### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response
	• •	A. General Info
1.	Recipient of Funding	The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs ("DCA"), Sandy Recovery Division ("SRD"), is the direct recipient of funding from the United Stat Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), Community Development Block Grant, Disaster Recovery Program ("CDBG-DR") to addre the massive property damage inflicted by Superstorm Sandy. DCA retained several contractors, who fall under the purview of the New Jersey Inte Oversight Monitor Act ("A-60"), to assist it in managing various programs designed to distribute CDBG-DR funds to eligible New Jersey residents ar 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 Rent Repair Program ("LRRP"); CGI Federal ("CGI"), which was retained to create and manage the Sandy Integrated Recovery Operations and Manageme System ("SIROMS"), an information technology solution to assist DCA in managing its SRD programs; Hammerman & Gainer ("HGI"), which was ret to manage the housing application process for the SRD's various housing programs; ICF, Inc., which was retained to provide subject matter experti and staffing augmentation services to DCA; and Cohn Reznick, which was retained to serve as DCA's internal integrity monitor.
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	Gilbane (RREM): \$75,194,441; Gilbane (LRRP): \$10,779,405 CB&I/Shaw: \$92,011,031 CGI: \$77,945,831 ICF: \$77,526,395

	Comments
ates ress egrity and to ntal nent etained tise	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
6.	Contract/Program Person/Title	RREM and LRRP: David Mazzuca, Assistant Director, Housing Recovery Programs, DCA; Terrie Quintero, Senior Contracting Manager, DCA SIROMS and Sandy Grant Manager Module ("SGM"): Joyce Paul, SIROMS Manager. ICF: Elizabeth Mackay, Assistant Director, Procurement & Legal	
7.	Brief Description, Purpose and Rationale of Project/Program	<ul> <li>RREM provides CDBG-DR awards of up to \$150,000 to eligible homeowners to restore homes damaged by Superstorm Sandy.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>SGM, a grant tracking system, was developed by CGI. It has replaced the eGrant system developed by HGI.</li> <li>ICF provides strategic advice, program implementation, subject matter expertise and staff augmentation services to DCA.</li> <li>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 GM 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.</li> </ul>	
8.	Contract/Program Location	Trenton, New Jersey	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response
9.	Amount Expended to Date	Amounts are based on current invoice totals as of September 30, 2016: Gilbane (RREM): \$56,062,155; Gilbane (LRRP): \$9,361,778 CB&I/Shaw: \$62,476,521 CGI Federal: \$58,322,160 ICF: \$67,575,857
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 September 30, 2016: RREM (Gilbane/CB&I Shaw): approximately 72% LRRP (Gilbane): approximately 87% SIROMS/SGM (CGI): approximately 75%* ICF: approximately 87%
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

Comments

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
14.	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)	Navigant's integrity oversight monitoring activity for the Third Quarter 2016 focused principally on three areas: (1) reviewing the invoices of the RREM Contractor Gilbane and their hazmat subcontractors; (2) commencing our Pathway B homeowner payment review and (3) continuing our comprehensive technical electronic analysis of RREM and LRRP application data to identify potentially problematic files for further review. During this quarter, we conducted six (6) meetings or teleconferences with State of NJ Department of the Treasury, DCA, Gilbane and CB&I.	
		A. Invoice Review:	
		Throughout the Quarter, we continued our review of Gilbane's hazmat subcontractor ("subcontractor") invoices and related supporting documentation, and continued: (1) Follow up discussions with Gilbane 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 relevant supporting documentation provided by Gilbane; and (3) Our review of subcontractor invoices, hazmat reports and related supporting documentation to identify and track additional potential discrepancies in the subcontractor invoiced amounts. Navigant reported in the prior Quarter's report that we were performing an analysis of invoices submitted by two of Gilbane's subcontractors which revealed potential findings and that in this Quarter we would (1) continue to follow up with Gilbane during the next quarter to obtain the necessary additional supporting documentation and (2) quantify the invoice discrepancies that may result in a credit to the State. Navigant provides the following updates with regards to the potential findings that were reported in the prior Quarter's report:	
		Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #1 – Shift Rate Contract Modifications Not Executed: According to our review, Subcontractor #1 submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.98 million. These invoices were also included with Gilbane's invoice submissions to DCA.	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
No.		Response         In our prior Quarter's report, our review of the detailed invoice support provided for this subcontractor determined that they billed for certain hazmat related tasks and associated unit prices that were not authorized in their contract with Gilbane. There are three (3) separate issues we have identified in connection with the contract modifications. First, this subcontractor billed \$150 per home for the preparation of abatement cost estimates for homes that were determined to contain asbestos or lead risks. These billings totaled \$174,600. Second, the subcontractor also utilized a higher daily shift rate of \$2,200 for inspections conducted on the weekends for an incremental increase of \$42,000. Finally, the subcontractor also billed at higher rates, ranging from \$1-\$6 per sample, for asbestos and lead samples collected during the field inspections and sent to the lab for the analysis of hazmat risks. These hazmat sample billings at the higher rates resulted in increased billings of \$39,785.         Gilbane advised Navigant that expedited testing was necessary for the asbestos and lead samples collected from initial site inspections ("ISI's") of applicant homes in order to comply with DCA requirements and also to avoid any impact on subsequent dependent work flow processes. Gilbane for ISI's), Gilbane issued verbal authorizations to its subcontractors, and later followed up with an email authorizing the subcontractors to bill the shift rates and the lead/asbestos sample collections at the higher unit prices. Accordingly, Gilbane conceded that although the original agreements did not reflect the higher unit prices, these prices were known and agreed to in advance between Gilbane and the subcontractor.	Comments

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response		
		Navigant's review noted that the amended unit rates that were billed in this subcontractor's invoices were referenced in contemporar documentation between Gilbane and the subcontractor by an email dated July 9, 2013, and Gilbane's Modification #1 dated July 12, 2013.		
		Navigant therefore recommended that Gilbane formally update and modify this subcontractor's agreement to properly incorporate the additional items and prices in order to properly reconcile the subcontractor's contract with the subcontractors' and subsequently, Gilbane's billings. Gilban agreed to modify the agreement to include the amended unit prices.		
		During the next quarter, Navigant will continue its review of this subcontractor's invoices and the corresponding hazmat lab reports to identif additional potential discrepancies, and Navigant will follow up with Gilbane for clarification and supporting documentation, as necessary.		
		Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #2: According to our review, Subcontractor #2 submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.1 million. These invoices were also included with Gilbane' invoice submissions to DCA.		

	Comments
raneous	
nal unit	
ane has	
tify any	
_	
ne's	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		Finding A: - Overbilling for Duplicate Shift Rates:	
		In our prior Quarter's report, we reported that this subcontractor's invoices included potential discrepancies wherein the subcontractor billed more	
		than one \$1,700 daily shift rate when more than one field inspector visited and performed a single hazmat inspection on the same day. These billings	
		for duplicate shift rates totaled \$34,500 and were passed through by Gilbane to DCA for payment.	
		During the quarter, Navigant's review also noted that Gilbane identified additional duplicate shift rate billings by this subcontractor. The additional	
		duplicate shift rate billings totaled \$93,500. Our review determined that Gilbane made the proper reductions to the subcontractor's invoices for these	
		overbillings and did not submit them to DCA for payment.	
		Navigant is continuing its analysis to validate and finalize our preliminary determination that this subcontractor overbilled an additional \$34,500 related	
		to duplicate daily shift rates and to identify any additional potential overbillings involving duplicative daily shift rates that this subcontractor billed	
		before a final quantification can be made for the total potential overbilled amount, and the amount of credit that the State should expect from Gilbane.	
I	1		1

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		Finding B: - Revised Pricing Contract Modifications Not Executed: In our prior Quarter's report, we reported that our analysis of a sample of hazmat reports and supporting lab results revealed some potential quantity and pricing discrepancies in the subcontractor's billings.	
		During the quarter, Gilbane obtained clarification from the subcontractor for these potential discrepancies. Gilbane provided Navigant with a pricing table that included an additional set of asbestos and lead sample unit prices that Gilbane authorized this subcontractor to bill. This set included higher unit rates charged by the subcontractor to provide a shortened turnaround time for lab analyses and the subcontractor's report. Similar to the circumstances and justification provided by Gilbane for amended unit rates authorized for Subcontractor #1, Gilbane did not modify their contract with the subcontractor to reflect the amended unit prices and pricing table. Navigant therefore recommended that Gilbane formally update and modify this subcontractor's agreement to properly incorporate the additional hazmat unit prices referenced in the pricing table to properly reconcile the subcontractor's contract with the subcontractor's and subsequently, Gilbane's billings. Gilbane has agreed to modify the agreement to include the amended unit prices.	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		Additionally, Gilbane provided clarification on asbestos and lead samples that were collected during ISI's that were not analyzed by the lab due to "stop positive" or "insufficient materials." Gilbane explained that although the lab did not analyze these samples, the subcontractor should have billed a \$10 prep fee per sample in lieu of billing the analysis unit prices for the appropriate hazmat sample type.	
		During the next quarter, Navigant will continue its review of this subcontractor's invoices and the corresponding hazmat lab reports to identify any additional potential pricing and quantity discrepancies, and Navigant will follow up with Gilbane for clarification and supporting documentation, as necessary.	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
		B. Meetings and Inspections:	
		During the quarter, Navigant participated in meetings with each of Gilbane and CB&I in order to understand their internal procedures for receiving,	
		reviewing, recommending approval, and then maintenance of documentation for draw requests submitted by either applicants in the RREM program	
		(Pathway A and B), or homebuilders hired as part of the RREM program (Pathway C). The draw requests pertain to Advance Payments, Design Draw	
		Requests, 'standard' Draw Requests, and Final Release of Funds from an applicant's grant award.	
		The review with Gilbane was performed in person in which Gilbane walked Navigant through the steps and documentation that they review for each	
		draw request received from applicants in the RREM program. Gilbane's process is multi-stepped in which internal teams each perform reviews based	
		on the required documentation to ensure each draw request is complete, accurate and includes the appropriate support as required in the form of photos or invoices.	
		All documentation received is maintained in both hard copy and electronically. The hard-copy files are maintained by Gilbane in secure file cabinets in a room accessible only to Gilbane employees. The electronic files are maintained both on SIROMS, and on an internal Gilbane server. At closeout, each applicant's files on SIROMS will be fully checked and verified to ensure completeness, providing the ability for the duplicative data on the Gilbane server to be subsequently deleted and destroyed.	
		The review with CB&I was performed via teleconference. CB&I personnel walked us manually through the steps and documentation that they review for each draw request received from applicants in the RREM program. A more detailed review of the CB&I process has been scheduled to be performed in person in the next quarter. A similar set of checks and balances for draw request reviews was communicated by CB&I, and both electronic and hard copy files are maintained as required by DCA until applicant closeout.	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response
		The current processes employed by both contractors appears to be sufficient to ensure draw requests are properly documented, supported, and maintained as required. In the following quarter, a more detailed review of sample draw requests will be performed, initially with personnel from of the contractors, and then electronically via Navigant personnel performing reviews of documentation as available on SIROMS, and as required by program.
		In the next quarter Navigant will continue our review of the draw request process and Gilbane and CB&I's procedures and processes for reviewing requests to ensure accuracy and that they are in accordance with the RREM program and the approved scope of work outlined in the ECR and Grar Award.
		C. Technical Electronic Analyses:
		During the Quarter, Navigant continued our comprehensive review of SIROMS application data to identify potentially problematic applications for further review.
		This Quarter, the Navigant team received a listing of known twin applicants from DCA as part of an independent review of applications with the sar or substantially similar, damaged property addresses between RREM and LRRP applications. During the Quarter, Navigant ingested the listing receiv from DCA and began comparison of the contents of the DCA report to the results of our initial analysis. This comparison will continue into the next Quarter.

	Comments
n each by the	
g draw ant	
r	
ame, eived xt	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

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
15.	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.	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 from CGI, data extracts containing the historical RREM and LRRP application structured data available at the time of the data migration, the curren RREM and LRRP application structured data available when the extract was prepared, and the current audit trail of changes made to the RREM and application data available when the extract was prepared, and information was utilized in the analyses described in paragraph 14 above
16.	Description of quarterly auditing activities that have been conducted to ensure procurement compliance with terms and conditions of the contracts and agreements.	As described in paragraph 14 above, during this Quarter, Navigant reviewed the invoices of the RREM and LRRP Contractor and their subcontractor potential billing irregularities, commenced our Pathway B homeowner payment review, and continued our comprehensive technical electronic analyses of RREM and LRRP application data to identify potentially problematic files for further review.
17.	Have payment requisitions in connection with the contract/program been reviewed? Please describe	As described in paragraph 14 above, during this Quarter, Navigant continued reviewing the RREM and LRRP Contractor-invoices and their subcont invoices, and updated our invoice database to compile relevant invoice details for further analysis. This database enables us to verify the mathem accuracy of invoiced amounts, validate the invoiced unit rates, identify any second-tier subcontractors, track the amount of the subcontractors' bil to date, track total amounts billed by subcontractors to the terms of their subcontractor agreements or purchase orders, and conduct additional in analytics based on the RREM and LRRP application numbers and other key information and underlying source documents. Although many of the previously reported subcontractor billing issues have been resolved there are a few issues that 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 the contractors.

# Comments gular nd (4) ent nd LRRP /e. ctors for ontractor ematical billings l invoice t of ded by

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response
18.	Description of quarterly activity to prevent and detect waste, fraud and abuse.	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 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 review of Pathway B homeowner payments was commenced to develop the methodology we will execu duting subsequent quarters to identify any potential irregularities in connection with these payments ; and our technical electronic analyses of the universe of RREM and LRRP applications sought to identify potentially problematic applications for further review using data extracts from SIROM
19.	Provide details of any integrity issues/findings	As explained in paragraphs 14 and 18 above, our review of the invoices of the RREM and LRRP Contractor and their subcontractors identified poter billing issues. Although many of the previously reported subcontractor billing issues have been resolved there are a few issues that 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 addition data and documents to be provided by the contractors; our technical analysis of RREM and LRRP applications, similar to our previously completed technical analyses, using data extracts from SIROMS to identify and analyze potential applicant eligibility issues. This analysis will continue throug next Quarter.
20.	Provide details of any work quality or safety/environmental/historical preservation issue(s).	N/A
21.	Provide details on any other items of note that have occurred in the past quarter	N/A

	Comments
of the cute he	
MS.	
ential pe onal d RREM ugh the	

### Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc. Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts For Quarter Ending: 9/30/2016

No.	Recipient Data Elements	Response	Comments
22.	Provide details of any actions taken to	N/A	
	remediate waste, fraud and abuse noted in		
	past quarters		
		C. Miscellaneous	
		For the Quarter Ending September 30, 2016:	
		Total hours incurred: 232.45 hours	
	monitoring review	Total fees incurred: \$ 63,924.00	
		Total expenses incurred: \$0	
24	Add any item, issue or comment not	N/A	
	covered in previous sections but deemed		
	pertinent to monitoring program.		
		•	
	Name of Integrity Monitor: Navigant Consult	ing Inc.	
	Name of Report Preparer: Daniel F. Gill		
		Succ	
	Signature:		
	Date: December 31, 2016		

Name of Integrity Monitor: Navigant Consulting Inc.		
Name of Report Preparer: Daniel F. Gill		
	Since	
Signature:		
Date: December 31, 2016		

## Appendix A Meetings Conducted For Quarter Ending 9/30/2016

	I. New Jersey Department of Community Affairs		
А.	Samuel Viavattine	Deputy Commissioner	
В.	Robert Bartolone	Director, Office of Auditing	
C.	David Mazzuca	Assistant Director Housing Recovery	
		Sr. Contracting Officer-	
D	<b>—</b> • • • •	Procurement/Legal- Sandy Recovery	
D.	Terri Quintero	Division	
		Assistant Commissioner, Sandy	
E.	Laura Shea	Recovery Division	
Б	Elizabeth Mackay	Assistant Director of Procurement and Legal	
F	Elizabeth Mackay	and Legal	
G	Michael Simon	Compliance	
		II. New Jersey Department of the Treasury	
<u>.</u>		Deputy Chief of Staff - Division of	
	Roseann Koval	Purchase & Property	
		III. Gilbane Building Company	
А.	Deborah Perriera	VP, Program CEO, LEED BD+C	
B.	Thomas Nieder	Senior Project Executive	
Ъ.	monius meder		
C.	Samir Patel	Senior Project Executive	
F			
D.	Kevin Kennedy	Project Manager	
E.	Ed Savoth	Payment Team	
_	-		
	IV. CB&I Shaw		
A.	Jo Carroll	Program Manager	
В.	Mary Shapiro	Marketing Specialist	
C.	Roger Clifford	Project Manager	
<u> </u>	noger childre		

D. Darren Hurley Project Manager

E. Joanna Kennedy Senior Manager