

**NEIGHBORHOOD RECOVERY INITIATIVE TRANSITION MEETING
NEIGHBORHOOD RECOVERY INITIATIVE
HOUSE RESOLUTION #1110
Wednesday, January 16, 2014 (9:00 am – 12:00 pm)
300 W. Adams, Chicago IL
Executive Director's Office
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)**

PARTICIPANTS

ICJIA: Jack Cutrone, Executive Director
Junaid Afeef, Acting Deputy General Counsel
Wendy McCambridge, Associate Director, Federal & State Grants Unit
Reshma Desai, Research Assistant

OAG: Mike Maziarz, Senior Audit Manager
Jill Paller, Audit Supervisor
Leighann Brown, Audit Manager

PURPOSE & INTRODUCTION

Maziarz described that the purpose of this meeting is to hold the exit conference for the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative (NRI) audit. ICJIA received a copy of the draft report on 12/18/13. (AD-23) Following receipt of the draft report, ICJIA requested an extension, which was approved, to hold this meeting and to provide responses to the draft report. This extension was granted. Responses to the draft report are due 1/29/14. (CS-61 p.1)

Paller passed around a sign-in sheet. (Attachment A)

Maziarz asked ICJIA about the status of the 4 grant monitors over NRI that were originally at IVPA. Cutrone said none of the 4 grant monitors are currently employed at ICJIA. He said that as of 7/1/12 there was much uncertainty over the funding for NRI. Cutrone said the decision to merge IVPA into ICJIA was made on 1/1/13 and IVPA staff was brought over to ICJIA on 3/1/13. McCambridge said 1 of the 4 grant monitors left IVPA before the merge was made; 2 left in April 2012; and 1 left in September 2012. Cutrone said all monitors were looking for new jobs prior to the transfer as a result of uncertainty with the Program. Maziarz asked who currently has responsibility for overseeing NRI. McCambridge said there was a transfer of responsibility. She said the Program name has changed from NRI to Community Violence Prevention (CVP). McCambridge said that Lorri Jenkins is still employed with CVP and 2 of ICJIA's grant monitors are overseeing the Program. McCambridge said ICJIA still needs to hire 2 more grant monitors.

Maziarz asked Afeef if he has held the formal hearing on grant recovery action against the Southwest Youth Collaborative (SWYC). Afeef said no. *Auditor note: On July 25, 2013, auditors first asked ICJIA about SWYC's formal hearing to start the recovery process. At that time, the hearing had not yet occurred. (CS-47 p.5/1) Auditors again followed up with ICJIA on November 1, 2013 regarding grant recovery proceedings with SWYC. ICJIA again reported that proceedings had not yet begun. (CS-47 p.7) As reported by Afeef during this meeting, formal grant recovery proceedings with SWYC have still not begun.*

Cutrone said this was a large audit with a massive amount of detail. He said ICJIA usually has few audit findings. Cutrone said for the most part, ICJIA agrees with the recommendations, but there are a few parts of some recommendations where ICJIA disagrees. Cutrone said overall he agrees that the IVPA process for NRI could have been better.

Maziarz asked Cutrone about the Governor's Office involvement with the draft report. Cutrone said he shared the report with the Governor's Office; there has been one meeting; and he will share ICJIA's draft response. Maziarz asked what the Governor's Office thought of the report. Cutrone said they have not said. Maziarz pointed out that the people responsible for making decisions about NRI are now gone (i.e. Barbara Shaw, Toni Irving, and Malcolm Weems).

Cutrone said most recommendations demonstrate how ICJIA already operates. Maziarz said he is surprised that since October 15, 2013, (CM-15) when ICJIA received the PAFs, he has only received one document. (AD-25) Cutrone said they have an updated spreadsheet of monies owed, which will be provided at the end of the meeting.

DRAFT REPORT DISCUSSION (AD-23)

Implementation Schedule (pages 29-31)

Cutrone said he has an issue with all of the dates outlined in the implementation schedule for NRI. He said that all of the dates and descriptions are factual; however, the way it is written makes it appear that IVPA was tasked with creating the Program and two days later they got the Program. Cutrone further stated that it appears that once IVPA got the Program, the planning stopped in August and that was not the case. He said that the Governor is concerned with violence in Chicago. He mentioned the editorials, newspaper articles, etc, on daily shootings. Cutrone said the Governor formed the Anti-Violence Commission prior to the announcement. He also stated that funding was not available until July. Cutrone said it was the Governor's intent to create some confidence in the public. He said meetings were continually held and there was constant refinement to the Program.

Maziarz said there may have been activities, including prior discussions between Shaw and ILAACP and MEE Productions. However, he said there is no documentation to show parts of the planning process including who made decisions to increase funding for the Program from \$20 million to \$55 million.

Cutrone said his point is that there was a continuing and refining planning process even absent documentation. Maziarz suggested that Cutrone write that in his response to the recommendation. Cutrone said people will take away more from the report text than ICJIA's responses and auditor comments, if any. Maziarz told Cutrone to provide a few sentences by the end of the week for him to consider adding. Maziarz said for a \$50 million dollar program, decisions should be documented. He said that if auditors would have seen such documentation, credit would have been given.

Cutrone questioned whether the quotes from the quarterly reports which mention agency challenges are from the first quarter of the first year. Maziarz said yes, but there are also others from later in the Program. Cutrone said that ICJIA's position is that NRI was a new and large program, and with any new and sizable program, there will always be issues. Maziarz said those quotes flow with the audit issue area. Maziarz said the SBC quotes referenced in the report are from the end of year 1 when that Program component was just getting started. Cutrone said that delays with the SBC component were primarily the result of getting contracts executed between agencies and the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). Maziarz said CPS knew this Program and component were coming based on a review of Shaw emails showing a correspondence before she even notified her own staff of the program. He said this issue goes back to the hasty implementation. Maziarz said considering the delay in signing contracts, IVPA should have considered holding the funds until contracts were implemented and the Program properly planned out. Maziarz stated there appeared a rush to get the Program started and funding out to the communities.

Cutrone said the report does not mention that IVPA recognized delays and sought ways to utilize the funds to get kids services and justify monies spent for SBC. Maziarz told Cutrone to write suggested language to be added to the report for him to consider by the end of the week. Maziarz also stated that in Year 2 of the Program there were still problems with SBC sites up and running. Cutrone said it was anticipated that NRI was going to be a program continuing into future years.

FY11 Appropriation (page 23)

Cutrone said that ICJIA and auditors may have to agree to disagree regarding the use of FY11 appropriation beyond FY11. Maziarz said the report does not have a recommendation associated with this issue. He said that he is aware of the Compliance report taking issue with the use of this money being outside the period of the interagency agreement. Cutrone reviewed the section on General Review Fund Appropriation. Maziarz said auditors are only showing fund expenditures and there is no recommendation associated with this.

Budget Process (pages 32-33)

Cutrone said that he does not think lead agencies were overpaid as stated in the report. He said based on the reports submitted by the grantee and projection of need, from his understanding, IVPA figured out the amount of unspent funds and deducted it from the projected amount of funds needed. Then, at the end of Year 1, IVPA used a process to

amend the contract. Afeef said ICJIA does not do this. He said once a grant ends, a new grant agreement is executed and any unspent funds reallocated. Cutrone said IVPA amended agreements to extend the Program. He said lead agencies were not overpaid; it was the practice IVPA used for Year 2 of the Program. Maziarz said IVPA used a set of amendments, which was based on inaccurate reporting, and deducted the unpaid amount. Cutrone said the amount paid in Year 1 was justified and the leftover amount was captured in the amendment for Year 2. Maziarz said making changes to the budgeting process after the fact defeats the point of having a budget. Cutrone said revisions to the budget process were part of the growing process.

Cutrone suggested switching columns 3 and 4 on Exhibit 2-9. He said the way the information is currently presented makes it seem like the Year 2 budget was late. Cutrone said switching the columns will keep the Year 1 information together.

Lead Agency Selection (pages 34-35)

ICJIA said elected officials were not in the position to make recommendations. Maziarz said based on emails and letters from aldermen, whether they were in the position or not, the aldermen were making the recommendations. Cutrone said aldermen did not have the power to designate lead agencies. Maziarz said this was a non-competitive process. He mentioned that with the exception of 3 lead agencies, each lead agency that was recommended by aldermen was accepted. He said in the cases of the 3 lead agencies, there were legitimate reasons why the originally recommended lead agencies could not be the lead agency. He gave the example of the JLM Abundant Life, an original recommendation. Maziarz said JLM Abundant Life was a subset of Mt. Vernon Baptist Church. He said while JLM Abundant Life was not able to be the lead agency, as originally recommended, the associated church, Mt. Vernon Baptist Church, was selected to be the lead agency. Maziarz said in another example, one of the recommended lead agencies had never overseen more than a \$100,000 budget; thus, was not able to handle the over \$1 million in funding. Maziarz said in each of the 3 cases, **Shaw went back to the aldermen** for a new recommendation. **Maziarz read emails from Shaw's account which showed aldermen making suggestions. Maziarz said that aldermen were making single recommendations and IVPA did not do their due diligence on any other possible lead agencies in the communities.**

Maziarz said this was not a good process because a lead agency like The Woodlawn Organization (TWO), who was recommended by an alderman, was not reviewed for financial stability. After one year in the Program, **TWO was removed from the Program and went out of business. Maziarz asked Afeef if ICJIA has recovered any funds from TWO. Afeef said no, ICJIA has an uncollectable judgment from the Attorney General on TWO.**

Maziarz further stated that aldermen did not fill out conflict of interest forms. He said that aldermen serve on advisory boards and commissions within each of the communities. **He also stated that it is possible that these agencies make political contributions to elected officials also adding to the appearance of actual or perceived conflict of interest.** Maziarz

said auditors have asked who decided to make this process non-competitive, and no one has been able to provide that information.

Cutrone also discussed the evaluation issues which he said would have been true if it was a competitive RFP. He said that because it was a non-competitive RFP process, it was not improper for IVPA to get applications, initially score the applications and get more documentation if needed. Cutrone said the fact that the process was non-competitive did not obligate them to follow the RFP process. Maziarz agreed that this was non-competitive; however, IVPA issued an RFP with criteria without being required to do so. Auditors reviewed the required and measured IVPA against that criteria. Maziarz questioned why IVPA went through the process if they were not obligated to do so other than to make the process look “right”.

Provider Agency Selection (pages 36-37)

Cutrone asked for this section to be expanded. He said lead agencies were tasked with finding provider agencies. Cutrone said this suggests that lead agencies had an unfettered decision regarding provider selection. He said that lead agencies had advisory councils which had members of religious groups, local entities, Chicago Police Department, Chicago Public Schools, etc. Cutrone said those members were not affiliated with the lead agencies and would not have been forced into accepting recommendations submitted by the lead agency.

Cutrone said that ICJIA did get the applications for provider agencies selected in each of the communities and the discussion in the report is factually incorrect. Maziarz said we did not see any evaluations for provider agencies that were either selected or denied. He further questioned receipt of applications for the provider agencies which were denied. Cutrone and Desai said IVPA did not receive those applications. Maziarz told ICJIA officials that the evaluations the lead agencies conducted, which had some form of quantitative evaluation, would have been needed for Shaw and the Governor’s Office to make a decision on the provider agencies, not just an application reviewed by IVPA staff for only the “winners.”

Desai said the budgets for partner applications for only the selected provider agencies were reviewed by 2 IVPA staff. Maziarz asked if the provider agencies were already selected. Desai said following the initial review, there was a meeting at the Governor’s Office to present the names. Maziarz again mentioned the quote from the report regarding “approval (or not)” of the recommendations. Desai said IVPA reviewed all applications, but again, not the applications for those providers who were not recommended. Maziarz again questioned how IVPA and the Governor’s Office could make an informed decision regarding provider agencies absent the applications of providers that were not selected and all evaluations conducted by the leads. Maziarz told Cutrone to provide suggested language to be considered for the report.

Year 3 Selection (pages 37-38)

Cutrone said ICJIA’s response will add context to the quote regarding the Governor’s Office request. Maziarz said that is fine and auditors will comment, if necessary

especially considering the quote came from the IVPA grant manager. He further stated that when originally asked, Lorri Jenkins was hesitant to provide this information. Maziarz said that certain providers were added and others removed in Year 3, in addition to a new community, Hermosa, which was added to the Program. Maziarz said he appreciates responses to the Year 3 questions which credit these changes to Toni Irving (Governor's Office). (CS-51 p.1) *Auditor Note: Irving is no longer employed at the Governor's Office.* Maziarz said the process used in Year 3 to make changes to providers in the Program was not the greatest way to protect State assets. Cutrone agreed.

In response to Recommendation 3, Cutrone said ICJIA's existing business practice is reflective of the recommendation.

Evaluations (pages 38-40)

Maziarz again showed Cutrone the RFP criteria outlined in the report. Cutrone previously mentioned issue with the criteria. (CS-61 p.2/1) Cutrone said ICJIA is okay with Recommendation 4.

Payment Method (pages 40-42)

Cutrone said the payment method used by IVPA is not how ICJIA operates. In reference to the Corazon example, Cutrone said documentation to support Corazon's expenses was eventually received. Maziarz pointed out the quarterly fiscal report came in but not support for those numbers. Cutrone said ICJIA's payment method to grantees includes pulling down the total award on a quarterly basis. Cutrone agreed with Recommendation 5

Evaluation Contract (pages 42-47)

Maziarz said the one thing that the evaluation contract did not do was to determine the effectiveness of NRI. He further stated that the report does not show if the \$55 million the State spent on the Program was a good use of State resources. Cutrone gave a preview to ICJIA's response to the Recommendation which focuses on the criminal justice aspect. He said there are many factors that cause crime including indicators such as unemployment and education. Cutrone said NRI was really a program which created jobs. Maziarz said if NRI was really a jobs program, it should have been portrayed as such, not as a violence prevention program. He said there is nothing in the University of Illinois at Chicago's (UIC) report that shows that NRI actually helped with violence.

With respect to the actual evaluation by UIC, Cutrone agreed that IVPA did not hold UIC to the deliverables and timetable set forth in the contract. He said that it was nearly impossible for UIC to complete the contract as stated because the data received from Social Solutions was so bad. Cutrone further stated that amending the contract was unavoidable. Maziarz emphasized that amending the contract should have been memorialized. He also said that if the data was so bad and UIC could not complete the contract as stated, UIC should have went to IVPA and said they could not complete the evaluation. Maziarz said UIC did not do this.

Cutrone said that while IVPA/Shaw may have had good experience with Social Solutions that has not been ICJIA's experience. He said for Year 3, ICJIA is using an in house evaluation database and has tasked ICJIA's researchers with analyzing the population served by NRI. Maziarz asked if the analysis includes the same kids that were served in Years 1 and 2. Cutrone said he does not know.

Chapter 3 – Monitoring of Lead Agency Personnel (page 55-56)

Cutrone asked for clarification on at least one instance of incomplete detail on the personnel expenses detail chart for all 23 communities. Maziarz said the majority of these instances occurred on the Year 1 Quarter 1 reports. He said absent this information, how does IVPA know who, if anyone, is working on the Program. Cutrone further questioned if the lack of detail makes up the \$885,169 amount in the next bullet. Maziarz said yes. Cutrone said he understands. He said it is ICJIA's usual practice to identify personnel by position title. Maziarz said that is fine, but that is not how the NRI contracts were designed.

Participation Rates (page 56)

Cutrone said the reported participation rates are not bad considering the newness of the Program. He said turnover is expected. Maziarz questioned how providers were able to use the money if the required number of kids were not hired in the months outlined in the contract. Maziarz said kids are in and out of the Program. Cutrone questioned whether the same kids was rehired and double counted. Paller said we have no way of knowing. Maziarz said auditors used the quarterly reports submitted by the coordinating partner for mentoring plus jobs in each of the 23 communities. He said auditors reported the number in those reports. Maziarz further stated that those reports do not include that level of detail. Cutrone said ICJIA does not have documentation to support this. Maziarz said auditors were conservative in terms of the number of kids hired. He said in the first quarter, many providers reported hiring 80 kids but reported \$0 spent on wages. Maziarz questioned how providers could have served any kids since those providers reported \$0 spent on wages. He also stated that a couple of providers reported a hiring freeze instituted by IVPA for the mentoring plus jobs component in June 2012. Neither Cutrone nor Desai could recall the details of this hiring freeze.

Timesheets (page 59-60)

Cutrone said he is not arguing this aspect of the report. He said it is ICJIA's general practice not to have grantees submit timesheets unless there is an issue. Maziarz stated there was a contractual requirement for at least two of the components requiring the submission of timesheets. Cutrone said ICJIA is using an electronic timekeeping system where kids call when they start work and call when they leave work.

Staff Work Under Multiple Grants (page 61-64)

Cutrone said he never thought to ask about this issue. He said ICJIA will take the recommendation to better their agency. Maziarz said this is a bigger issue than ICJIA and is a problem with grants across the State. ICJIA said they are specifically looking into the cases identified in the report.

Chapter 4 – File Audit (page 68)

Maziarz said he was unaware of the file audit conducted by IVPA until he had a conversation with Ann Spillane at the Attorney General's Office. Maziarz told ICJIA that Spillane told Shaw to share the file audit with auditors. Maziarz said the file audit was around the time Shaw retired. Cutrone said ICJIA's standard practice is to periodically review grant files. He said ICJIA will continue with this practice.

Support for Community Selection (pages 69-72)

Cutrone said he reviewed the communities selected for factors other than violent crime which support the communities that were selected for NRI. He said other factors from the public health aspect include education, employment, etc. Maziarz reiterated that no one has been able to provide the analysis that was used to select the communities participating in Safety Net Works which was subsequently used to select the communities for NRI. As a result, Maziarz said auditors used the Chicago Police Department's violent crime data as shown in the report.

Maziarz also said that some of the existing lead agencies already receive funding for violence prevention and absent any analysis; services could be limited to other communities. Maziarz mentioned barriers reported by certain lead agencies which included having to turn away kids because they were not in one of the NRI communities. Cutrone said the Year 3 contract does not limit services to only NRI communities. He said ICJIA is soliciting lead agencies to serve unselected communities. Cutrone gave the example of Hermosa in Year 3. He said the lead agency for Hermosa is serving a population outside of Hermosa.

Approval for NRI Contracts (page 73-74)

Cutrone said ICJIA allows grantees to start work and submit expenses prior to grant execution as long as the expenses fall within the grant period; however, grantees do so at their own risk. He said this often occurs with continuation grants. Maziarz said he knows this is allowable with grants and used to be allowable with contracts.

In terms of late filing, Cutrone said it is expected that revised reports are late. He said ICJIA rarely receives revisions.

Timely Submission of Quarterly Reports (page 77)

Cutrone said ICJIA will specifically look into these cases and ensure there are no other instances like the ones reported.

Reentry Services (pages 78-81)

Cutrone discussed Exhibit 4-3 on the age breakdown for participants. He said he met with UIC's principal investigator for the project, Marc Atkins, the day before this meeting to determine why these participants were reported. With respect to participants whose ages fell outside the allowable range, Cutrone said UIC reported that year 1 reentry participant information was pulled from a demographic spreadsheet maintained by Social Solutions. Cutrone said year 2 data was pulled from a spreadsheet on services provided. Cutrone said during the meeting with Atkins, they specifically looked at the

outliers, and in the case of the 7 year old, no cost was actually incurred. Cutrone told Maziarz that some of the participants falling outside the allowable range did receive services while others did not. Maziarz told Cutrone based on that explanation even less participants were actually served than what is reported in UIC's report. ICJIA did not say anything. Cutrone reiterated that the data was so bad.

Cutrone said ICJIA agrees with Recommendation 14 and will explain the situations outside of the allowable age range in their response. McCambridge said the Reentry allowable age in Year 3 is ages 13-28 which is expanded from ages 17-24.

Cutrone questioned why auditors did not include an exhibit for reentry caseload in Year 2, similar to Exhibit 4-4. Cutrone said ICJIA created an exhibit for Year 2 and the caseload difference went down. Maziarz said there was a specific reason why the information was not presented for Year 2. Maziarz asked for the source for number served in Cutrone's proposed exhibit. He was not sure. Maziarz said the reason only Year 1 was presented was because the information is based on UIC's reported numbers. He said the UIC report did not only report unique individuals in year 2; some individuals received services in year 1 and again in year 2 and the report did not differentiate between the two thus a potential of double-counting was possible. Maziarz said ICJIA can include an exhibit of Year 2 reentry caseload in their response to be included in the report and we will comment on any such table.

Maziarz verified that NRI has not expanded to serve any community outside of Cook County as planned and stated in the original press release. Cutrone said no. Maziarz verified there is no funding for Safety Net Works, which did include downstate communities. Cutrone agreed. Cutrone said it is not an efficient use of resources for ICJIA to expand services downstate. He said from a monitoring perspective, ICJIA does not have those resources elsewhere. Cutrone said ICJIA is aware that NRI is only in Cook County. He said that ICJIA receives other funding, such as those for after school programs. Cutrone said 2/3 of the after school funding is going outside of Cook County.

Background Checks (pages 82-84)

Cutrone said ICJIA followed up with those agencies not having many background checks. He gave the example of the Organization of the Northeast (ONE). Cutrone said from his experience this is a reputable organization. He said ONE told him they did background checks. Brown said ONE was able to provide 5 background checks, but the majority of what was provided was the permission form allowing ONE to conduct the background check, not the actual check itself. Brown told Cutrone there were even follow-up emails regarding this issue. Cutrone said that in conversation with ONE, he was told that because of the sensitive nature of the background checks, they were locked in the director's office. However, ONE has since been through 3 or 4 changes in directors and now they cannot find the background checks and they could not find them. Maziarz reiterated that the information reported is factual. Cutrone agreed.

For the background checks reviewed, Cutrone questioned if the offenses reported were convictions or arrests. Maziarz and Brown said they will check. *Auditor note: Following*

the meeting, auditors determined that all but two of the offenses reported were convictions. Auditors changed the report wording from "offenses" to "convictions" and deleted the two instances in the report, endangerment to the life/health of a child and aggravated battery with a dangerous weapon, which referenced arrests.

Cutrone said there is some merit in hiring mentors with criminal backgrounds. Cutrone said ICJIA was asked to serve on a task force regarding criminal history and employment. He said one of the recommendations the task force made, similar to this issue, was that there should be a rational relationship between the offense and the job. (i.e. If a person is convicted of financial embezzlement and he/she applies to be a bank teller, there is a rational relationship to deny employment.) Cutrone also said there is research that suggests that the further time passes from the crime, the recidivism rate goes down. He said at some point, a conviction should not disqualify a person. Cutrone questioned whether the Program should never hire mentors with a criminal background. He said in a way that is inviting crime. Cutrone provided statistics limiting the number of mentors available to the Program.

Budget Reallocation Approvals (pages 84-88)

Cutrone said he is not arguing this point.

Capital Equipment (pages 88-89)

Cutrone said he is not arguing this point. He said ICJIA's current agreements give ICJIA the discretion to allow grantees to keep equipment.

Expense Monitoring (pages 89-94)

Cutrone asked auditors to break out the 40 percent of unsupported expenses into the two categories of not supported by backup documentation and unallowable based on criteria. He said unallowable is evil intent; whereas, not supported is not necessarily evil intent. Maziarz said either way, the expenses are unallowable. Brown said she can argue that no support could also be evil intent there is just no documentation to show it. Maziarz said he will consider breaking out expenses.

Maziarz said that during the last quarter of Year 2 it was reported to auditors that IVPA collected the backup documentation from providers to support expenses. He asked Cutrone and Desai what IVPA found. Neither Cutrone nor Desai had a response. Maziarz further stated that Christian Love Missionary Baptist Church, certified to auditors during expense site testing they had no support for any expenses. (T-13 p.3) Maziarz asked Cutrone and Desai how that issue was handled. Neither Cutrone nor Desai had a response.

Recovery of Unspent Grant Funds (pages 94-96)

Cutrone said the amount of unspent grant funds that still needs to be recovered is down from \$4.1 million as shown in the audit report to \$1.2 million. Cutrone provided every refund check ICJIA has received. (AD-27 p.2) Maziarz looked at the first check dated February 2013. He told Cutrone these checks are problematic in the sense that auditors requested all year 2 closeout reports and any grants recovery action on November 15,

2012. Maziarz further stated that auditors received the last closeout report on September 3, 2013 and the information to that date is what is used in the spreadsheets and analyses in the report. He told Cutrone this information was requested and should have been provided. Maziarz said he has been through the files at ICJIA since the request was first made and saw checks in the grant files, which were requested, but not received by auditors. Maziarz said that considering the cooperation issues and length of time it has taken to get this information, receiving these checks at the ext conference is troubling. Maziarz told Cutrone he will let him know how these checks will be handled. *Auditor note: On 1/16/14, Maziarz received an email from Cutrone again apologizing for the late submission of the refund checks. (AD-28)*

Other

Maziarz said responses to the draft report are due from ICJIA on January 29th, two weeks from this meeting. He told ICJIA their responses will be included as an appendix to the report and within the body following each recommendation. He showed ICJIA a previously released report as an example. Maziarz said he still has to write the synopsis and digest, which ICJIA has not seen; however, it is the same report text.

Maziarz told ICJIA they will be notified of the release the day before. He said that Bill Helton or someone else from our Chicago Office will deliver two copies of the final report to ICJIA on the morning of the release. Maziarz said the release will be at 10 a.m. and will also appear on the Auditor General's website at that time.

Maziarz said auditors are currently going through the workpapers removing confidential information. He said that once the report is released, the workpapers become public information.

Maziarz asked ICJIA to provide the letter from the director in PDF format for the appendix. He also asked ICJIA to provide the individual responses to the recommendations in a Word file so he can block and copy their responses into the body of the report.

Maziarz explained the face validity process and said he will address ICJIA's issues quickly. Maziarz reiterated that any suggested changes discussed during this meeting need to be provided by Friday, January 17th. Cutrone agreed. Cutrone asked for a possible release date. Maziarz said he is not sure and it is up to the Auditor General to decide the release date.

ICJIA PROVIDED/AGREED TO PROVIDE:

- Language re: Planning process (pages 29-30)
- Language re: Justification to support funds and services provided as a result of delays to the SBC component (pages 30-31)
- Language re: Provider agency selection (pages 36-37)
- Exhibit 2-9: columns 3 & 4 (page 33)
- Updated spreadsheet of monies owed (revised Appendix E) (AD-27 p.1)

- Copies of every refund check issued from years 1 and 2 of the NRI program (AD-27 p.2)

OAG AGREED TO:

- Determine the number of background checks referenced in the report related to arrests and the number related to convictions (pages 82-84)
- Consider breaking out expenses into not supported and unallowable (page 90)
- Consider the refund checks provided to auditors during the exit (AD-27 p.2)