

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: 12/31/2015

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
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 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.	
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): \$70,424,703; Gilbane (LRRP): \$10,779,408 CB&I/Shaw: \$87,354,921 CGI: \$66,145,164 ICF: \$74,631,592 URS: \$5,543,381* HGI: \$43,535,449** Cohn Reznick: \$9,064,952 *In February 2014 the URS contract for the RREM program was allowed to expire by mutual agreement. Gilbane and CB&I Shaw assumed the remaining joint responsibility for the URS duties. As a result the total award and amount expended for URS is no longer considered for purposes of calculating the completion status (see Report Section 11) of the RREM program. **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.	
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 Cohn Reznick: Robert Bartolone, Director, Office of Auditing, DCA	

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: 12/31/2015

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
7.	Brief Description, Purpose and Rationale of Project/Program	RREM provides CDBG-DR awards of up to \$150,000 to eligible homeowners to restore homes damaged by Superstorm Sandy. 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. 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. SGM, a grant tracking system, was developed by CGI. It has replaced the eGrant system developed by HGI. ICF provides strategic advice, program implementation, subject matter expertise and staff augmentation services to DCA. 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.	
8.	Contract/Program Location	Trenton, New Jersey	
9.	Amount Expended to Date	Amounts are based on current invoice totals as of December 31, 2015: Gilbane (RREM): \$38,131,992; Gilbane (LRRP): \$6,873,926 CB&I/Shaw: \$32,677,232 CGI Federal: \$39,379,272 ICF: \$40,363,816 URS: \$5,543,381* HGI: \$43,535,449** Cohn Reznick: \$9,064,952 *In February 2014 the URS contract for the RREM program was allowed to expire by mutual agreement. Gilbane and CB&I Shaw assumed the remaining joint responsibility for the URS duties. As a result the total award and amount expended for URS is no longer considered for purposes of calculating the completion status (see Report Section 11) of the RREM program. **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.	
10.	Amount Provided to other State or Local Entities	N/A	

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: 12/31/2015

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
11.	Completion Status of Contract or Program	Completion Status based on contract values and invoiced amounts as of December 31, 2015: RREM (Gilbane/CB&I Shaw): approximately 58% LRRP (Gilbane): approximately 72% SIROMS/SGM (CGI): approximately 80% ICF: approximately 62% Cohn Reznick: 100%	
12.	Expected Contract End Date/Time Period	RREM (Gilbane & CB&I Shaw): May 22, 2017 LRRP (Gilbane): June 30, 2016 CGI: May 24, 2016 ICF: July 15, 2016 Cohn Reznick: June 30, 2015	
Monitoring Activities			
13.	If FEMA funded, brief description of the status of the project worksheet and its support.	N/A	
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 Fourth Quarter 2015 focused principally on four areas: (1) reviewing the invoices of the two RREM Contractors, Gilbane and CB&I/Shaw ("the Contractors"), and their numerous 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 11 meetings with DCA, Treasury, NJ Attorney General's Office, ICF, Housing Center staff and RREM applicants. We also conducted a site visit in Lavalette, NJ encompassing fifty-eight (58) properties. A. Invoice Review: Throughout the Quarter, we continued our review of the RREM and LRRP Contractor and their respective subcontractor invoices, and continued: (1) Identifying and tracking potential discrepancies including invoiced unit pricing for hazmat sample testing and daily shift rates that are not authorized in subcontractor agreements; (2) Analyzed and reviewed for unsupported invoiced hazmat testing (3) Analyzed and reviewed for potentially duplicative invoiced inspector daily shift rates. Navigant reported in the prior Quarter's report that we are reviewing additional Gilbane subcontractor invoices to identify pricing that is inconsistent with Gilbane's purchase orders and/or contracts with their subcontractors. In particular, Navigant's review of invoices submitted by two of Gilbane's subcontractors revealed the following potential findings that we will continue to follow up with Gilbane during the next quarter to obtain the necessary additional supporting documentation:	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
For Quarter Ending: 12/31/2015

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
		Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #1: Finding A: Our review determined that this subcontractor submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.98 million. These invoices were included with Gilbane's invoice submissions to DCA. Our review of Gilbane's submissions determined that some of the submitted invoices only included the hazmat subcontractor's summary invoice pages, and failed to include the underlying detail in support of the summary invoice page which identified the specific home inspected, the RREM or LRRP #, the types and quantity of hazmat samples collected and tested, the date of inspection and the name of the inspector. During the quarter, Gilbane provided Navigant with a partial set of the missing detail pages from the subcontractor invoices. Navigant has made a supplemental request to obtain additional detailed support to replace poor quality copies which were illegible and could therefore not be reviewed for our analysis. Navigant expects to receive and review this supplemental set of documents during the next quarter. Finding B: Navigant's 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 each home inspected that contained asbestos or lead risks. During field inspections, samples are collected from homes and submitted to a hazmat laboratory to test for asbestos and/or lead risks. Consequently, for the homes in which samples that tested positive for hazmat risks this subcontractor's report included additional estimated cost abatement information. Therefore, if a home tested positive for both asbestos and lead risks, the home was typically invoiced for a total of \$300. 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 did not charge the homeowner to provide this estimate. During the next quarter, Navigant will follow up with Gilbane for additional clarification and supporting documentation for this invoiced line item, which Navigant, to date, has determined to total approximately \$136,000. Finding C: Navigant also noted 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. Finding D: 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 separate, higher weekend shift rate greater than the \$1,700 daily shift rate was not included as an approved unit price in the subcontractor agreement. During the next quarter, Navigant will also follow up with Gilbane for additional clarification and supporting documentation for these higher invoiced unit line items.	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
For Quarter Ending: 12/31/2015

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
		Potential Findings for Gilbane Subcontractor #2: According to our review, this subcontractor submitted invoices totaling approximately \$1.1 million. These invoices were also included with Gilbane's invoice submissions to DCA. Finding A: Our review of Gilbane's submissions determined that their subcontractor agreement includes a \$1,700 daily shift rate charge for each inspector. This total overall rate includes 8 hours of field inspections for asbestos and lead risks at one or more assigned homes for each day of that inspections are performed. Navigant's review of this subcontractor's invoices noted however that some homes were invoiced for two shift rates (\$3,400) instead of one. We further determined that although the subcontractor invoice listed the names for two inspectors, and thereby indicating that two inspectors participated in the inspection, the corresponding hazmat reports for these homes only reflected the name for one inspector. Navigant was not able to identify any factors or special circumstances in the hazmat report that would justify the billing for two shift rates. During the next quarter Navigant will follow up with Gilbane to obtain additional information and any supporting documentation for such billings. Additionally, Navigant determined that some hazmat reports needed for our analysis pertaining to this finding were not uploaded to SIROMS and we will follow up with Gilbane to obtain copies of the missing hazmat reports. Finding B: Additionally, Navigant's review of select hazmat reports also revealed that in some instances 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. Navigant will follow up with Gilbane to determine whether there are any additional hazmat laboratory test results that should have been included with the hazmat reports and any other supporting documentation to reconcile and resolve such billing discrepancies. Finding C: Navigant 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. Navigant will follow up with Gilbane to determine whether the subcontract agreements were subsequently updated with the invoiced unit rates, and if so, will obtain a copy to review for appropriate support. Navigant will continue to request and review newly submitted invoices submitted by the Contractors on a recurring basis, and will update our Contractor and Subcontractor invoice database to compile relevant invoice details for further ongoing analysis. This database will enable 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, and track total amounts billed by subcontractors to the terms of their subcontractor agreements or purchase orders. It will also enable us to conduct additional invoice analytics based on the RREM and LRRP application numbers, other key information and underlying source documents.	
		B. Meetings and Inspections: During the Quarter, we reviewed relevant documentation available on SIROMS, and conducted random site visits to assess construction progress.	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
For Quarter Ending: 12/31/2015

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
		Site visits were performed in the town of Lavallette encompassing 58 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. During the site visits, the status of construction, and evidence of work either being performed, or completed was noted. As these site visits and inspections were random and not performed in conjunction with RREM Contractor or other scheduled meetings, interior inspections were not performed. Our observations included an evaluation of the following: (a) Were construction crews present; (b) Has the elevation of the damaged property been completed or in the process of being performed; (c) Is past or ongoing work evident; (d) Are construction permits posted; (e) Is the damaged property still an empty lot; and (f) has the construction started or complete? 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 Hoboken, Union Beach and Toms River the previous quarter, a total of 191 site visits have been performed to date. Of all the site visits performed to date, there were a total of 7 locations with empty lots. A review of the SIROMS data indicated that each of the 7 applicants had received payments from the program (an average of \$78,131.38). The payments were generally found to be advance payments issued to pay contractors to start work. Three of these applicants have had a large time lapse from the receipt of monies. Each of these applicants/locations have been noted and will be monitored. An additional 10 homes did not appear to have any construction completed, but had received funds from the program (average of \$70,673.94). The majority of the payments were found to be advance payments given to pay contractors to start work. Some of these homes require a more detailed review that will be performed next quarter. A review of the status of work for each of these properties will be monitored in the following quarters. A review and analysis of the SIROMS data was performed on the homes visited. Since the site visit, a total of 9 homes have been deemed ineligible, withdrawn, placed in compliance hold, or removed from further analysis due to other minor discrepancies. For the remaining 182 homes, it was determined that 171 have been paid a total of \$15,110,564.66 (with an average grant award of \$119,765.65), and an additional 11 homes had not received any payments (with an average grant award of \$118,838.21). Further, of the homes that have received payment, 48 have been paid their full grant award amount, and 86 receiving more than the initial draw and/or design request, confirming that construction either has or is near commencement. The 11 applicants that have yet to receive payment appear to simply be lagging in terms of moving into and completing the construction phase. Each of these homes will be monitored for progress going forward.	

Firm Name: Navigant Consulting Inc.
Engagement: EQ2014-002-P3-DCA Sandy Contracts
For Quarter Ending: 12/31/2015

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 review of the data (taken on or before the site visit took place), reveals that homes in the program are completing construction at a slower than anticipated rate based on the Grant Award Agreement which indicates the assigned scope of work is to be completed within a year of Grant Award Signing. For example, of the 47 homes that were currently under construction based on our observations during the site visits, an average of 470 days has elapsed from Grant Award Signing to the date of the site visit. DCA allows extensions, and there may be valid reasons for delays. The reasons for homes being incomplete varies from case to case (e.g. homeowners' schedules, builders' delays, etc...). DCA has processes in place to review potential delays, approve extensions, and monitor progress including check points that are reviewed every thirty days. These processes include attempts to contact the homeowner via email, telephone and/or written correspondence to obtain an updated status. Navigant has been informed that all extensions are reviewed and approved by DCA and project managers. Navigant will review and test these extensions going forward. C. Technical Electronic Analyses: During the Quarter, Navigant continued our comprehensive review of SIROMS application data and commenced design of a new technical analysis to identify potentially problematic applications for further review. This Quarter, the Navigant IT team focused principally on an assessment of the LRRP data validation necessitated by the migration of data from the predecessor eGrants system to SIROMS. Our assessment of the validation efforts included review of: (1) the State's post-migration validation processes, and (2) the quality control measures performed on the standardization and organization of the attachments to the LRRP applications. In completing this assessment, we conducted an onsite meeting and interviews at DCA's Data Validation Center in Newark. Based on our interviews and review of the processes, we found the LRRP data validation protocol to be reasonable. Navigant offered the following recommendations based on observations made during the site visit: (1) update tracking of the LRRP validation status within the SIROMS to indicate when validation of each application is commenced and complete; and (2) update the LRRP data validators' review panel to display the original and updated values when a substantive change is made during validation. Also this Quarter, Navigant received extracts from CGI of the LRRP application data contained within SIROMS, including the LRRP audit log data and a lookup table that defines the funding status of each LRRP application. Using the LRRP extracts and RREM extracts previously received, Navigant commenced design of a new comprehensive technical analysis to identify potentially problematic applications for further review. This analysis will continue into the next Quarter.	
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 (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.	

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: 12/31/2015

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
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 Contractors and their subcontractors for billing irregularities; attended and observed homeowner and Contractor meetings and inspections to assess compliance with program policies, procedures and controls, and provided feedback to DCA and the Contractors; conducted site visits of homes under construction or repair; and commenced our comprehensive technical electronic analyses of 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 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.	
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 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.	
19.	Provide details of any integrity issues/findings	As explained in paragraphs 14 and 18 above, our review of the invoices of the RREM Contractors 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 is expected to continue through the 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	

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: 12/31/2015

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
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 December 31, 2015: Total hours incurred: 892.15 hours Total fees incurred: \$241,341.25 Total expenses incurred: \$0	
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: April 1, 2016

Appendix A
Meetings Conducted
For Quarter Ending 12/31/2015

I. New Jersey Department of Community Affairs

A. David Reiner	Deputy Commissioner, Sandy Recovery Division
B. Robert Bartolone	Director, Office of Auditing
C. Elizabeth Mackay	Assistant Director of Procurement and Legal
D. Sam Viavattine	Director, Sandy Recovery Division
E. Jerry O'Brien	Principal Fiscal Analyst
F. Christopher Trench	Director of LRRP
G. Wayne Morgan	LRRP-Validation Floor Manager
H. Addys Velez	LRRP-Validation Floor Manager

II. New Jersey Department of the Treasury

A. Roseann Kovall	Integrity Oversight Monitor Program
B. Matthew Murray	Office of the Treasurer-Deputy Chief of Staff

III. New Jersey Office of the Attorney General

A. Christine Hoffman	Deputy AG
B. Mark Kurzawa	Deputy Chief
C. David Nolan	Lieutenant

IV. ICF International

A. Kevin Roddy	Technical Director
----------------	--------------------