



US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Southwest District
1600 Throckmorton, Room 406
Post Office Box 2905
Fort Worth, Texas 76113-2905
(817) 978-9309 FAX (817) 978-9316

April 4, 1997

97-FW-201-1806

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chet J. Drozdowski, Director,
Office of Public Housing, 6HPH

FROM: D. Michael Beard, District Inspector General for Audit, 6AGA

SUBJECT: Review of Maintenance Overtime
Housing Authority of New Orleans
B.W. Cooper, Desire, Fischer, and Guste properties

Based on a request by HUD transition team and housing authority officials, we performed a limited review of the maintenance work orders and overtime records at the Housing Authority of New Orleans (the Authority) for indications of payroll fraud. This report reflects review results at B.W. Cooper, Desire, Fischer, and Guste for the pay period March 3 through March 16, 1996. The review results did not conclusively establish payroll fraud. However, the review disclosed serious deficiencies, including poor workmanship, excessive and overlapping time charges, payroll posting discrepancies, work orders not entered into the system, ordinary work performed using overtime, loose controls over vacant unit work, and other matters needing attention.¹ These conditions contribute to tenants continuing to live in unsafe, unsanitary housing, and further result in a wasteful, inefficient use of scarce funds. This occurred because of poor management, ineffective supervision, and obsolete maintenance policies and procedures. We reported these conditions before in Appendix B of our June 29, 1994 report. Based on our observations, it does not appear that significant physical improvements have been made since the prior report, and in some instances, conditions have deteriorated.

¹ On April 4, 1996 we met with HUD transition team and Authority officials and provided them with the preliminary results of our review.

Authority maintenance overtime process²

- A tenant calls in a complaint to the Authority hotline operator.
- The hotline operator refers the complaint to the maintenance employee on call at the project, and gives the employee a temporary emergency work order number.
- The maintenance employee performs the work and completes an emergency work order ticket. The employee (and sometimes the maintenance supervisor) prepares a daily overtime report. The next day the employee turns in the work report and emergency work order tickets to the project maintenance supervisor.
- The maintenance supervisor prepares a daily overtime report from the employees' daily work reports and emergency work order tickets³. From the daily overtime reports, the supervisor compiles a summary overtime voucher for the 2-week pay period. The supervisor transfers totals from the overtime vouchers to the employee time reporting sheet, then sends the time reporting sheets, overtime vouchers, daily reports, and work order tickets to the project manager for approval. The project manager then sends these documents to accounting to use as a basis for paying the employee. The project maintains employees' daily work reports. The maintenance supervisor (or project manager) also sends a copy of the emergency work order tickets to the work order center.

Review scope and methodology

During the 2-week period reviewed, Authority records show 173 maintenance employees claimed 5,870 hours of overtime:

² Based on OIG staff's interviews and observations.

³ The maintenance employee will sometimes prepare the daily report if he was the only person that worked overtime that day.

Site	Employees	Overtime hours	Average hours/employee
B.W. Cooper	16	426.0	26.6
Desire	21	1,018.5	48.5
Fischer	14	654.0	46.7
Guste	19	645.0	33.9
Iberville	14	532.5	37.4
C.J. Peete	18	421.0	23.4
St. Thomas	16	400.0	25.0
Florida	10	469.5	47.0
Lafitte	14	230.0	16.4
St. Bernard	19	605.5	31.9
Scattered sites	12	468.0	39.0
Totals	173	5,870.0	34.1

We selected the B.W. Cooper, Desire, Fischer, and Guste developments for review of overtime work for one pay period (March 3 through March 16, 1996). The scope of our review included: (1) recalculating overtime; (2) tracing time recorded from work order tickets to daily reports, overtime vouchers, and time reporting sheets; (3) reviewing employee records at the maintenance site; (4) reviewing automated listings generated by the work order center (unit and employee work order summaries); (5) examining the hotline log; (6) reviewing Authority unit reports (Unit Turnaround Report and Move-In Report); and (7) inspecting selected units and other sites where overtime work was performed. In addition, we interviewed tenants, Authority employees, and site supervisors. For our inspections, the Authority supplied us with a modernization expert under contract with the Authority to aid in the assessment of workmanship quality.⁴

⁴ Mr. Joseph Baker is employed under a personal service contract.

Summary of results

The review disclosed significant problems with:

- *Poor workmanship* at B.W. Cooper, Desire, and Guste. The inspections found inadequate repairs, repairs not done, repeat trips to correct the same problem, and repairs that created hazardous conditions.
- *Excessive and overlapping time charges* for B.W. Cooper, Desire, and Guste. The modernization expert that accompanied OIG staff on inspections noted too much time charged for work performed. Also, tenants often claimed the repair men had spent significantly less time performing work than what was stated on the work order tickets. Finally, the review noted several instances where different work order tickets for the same employee had overlapping times. This resulted in tenants continuing to live in substandard conditions and in overpayments to employees.
- *Posting discrepancies* at B.W. Cooper and Guste. Hours on work order tickets did not always reconcile to summary schedules or time reporting sheets, resulting in employees being overpaid (and in a few cases underpaid).
- *Work orders not entered into system* at all four sites reviewed. Most overtime work order tickets could not be traced to work order listings generated by the automated system. Maintenance personnel said they did not submit hotline or small item work order tickets to the work order center. A review of work order history reports confirms this. As a result the Authority does not have complete and accurate information to evaluate performance and unit repair histories. The Authority should be capturing and using the above information to support payroll payments, evaluate workers' performance, and analyze work performed at units. In addition, the Authority may be understating its maintenance accomplishments for the Public Housing Management Assessment Program (PHMAP).
- *Ordinary work performed using overtime* at Desire and Fischer. Maintenance employees claimed large amounts of overtime for cleaning maintenance areas, mopping and stripping floors, and purging work orders from the automated system. This resulted in excessive payroll costs for activities that should be done during regular hours.
- *Loose controls over vacant unit work* at B.W. Cooper and Fischer. Employees and supervisors often did not indicate which units were being worked on. Also, for those work orders that did include addresses, in most cases the units did not appear, as would be expected, in Unit Turnaround or Unit Move-In reports. As a result, significant overtime hours are not properly supported or accounted for, and

there are unexplained inconsistencies between overtime work and unit turnaround reports.

- *Other problems* included costly overtime, materials, and water usage at Desire because copper pipes running underneath buildings are being stolen. At Fischer, the Authority needs to consider less costly alternatives for boiler watch engineer costs. At Guste, inspections found an abundance of trash under buildings despite significant overtime hours charged for trash cleanup. At some scattered sites, the Authority could obtain emergency federal funds by completing Damage Survey Reports. Also, the Authority needs to re-evaluate its position of performing flood damage repairs at these scattered sites during overtime hours.

These conditions are reported, by project, in more detail in the attached appendices (except for the "Work orders not entered into system" issue). Appendix B of the June 29, 1994 audit report disclosed many of these same conditions. The reader should keep in mind that the review only covered a 2-week period at four properties. The reported problems would likely be greatly magnified (posting discrepancies for example) if projected over a longer time period and to all properties.

Ineffective management and obsolete policies and procedures contribute to overtime deficiencies

This report does not primarily fault the site workers or even the site maintenance managers for deficiencies noted during the review. They are faced with having to perform repairs on units in deplorable condition, and in need of extensive rehabilitation. Due to dangerous conditions at the sites, especially at night, supervisors have difficulty finding employees willing to work overtime. Also, employees only carry out management's policies. A key responsibility of upper management is to increase accountability and productivity by closely supervising and monitoring staff performance. Through lax management of maintenance operations, the Authority allows maintenance personnel to overstate time and to perform inferior repairs to the units without penalty. Inefficient and unnecessary use of overtime also may deplete scarce maintenance funds. At March 31, 1996, the Authority was \$245,000 over budget for maintenance labor.

Management has not provided adequate guidance to site supervisors for making sure the overtime work order process functions smoothly and effectively. The only written maintenance policies and procedures available to site supervisors is a 1977 manual that does not discuss the current work order system. The present work order system is overloaded with forms and paperwork, easily misplaced and arduous to reconcile. An automated data system on-site could go a long way towards streamlining the work order process and reducing paperwork.

Supervisors should be reviewing overtime repairs to make sure problems are being timely and properly corrected. However, the substandard work and excessive time charges found at

three of the four projects reviewed demonstrated the lack of an effective quality control program at the Authority. Supervisors and payroll accounting should reconcile work order tickets to summary schedules and time sheets to ensure employees are paid what they are owed. Supervisors should be reviewing the employee's daily work reports and work tickets to evaluate their performance. In addition, supervisors or site managers should make sure all work order tickets are turned in to the work order center for entry into the automated system so that management can use the information in evaluating performance and needed changes.

Housing Authority Comments

An exit conference with Housing Authority and New Orleans Public Housing officials took place on January 17, 1997, at which time the Authority provided verbal comments. Authority officials generally agreed with the draft report. They emphasized that they had requested the payroll overtime review, and said the Authority had taken steps prior to, during, and subsequent to the audit field work to address problems. The Authority, however, did not provide a written response to the draft report.

Recommendations

We recommend the Authority:

- 1A. Update the maintenance manual to include policies and procedures pertaining to the current work order system. The policies and procedures should:
 - Specify what activities can be performed using overtime to ensure that routine and ordinary work items are not being performed during overtime hours.
 - Require maintenance employees to provide detailed information on work orders.
 - Require site supervisors to verify overtime charges on the employees' daily overtime reports by comparing information on work order tickets with information on the hotline log and by reviewing repairs performed on a test basis.
 - Include provisions to ensure repair work is properly done, performed within reasonable time standards and does not require unnecessary return trips.
 - Include provisions to ensure maintenance employees are properly trained and qualified.
 - Require maintenance employees to correct or report other problems noted while performing unit repairs.

- Require supervisory and/or accounting staff to reconcile work order tickets with overtime summaries to ensure consistency and accuracy.
 - Require all work orders to be entered into the automated work order system.
- 1B. Determine why many units that have vacant work overtime charges are not appearing on the Unit Turnaround or Unit Move-In reports.
- 1C. Take immediate measures to stop or mitigate the effects of stolen water lines at Desire.
- 1D. Seek more cost effective alternatives for engineer overtime (boiler watch) at Fischer.
- 1E. Submit necessary documentation to collect suspended Federal Emergency Management Assistance (FEMA) payments.
- 1F. Re-evaluate its position of performing flood damage repairs at America Street during overtime hours.

Within 60 days, please give us a status report for each recommendation made in the report on: (1) the corrective action taken; (2) the proposed action and the date to be completed; or (3) why action is considered unnecessary. Also, please provide us copies of any correspondence or directives issued because of the review.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please feel free to contact me or Frank Baca, Assistant District Inspector General for Audit, at (817) 978-9309.

Appendices

A	B.W. Cooper	Page 8
B	Desire	Page 11
C	Fischer	Page 15
D	Guste	Page 17
E	America Street	Page 19

B.W. COOPER

During the 2-week period reviewed, 16 Maintenance employees claimed a total of 426 hours of overtime.

Inspections noted substandard and repeat repairs, and excessive time charges. The review included inspections of some maintenance work performed by the emergency work order employee. The emergency work order employee had 130 of the 426 overtime hours claimed at B.W. Cooper for the 2-week period.

On April 1, 1996, OIG staff, accompanied by a modernization expert, inspected eight units that records show the emergency work order employee worked overtime during the 2-week period. The inspections indicated significant deficiencies in work performed, repeat trips to correct the same items, and probable inflating of work order time. The emergency work order employee (overtime employee) admitted he does not put in the correct repair time on the work orders.

1124 South Rocheblave St.

- * Records show overtime employee came 2 days in a row to repair a kitchen sink back up (3/14/96, 1 hour; 3/15/96, 3 hours);
- * Tenant says he came for about 1/2 hour each time;
- * Modernization expert said sink was not snaked as stated on the work order;
- * Modernization expert rated work quality as poor.

1275 South Rocheblave St.

- * Records show two trips to fix leaking water heater: one by the overtime employee (3/16/96, 1 hour), and another during regular hours by a different employee (3/15/96, 2 hours);
- * Tenant states overtime employee came out twice: once for a few minutes on Saturday (3/16), but did not fix the water heater until Monday (3/18). The tenant and a newborn baby did not have hot water during the weekend;
- * Modernization expert stated too much time charged for work, and rated work quality as poor.

1278 South Rocheblave St.

- * Records show three trips to fix leaking water heater: one by the overtime employee (3/16/96, 1.5 hours), and two others during regular hours by different employees (3/15/96, 1 hour; 3/18/96, 1 hour);
- * Modernization expert states water heater should have been replaced;
- * Modernization expert stated too much time charged for work, and rated work quality as poor.

3508 Erato, Apt. D

- * Records indicated two trips to fix kitchen sink backup, including one overtime work order (3/12/96, 2.5 hours), and one work order during regular hours by a different employee (3/19/96, .5 hour);
- * Tenant states overtime employee came by on 3/12/96 for about 1 hour, then came back the following day for 3 hours;
- * Problem still exists;
- * Modernization expert stated too much time charged for work, and rated work quality as poor.

3712 Erato, Apt. C

- * Records indicated two overtime work orders (3/9/96, 2.5 hours; 3/14/96, .5 hour) for ceiling leak and leaking bathtub faucet;
- * Problems still exist;
- * Modernization expert stated too much time charged for work, and rated work quality as poor.

1309 South Johnson Street

- * Records indicated 4 work orders for a clogged toilet, including 3 overtime work orders (3/9/96, 1.5 hours; 3/10/96, .5 hour; and 3/13/96, .5 hour) and one work order during normal hours by a different employee (3/15/96, 2.5 hours);
- * Problem still exists;
- * Modernization expert stated too much time charged for work, and rated work quality as poor.

1416 South Johnson Street

- * Work order for electrical power outage states overtime employee charged 2 hours on 3/13/96; tenant states he did not stay 10 minutes;
- * Modernization expert stated work should have been done in 15 minutes, and rated work quality as poor.

1415 South Prieur A

- * Records indicated two overtime work orders to fix a clogged sewer line (3/12/96, 3 hours; 3/14/96, 2.5 hours);
- * Tenant states the problem still exists;
- * Modernization expert stated work took too long and was done in an unacceptable manner, creating a possible health hazard.

Posting discrepancies. The review noted seven addition errors and posting discrepancies between the daily reports and overtime vouchers for the emergency work order employee. For example, the March 4, 1996 daily report showed 7.5 overtime hours; however, the summary voucher showed 10 hours. The discrepancies resulted in the employee receiving an additional 17

hours of overtime. In addition, the review found instances of overlaps in time recorded on the work orders and daily reports.

For 3 of the 16 employees there were differences between hours posted to the overtime vouchers and the employee time reporting sheets.

Incomplete data on vacant unit work. Preparing vacant units for occupancy accounted for the remainder of employee overtime claimed (approximately 196 hours) at B.W. Cooper. For 75 percent of the 196 hours, maintenance workers did not list addresses on the daily sheets. The remaining 25 percent of the 196 hours claimed listed four unit addresses: 3621 Thalia B; 3621 Thalia C; 3515 Thalia A; and 3617 Erato. The Authority's Unit Turnaround Report for the period March 1, 1996, through April 1, 1996,⁵ did not report any of these units as turned around. The Authority's Move-In Report for same period listed only one of the units, 3621 Thalia C. It seems that this unit should have appeared on the Unit Turnaround report as well.

On the bright side, the review found that B.W. Cooper's "curb appeal" had improved significantly since the OIG's 1993 Housing Quality Standards inspections.

⁵ Supplied by the Authority's Management Information Systems Department.

DESIRE

During the 2-week period reviewed, 21 maintenance employees at Desire claimed a total of 1,018.5 hours of overtime.

Overtime work orders did not resolve problems. Only 11 percent of the overtime work orders during the 2-week period were for emergency repairs (using overtime to perform ordinary work is discussed below). However, inspections on April 2, 1996, at two selected units where emergency work was performed found the problems were not resolved in either case.

3711-A Pleasure

Leaning electrical pole. On March 4, 1996, all 12 hours of overtime involved 2 maintenance men waiting for and watching Sun Electric "repair" the electrical pole. Neither maintenance employees nor tenants reported the pole until it pulled away from the building. Sun Electric anchored the pole "temporarily" to a handrail on a building and removed the transformer. As of the inspection date (April 2, 1996), the electrical pole remained anchored to the handrail. Also, there was another pole in similar condition next to the one anchored. Maintenance said they have not requested this pole to be replaced. Neither of the poles deteriorated over night. Maintenance should not be waiting for problems to become serious before addressing. Maintenance should have called Sun Electric to have both poles replaced prior to the "emergency" situation.

3351-A Desire

Sparks from a wall outlet. The maintenance worker made sure the family was safe, but an electrician was needed to fix the problem. A problem with the outlet still exists.

Posting discrepancies. The review found posting discrepancies for 7 of the 21 maintenance employees for the 2-week period:

- The Authority did not have daily reports or work order tickets to support 91 overtime hours posted on overtime vouchers and paid to 6 employees:
- Four employees (5 instances) submitted two separate work orders that had overlapping overtime hours, although the employees were only paid for one of the work orders. For example, one employee submitted two March 4, 1996 overtime work orders. One work order stated work performed from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. The second work order stated work performed from 5 p.m. to 1 a.m. at a different location. The employee was paid 8 overtime hours for the day.

- Two different overtime vouchers listed 8 hours for one employee for March 10, 1996; however there was only one work order for 8 hours. Therefore, the Authority paid the employee 16 hours overtime for that day.
- A March 4, 1996 daily report and work order ticket showed an employee worked 5 overtime hours. However, the overtime voucher showed only 4 hours. Apparently, the employee was underpaid 1 hour due to a posting error.

Also, hours posted to the overtime vouchers and the employee time reporting sheets differed for 4 of the 21 maintenance employees. Although the Authority pays overtime based upon the time posted to the overtime voucher, the documents should be consistent, reflecting the same number of overtime hours.

Ordinary work performed during overtime. The maintenance supervisor regularly assigns work and performs routine supervisory duties during overtime hours. The work orders showed excessive amounts of overtime hours charged for miscellaneous work items such as cleaning the maintenance area and stripping the administrative buildings floors, and purging computer printouts of closed work orders:

Overtime work performed	Hours	Staff days	% of total
Repairing stolen pipes	327.5	41	35.9%
Cleanup of maint. areas	282.0	35	30.9%
Emergency repairs to units	103.5	13	11.3%
Prepare vacant units	102.5	13	11.2%
Purging computer printouts	86.0	11	9.4%
Supervising staff	12	1	1.3%
Totals	913.5 ⁶	114	100.0%

Maintenance Management needs to ensure that routine and ordinary work items are not being performed during overtime hours.

Stolen pipes result in costly overtime. As noted in the table above, more overtime at Desire results from repairing stolen copper pipes from underneath the buildings than any other reason. Pipe theft causes serious problems for the Authority. First, correcting the problem is extremely labor intensive. Repairs involve shutting off the water grid, pumping the water from underneath

⁶ The number of work order hours (913.5) differs from the number of overtime hours claimed (1018.5) due to various posting discrepancies.

the building, and capping the pipe. This work causes normal work orders to be delayed. Second, the amount of water running from the broken pipes increases the Authority's utility expense. Third, the huge loss of water can reduce the water pressure in the area, putting people at risk in case of fire. Fourth, although most of the water runs under the building, some damage to the buildings may be occurring. The Authority should take steps to limit the effects of stolen water lines such as:

- Have the on-site police officers actively pursue those persons stealing the pipes.
- Ensure maintenance shuts off all water lines to empty buildings. Although the authority should have a zero-tolerance for criminal behavior, the Authority has demonstrated that they cannot secure the buildings and therefore should try to minimize its losses.
- Consolidate residents in buildings, and thus, decrease the number of buildings that have only one or two tenants in them.⁷ Many buildings have only one or two units occupied. Maintenance could turn off the water to the empty buildings.
- Better secure the buildings, including locking the traps.

Accompanied by a modernization expert on April 2, 1996, OIG staff inspected seven buildings that had recent overtime work during the 2-week period.

3402 & 3343 Pleasure

The street between these two buildings was flooded. The pipes were stolen from the ground and broken below the valves. Water had to be pumped from under the buildings. There were sink holes outside the buildings.

3518 Desire

There were pools of sewage outside the building. The inspector rated the work performed as poor.

3562 Desire

Water was gushing underneath the building. Only three residents live in the building, but the water can't be turned off.

3622 Desire

There was a "swimming pool" of water between this and a neighboring building.

3622 Alvar

⁷ This recommendation would also decrease the number of buildings that Authority maintenance would need to service, secure, and maintain.

Strong sewage smell in the air.

3642 Alvar

The sewage backflush cap was removed. When the pipe gets clogged sewage will spill out.

3802 Benefit

Water gushing from the ground under the building, flooding the sidewalk, yard, and street.

FISCHER

During the 2-week period reviewed, 14 maintenance employees at Fischer claimed a total of 654 overtime hours.

Inspections find repair work adequate. An inspection of seven Fischer units on April 16, 1996, disclosed similar problems found at B.W. Cooper and Desire. Problems included poor quality work, repeat repair visits, excessive repair time, and other repair problems not addressed. Also, the work orders did not provide sufficient information about work performed for the inspector to make a proper evaluation. Nevertheless, Fischer's problems were neither as frequent nor severe as those found at B.W. Cooper and Desire. Overall, the modernization expert indicated maintenance personnel provided adequate work to the units inspected at Fischer.

2020 Wagner #1F

- * Records show two trips to fix water running down the unit wall (3/5, 3/11). The second time the entire unit was flooded.

2000 Hendee 2C

- * Kitchen sink leaking. Work order charged 2 men for 1.5 hours each. Tenant states men were there for about 45 minutes.
- * Tenant stated there was no charge, but the work order showed a \$16.03 charge.

1700 General DeGaulle 3D

- * Toilet stop up (3/3). Work order charged 2 men for 3 hours each. Tenant states 2 men came for about 1 hour then went downstairs.
- * Tenant states it has been 1 year since she called about a door problem. According to records, only open work order for unit is for a wall repair - called in 3/10/95.

2125 Lebeouf 2E

- * Toilet stop up (3/9). Tenant states problem still exists.

1335 Wall 3C

- * Secure window (3/7). Modernization expert rated quality of work poor and too much time spent (1.5 hours). Because caulking is not strong enough, rain blows in from the top of the window.

2030 Whitney 2M

- * Transformers went out (3/9). No electricity at Fischer site. Maintenance employee waited 5.5 hours for an electrician.

2035 Whitney 2B

- * Toilet and tub stopped up. Tenant states she was charged \$7.50 to plunge the toilet, but the work order showed no charge.

Posting discrepancies. The Authority did not have daily reports or work order tickets to support March 7, 1996 overtime hours for two employees. The two employees each had 4 hours posted to the overtime voucher. There were no other posting discrepancies at Fischer for the period reviewed.

Ordinary work performed during overtime. Maintenance staff charged 28 overtime hours during the 2-week period for mopping and stripping the administrative building floors. Maintenance Management needs to ensure that routine and ordinary work items are not being performed during overtime hours.

Loose controls over vacant unit work. Preparing vacant units for occupancy accounted for over half of the overtime claimed (332 hours) at Fischer. Maintenance workers did not list unit addresses on the daily overtime sheets and did not attach work order tickets to support the overtime hours listed on the daily overtime sheets. Thus, the Authority has no way of tracking which units were actually worked as overtime. The maintenance managers should not be approving overtime for payments without adequate supporting documentation.

Fischer's Weekly Make Ready Reports indicated Maintenance completed ten units during the review period. However a review of the Authority's Unit Turnaround Report for the period March 1, 1996, through April 1, 1996, indicated Fischer had zero units completed. Further, the Authority's Move-In Report for the same period only listed four of the ten units completed. As indicated earlier, inconsistencies exist regarding the actual units completed in the Authority's Unit Turnaround Report. The Authority should take steps to ensure all unit reports reflect accurate and consistent data.

Authority should seek more cost effective alternatives for engineer overtime. The Authority assigned two stationary engineers to the Fischer development. Each engineer works a 12-hour shift. This results in the payment of 8 hours of overtime every weekday and 24 hours of overtime during the weekend days. During the 2-week period reviewed, the Authority paid 168 hours of overtime to these maintenance employees. The Authority is required to employ a stationary engineer around the clock.⁸ However, to minimize overtime costs, the Authority should consider hiring a third engineer. An alternative solution might be to transfer one of the Guste's four stationary engineers to Fischer. This way, both developments have three stationary engineers to work 8-hour shifts during a 24-hour period.⁹

⁸ According to Part 129.1 of the Standard Mechanical Code, the Authority must have a Stationary Engineer on the premises at all times while the boilers are in operation.

⁹ The Authority could also hire a few more stationary engineers and pay no overtime at any of the sites.

GUSTE

During the 2-week period reviewed, 19 maintenance employees at Guste claimed a total of 645 overtime hours.

Generally, OIG staff observed the following: work orders not entering the work order system; poor workmanship of the repair, and in some cases the correction of the problem created a health hazard; possible overstating of time worked; repeat trips to correct problems; allowing safety hazards to go unreported; and while correcting one problem in a unit, not reporting or correcting other maintenance problems noted.

Inspections disclose substandard repair work. The review disclosed the following conditions during an April 3, 1996 inspection of overtime work performed. In his written comments, the modernization expert rated all of the work as poor.

2318 Erato F

Toilet ballcock broke, flooding entire apartment (3/12/96, 3.5 hours for two people; 3/13/96, 2 hours). According to the tenant the problem was a leaking sink; she did not have a problem with the toilet. The modernization expert rated repair work as poor, with too much time charged.

2401 Erato B

Light space heater (3/8/96, 1 hour). Modernization expert noted excessive time charged to perform a simple task.

The inspection also noted the sewerage cap under a building at 2401 Erato had been removed to allow drainage. Thus, the sewerage runs freely underneath the building when a back up occurs. Maintenance solved one problem by creating an unsanitary environment. Easily accessible fuse boxes were also observed during the inspection.

2429 Erato E

Kitchen sink backing up (3/8/96, 3 hours). According to the tenant, the maintenance man did not finish the job and only spent 1 hour in the unit and at a different time than listed on the work order. The modernization expert noted the repair person combined metal with PVC piping, and charged excessive time for this task.

2138 Clio 3D

Leaking bathroom ceiling (3/9/96, 1.5 hours; 3/13/96, 2 hours). Rather than repairing the leak, a patch was placed over the soft spot. At the time of the inspection, the water leak had still not been repaired and continued to leak onto the patch. Moreover, the leak is near a light fixture. Maintenance may have created a safety hazard by not correctly fixing the leak.

2330 Thalia D

Toilet fell off the wall (3/9/96, 2 hours). The work order stated: "rotten and cannot secure, the tenant needs a new toilet." As of the date of the inspection, the toilet was still braced with 2 X 4 boards. In addition, Maintenance did not report or correct a running faucet in the bathtub.

1301 Simon Bolivar, #523

Hot water constantly running (3/10/96, 2 hours). Tenant says the repair man was there for about 20 minutes. Modernization expert stated work was not done. Other items needing attention not reported. The tenant needs a toilet valve; has to turn the water on and off to use toilet. Also, tenant states unit has not been painted in 18 years.

Substandard work at police sub-station. At the time of the inspections, Maintenance was in the process of converting the old low-rise management office into a police sub-station. This task accounted for almost half of the overtime claimed (312 hours) at Guste. The two walls built by Maintenance did not have adequate studding. And although the office had been recently painted, it was still in a state of disrepair. Modernization expert considered the work sub-standard. OIG staff also considered the quality of the work unacceptable relative to the reported number of overtime hours.

Posting discrepancies. A review of Authority payroll records disclosed only one minor posting error at Guste. For March 9, 1996, the daily reports show an employee worked 12 overtime hours while 11 hours were posted to the overtime vouchers. Therefore, the employee was apparently underpaid by 1 hour for the period.

Trash under buildings. The inspections noted an abundance of trash under the buildings, yet over 20 percent of overtime claimed (135 hours) was to clear trash from under the building. Overall, OIG staff found a significant amount of deterioration at this development since the 1993 Housing Quality Standards inspections.

AMERICA STREET

Overtime work at America Street needs re-evaluation. During the review, OIG staff noted that Desire and Guste maintenance employees charged many hours of overtime to scattered site addresses on America Street. Employees said that these units, along with others, incurred a significant amount of damage from the May 1995 flood. The Executive Director instructed maintenance to repair the units during overtime hours. In the months after the flood, the Authority had a work force of 30-35 people to repair the flood damaged units. At the time of the review, the Authority has a work force of ten employees repairing the units during overtime hours. Staff believe the Authority will be reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Assistance (FEMA) for some of the cost of the repairs.

Because the Authority is significantly over budget on maintenance labor, and there does not appear to be any controls to ensure rapid completion of the units, the Authority should re-evaluate its position to perform the flood damage repairs during overtime hours.

Authority can collect funds by submitting documentation. The Authority received \$51,043 from FEMA through the Office of Emergency Preparedness. However, the Office of Emergency Preparedness suspended payments on 31 Damage Survey Reports submitted by the Authority. In a May 11, 1996 letter, the Office of Emergency Preparedness stated that if the Authority provides information regarding insurance (29 Damage Survey Reports) and additional documentation (2 Damage Survey Reports), the Authority could receive additional funds. The Authority should submit the necessary documentation to un-suspend the Damage Survey Reports and receive payment from the Office of Emergency Preparedness.