane and conducted follow up discussions with Gilbane to obtain clarification and supporting documentation. Navigant also provided examples of instances in which the same home was inspected for lead and asbestos hazards on different days.</p> <p>Gilbane explained that some homes required repeat visits due to homeowner delays such as no-shows at scheduled appointments, homeowner cancellation of scheduled appointments, and access to all areas of the property was not granted or possible. Gilbane also explained that for safety and liability reasons, its standard operating procedure was that two (2) inspection representatives would participate in site visits. Gilbane further advised that inspection team would typically include a Gilbane inspector for the accompanied by an inspector employed by the subcontractor for the initial visit. If a second site visit was required, two inspectors employed by the subcontractor would conduct the inspection.</p> <p>During the next quarter, Navigant will provide Gilbane with additional instances where two shift rates were invoiced so that Gilbane can provide appropriate supporting documentation to justify such billings.</p> <p>Finding B: In our prior Quarter’s report, we reported that our analysis of select hazmat reports determined that in some cases the supporting hazmat laboratory test results that accompanied the hazmat report could not be reconciled to the subcontractor’s invoiced quantities and specific hazmat tests. Specifically, in some instances the invoiced quantities were higher than the number of samples actually tested when compared to the hazmat laboratory test results, which appeared to be attributed to some samples that the lab did not analyze and denoted as “Stop Positive – Not Analyzed.”</p>	

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>During the quarter, Navigant provided Gilbane with a representative sample of lab reports that did not reconcile to the subcontractor's billings. With respect to samples where the hazmat samples were not tested by the lab and denoted as "Stop Positive," Gilbane explained that the hazmat labs can follow a variety of testing protocols within industry standards which may include additional sample analysis, and in other instances the labs may have charged sample preparation fees.</p> <p>Navigant's review also determined that some hazmat lab reports did not contain the complete lab test results. Gilbane was able to locate and produce the missing lab test results in their files for certain identified homes.</p> <p>During the next quarter, Navigant will continue to review and reconcile the subcontractor invoiced quantities and hazmat sample types to the lab reports and followed up with Gilbane to obtain clarification and supporting documentation to reconcile and resolve any additional potential billing discrepancies.</p> <p>Finding C: In our prior Quarter's report, we reported that our review of this subcontractor's invoice also noted instances in which higher unit rates were charged for the various hazmat sample tests than what was authorized in the subcontractor agreement with Gilbane. During the quarter, Navigant followed up with Gilbane and confirmed that there were no modifications to the subcontract agreements. Gilbane explained that some of the higher unit rates invoiced by the subcontractor may be attributed to expediting the turnaround time of the initial site visit, the lab analysis of the hazmat samples and the preparation of the hazmat report, and that the higher unit rates are well below industry standard for expedited sample analysis rendered.</p> <p>Gilbane also stated that due to the evolving nature of the RREM and LRRP programs and pace of the work at the inception, Gilbane would issue verbal authorizations to its subcontractors and then later follow up with documentation (i.e. email, contract amendment) to memorialize Gilbane's approval. For this subcontractor, Gilbane stated that although it verbally approved the unit rates invoiced by the subcontractor, Gilbane did not incorporate these unit rates into the subcontractor agreement.</p> <p>During the next quarter, Navigant will continue its analysis to identify invoiced unit rate discrepancies and follow up with Gilbane for appropriate supporting documentation.</p>	
		B. Meetings and Inspections:	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>During the Quarter, we reviewed relevant documentation available on SIROMS, and conducted site visits in preparation for performing a detailed review of Gilbane and CB&I's draw request review and approval process.</p> <p>Site visits were performed in Atlantic City, Ocean City, Ventnor City, Brigantine, Little Silver, and the Township of Rumson, encompassing 218 properties in the RREM program. In preparation for the site visits a list of the RREM homes within each town was extracted from SIROMS. The current "status" within SIROMS, as well as some key information, including the Grant Award, Grant Award Signing Date, Reimbursement Award, Pathway, Payments Received etc., were extracted from SIROMS in preparation for the site visits. Of the 218 properties, three were found to be either on hold or inactive in the RREM program.</p> <p>During the site visits, field observations were made in order to assess both the accuracy of homeowner reported information as well as the process for reviewing and approving of draw requests by Gilbane and/or CB&I. As these site visits and inspections were conducted randomly and not performed in conjunction with RREM Contractor or other scheduled meetings, interior inspections were not performed.</p> <p>A database of the individual RREM Applicant's information is being maintained for the damaged properties that were visited. Including those site visits performed in previous quarters, a total of 409 site visits have been performed to date. This database is being maintained with payment data including amounts paid and timing of payments. This database will be utilized in review of Gilbane's and CB&I's process for approving draw/reimbursement requests which will be conducted in subsequent quarters.</p> <p>A review and analysis of the SIROMS data was performed on the homes visited this quarter. A total of 3 homes have been deemed ineligible, withdrawn, or placed in compliance hold by the DCA, and therefore removed from further analysis by Navigant. For the remaining 215 homes, it was determined that 201 homes (with an average grant award of \$132,704.28), and paid a total of \$19,257,644.13, and 14 homes (with an average grant award of \$148,611.90) had not received any payments to date.</p> <p>In the next quarter Navigant will start our review of the draw request process and Gilbane and CB&I's procedures and processes for reviewing draw requests.</p> <p>C. Technical Electronic Analyses:</p> <p>During the Quarter, Navigant continued our comprehensive review of SIROMS application data to identify potentially problematic applications for further review.</p>	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		<p>This Quarter, the Navigant IT team designed and executed a technical analysis to identify applications with the same, or substantially similar, damaged property addresses between RREM and LRRP applications. Navigant designed a phased approach in determining which application pairings would warrant further review. First, Navigant applied an established analytic technique that measured the distance between the LRRP damaged property addresses and the RREM damaged property addresses to programmatically score the similarity between the address values. Based on those results, Navigant then systematically narrowed the full population of RREM and LRRP address comparisons to a subset that was deemed similar enough to warrant a refined comparison between the applications' damaged property addresses. Finally, Navigant completed an in-depth manual review of the refined results in order to assign a risk ranking to the narrowed set of application pairings which may require additional review, based on the damaged property address values and application funding statuses.</p> <p>This analysis will continue into the next Quarter.</p>	
15.	<p>Brief Description to confirm appropriate data/information has been provided by recipient and what activities have been taken to review in relation to the project/contract/program.</p>	<p>Navigant obtained (1) from DCA, invoice-related documentation (2) from DCA, supplemental applicant related data (3) from the Contractors, regular schedules of their planned RREM applicant meetings and inspections, and some, but not all, of the invoice-related documentation requested; and (4) from CGI, data extracts containing the historical LRRP application structured data available at the time of the data migration, the current LRRP application structured data available when the extract was prepared, and the current audit trail of changes made to the LRRP application data available when the extract was prepared. This data and information was utilized in the analyses described in paragraph 14 above.</p>	
16.	<p>Description of quarterly auditing activities that have been conducted to ensure procurement compliance with terms and conditions of the contracts and agreements.</p>	<p>As described in paragraph 14 above, during this Quarter, Navigant reviewed the invoices of the RREM and LRRP Contractor and their subcontractors for potential billing irregularities, conducted site visits of homes under construction or repair, and continued our comprehensive technical electronic analyses of LRRP application data to identify potentially problematic files for further review.</p>	

State of New Jersey
 Department of Treasury
 Integrity Oversight Monitoring Reporting Model

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016


Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
17.	<p>Have payment requisitions in connection with the contract/program been reviewed? Please describe</p>	<p>As described in paragraph 14 above, during this Quarter, Navigant continued reviewing the RREM and LRRP Contractor-invoices and their subcontractor invoices, and updated our invoice database to compile relevant invoice details for further analysis. This database enables us to verify the mathematical accuracy of invoiced amounts, validate the invoiced unit rates, identify any second-tier subcontractors, track the amount of the subcontractors' billings to date, track total amounts billed by subcontractors to the terms of their subcontractor agreements or purchase orders, and conduct additional invoice analytics based on the RREM and LRRP application numbers and other key information and underlying source documents. Our review during the Quarter continued to identify potential billing issues that require additional documentation to resolve.</p>	
18.	<p>Description of quarterly activity to prevent and detect waste, fraud and abuse.</p>	<p>As described in paragraph 14 above, all of Navigant's work this Quarter was designed to prevent and detect waste, fraud and abuse. Our review of the invoices of the RREM and LRRP Contractors and their subcontractors sought to identify any potential irregularities with billings submitted by the Contractors and their subcontractors; our performance of site visits to analyze and reconcile the progress of repairs with payments made to both homeowners or homebuilders; and our technical electronic analyses of the universe of LRRP applications sought to identify potentially problematic applications for further review using data extracts from SIROMS.</p>	
19.	<p>Provide details of any integrity issues/findings</p>	<p>As explained in paragraphs 14 and 18 above, our review of the invoices of the RREM and LRRP Contractor and their subcontractors identified potential billing issues. The subcontractor billing issues continue to be reviewed and a comprehensive set of findings is expected to be completed during the next Quarter pursuant to our review and analysis of additional data and documents to be provided by the contractors; our technical analysis of LRRP applications, similar to our previously completed RREM technical analyses, using data extracts from SIROMS to identify and analyze potential applicant eligibility issues. This analysis will continue through the next Quarter.</p>	
20.	<p>Provide details of any work quality or safety/environmental/historical preservation issue(s).</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
 Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
 For Quarter Ending: 3/31/2016

Reports required under A-60 will be submitted by Integrity Monitors on the first business day of each calendar quarter to the State Treasurer and will contain detailed information on the projects/contracts/programs funded by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act.

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
21.	Provide details on any other items of note that have occurred in the past quarter	N/A	
22.	Provide details of any actions taken to remediate waste, fraud and abuse noted in past quarters	N/A	
C. Miscellaneous			
23.	Attach a list of hours and expenses incurred to perform your quarterly integrity monitoring review	For the Quarter Ending March 31, 2016: Total hours incurred: 557.85 hours Total fees incurred: \$153,111.25 Total expenses incurred: \$10.91	
24	Add any item, issue or comment not covered in previous sections but deemed pertinent to monitoring program.	N/A	

Name of Integrity Monitor: Navigant Consulting Inc. Name of Report Preparer: Daniel F. Gill

Signature: Date: July 1, 2016