



Issue Date	August 31 , 1998
Audit Case Number	98-AT-202-1007

TO: Judy Wojciechowski, Director, Troubled Agency Recovery Center, Memphis
Area Office, PB2

FROM: Nancy H. Cooper
District Inspector General for Audit-Southeast/Caribbean, 4AGA

SUBJECT: Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota
Public Housing Drug Elimination Program
Sarasota, Florida

We conducted an audit of the Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota's (SHA) Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) for fiscal years 1994 through 1996. The audit was part of a nationwide audit of the PHDEP. The purpose of our review was to determine whether the SHA administered and implemented its programs in accordance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements.

The report contains two findings requiring follow up action by your office. We will provide a copy of this report to the SHA.

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

If you have any questions, please contact James D. McKay, Assistant District Inspector General for Audit, at (404) 331-3369 or Sam Daugherty, Senior Auditor, at (904) 232-1226.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

Executive Summary

We conducted an audit of the Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota's (SHA) Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) for fiscal years 1994 through 1996. The audit was part of a nationwide audit of the PHDEP. Our audit objectives were to determine whether the SHA (1) implemented a system for evaluating, monitoring, and reporting program outcomes/benefits; (2) prepared and submitted timely and accurate semi-annual performance reports to HUD; (3) established controls over its PHDEP planned expenditures, including assurances that only eligible costs were charged to grants; and (4) executed and monitored contracts with private providers.

The SHA lacked the necessary controls to properly monitor, evaluate, and report program results. Specifically, SHA did not: (1) establish a system to measure and monitor its grants to ensure that it met program objectives, (2) adequately report to HUD program results, (3) maintain proper control over its grants, and (4) execute and monitor contracts with private providers. The agency spent \$377,976 without proper assurance the funds were of intended benefit to the community. Of the \$377,976, \$37,891 was ineligible because SHA charged its grants for costs incurred prior to grant award and after grant expiration. The SHA needs to substantially improve its control over the program, reimburse the program or HUD for ineligible costs, and resolve unsupported costs of \$174,820. Also, HUD needs to recapture unused grant funds of \$80,732.

We discussed the findings with SHA officials during the course of the audit and at an exit conference on July 28, 1998. The SHA provided written comments to our findings and has taken initial steps to correct some deficiencies. We considered the responses in preparing our final report. We have summarized the SHA's responses for each finding and included the complete response as Appendix B.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

Table of Contents

Management Memorandum	i
-----------------------	---

Executive Summary	iii
-------------------	-----

Introduction	1
--------------	---

Findings

1	SHA Lacked Control Over Its PHDEP Grants	3
---	--	---

2	SHA Spent \$37,891 on Ineligible Activities and Allowed Grant Funds to Expire	9
---	---	---

Management Controls	11
---------------------	----

Follow-Up On Prior Audits	13
---------------------------	----

Appendices

A	Schedule of Ineligible and Unsupported Costs and Cost Efficiencies	15
---	--	----

B	Auditee Comments	17
---	------------------	----

C	Distribution	23
---	--------------	----

Abbreviations:

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
NOFA	Notice of Funding Availability
PHDEP	Public Housing Drug Elimination Program
SHA	Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota, Florida

Introduction

The Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota, Florida (SHA) is a public body organized under Chapter 421 of the laws of the State of Florida. Its mission is to provide low rent housing for qualified individuals in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by HUD and other Federal agencies. The SHA operates 561 low income housing units, 75 Section 8 new construction units, 526 Section 8 certificates, and 27 Section 8 vouchers. During the audit period, the SHA employed five executive directors. At the time of our audit, Victoria Main was the Executive Director and Gary Hoyt was the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners. A seven member Board of Commissioners governs the SHA.

The goal of the PHDEP is to eliminate drug related crimes and problems associated with them. The program encourages housing authorities and resident management corporations to develop a plan to address drugs and other related problems that includes prevention and intervention initiatives that can be sustained over a period of several years. HUD approved the grants for law enforcement, drug prevention, physical improvements, and other program activities. Specific Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) for the grant and Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 761 define HUD requirements for PHDEP.

The following table shows SHA's fund activity for fiscal years 1994 through 1997 as of March 31, 1998:

<u>PHDEP Fund Year</u>	<u>Funds Awarded</u>	<u>Costs Incurred</u>	<u>Funds Drawn</u>	<u>Balance</u>
1994	\$168,300	\$161,081	\$160,981	\$ 7,319
1995	246,270	174,820	172,857	73,413
1996	250,000	42,075	-0-	250,000
1997	<u>168,300</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>168,300</u>
Total	<u>\$832,870</u>	<u>\$377,976</u>	<u>\$333,838</u>	<u>\$499,032</u>

The authority's records, except for maintenance, were located at 1300 Sixth Street, Sarasota, Florida. The maintenance records were located at 1912 Orange Avenue, Sarasota, Florida.

Audit objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine if the SHA administered and implemented its Drug Elimination Program in accordance with HUD requirements. Specific audit objectives were to determine whether the SHA:

1. Implemented a system for evaluating, monitoring, and reporting program outcomes/ benefits.
2. Prepared and submitted timely and accurate semi-annual performance reports to HUD.

3. Established controls over its PHDEP planned expenditures, including assurances that only eligible costs were charged to grants.
4. Executed and monitored contracts with service providers.

Audit scope and methodology

We reviewed the SHA's controls and procedures over its implementation and administration of PHDEP grants awarded for fiscal years 1994 through 1996. We reviewed PHDEP grant applications, grant agreements, and financial records. Audit tests included comparison of program objectives to accomplishments and comparison of SHA financial records to the HUD approved PHDEP grant budgets to determine whether costs were in accordance with agreements. We also tested eligibility and support for costs. We randomly selected 22 transactions representing costs of \$243,244.

We interviewed Jacksonville Office of Public Housing program staff and current and former SHA staff. We performed our audit from February 11 through June 30, 1998. The audit covered the period April 1, 1994, through March 31, 1998. We extended the audit period as necessary. We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

SHA Lacked Control Over Its PHDEP Grants

SHA lacked the necessary controls to achieve or evaluate program results. Specifically, SHA did not (1) properly execute contracts for services, and (2) did not establish a system to measure and monitor its grants. As a result, the SHA did not have adequate information to support eligibility of costs, evaluate the effectiveness of the PHDEP, or determine whether the SHA met program objectives. HUD has no assurance the SHA spent its \$377,976 of PHDEP funds for services necessary to accomplish program objectives.

Program requirements

Under 24 CFR 761.35 grantees are responsible for monitoring the day-to-day operations of grant activities to ensure compliance with applicable Federal requirements and accomplishment of performance goals. HUD's Notice 94-83 issued in November 1994 required submission of an Outcome Monitoring Report along with the semiannual report. This required reporting of crime statistics, resident participation, and performance indicators to allow grantees to measure and report the progress of their drug elimination efforts. Also, the annual NOFA required the grantee to describe in its application how the program would be evaluated.

Office of Management and Budget Circulars A-87 and A-122 provide cost principles to ensure costs are reasonable and necessary. These circulars point out, for example, that personnel costs must be supported by payroll documentation approved by a responsible official. Where an employee works multiple activities, the salary distribution must be supported by personnel activity reports signed by the employee.

Title 24 CFR part 85 defines required procurement procedures. Part 85.36 requires grantees to: (1) maintain records to detail the significant history of the procurement, (2) assure procurements provide free and open competition, (3) use time and material contracts only after a determination that no other contract is suitable, (4) have written selection procedures with a clear and accurate description of all requirements for the service to be procured, and (5) perform a cost or price analysis for each procurement action.

Inadequate 1994 and 1996
law enforcement contracts

SHA's 1994 PHDEP application stated the SHA would provide \$168,300 to hire two police officers for 2 years. The 1996 application provided for \$84,150 to hire the two officers for an additional year. Both applications indicated the officers would conduct foot and bike patrols exclusively for SHA public housing properties during peak periods of suspected drug activities.

The SHA executed two \$168,300 contracts with the local law enforcement agency, one for the 1994 grant and one for the 1996 grant period. The 1996 contract was for a 2 year period instead of 1 year. Contrary to its applications, the contracts simply stated that the local law enforcement agency would provide four full time officers to the police substations already located in public housing facilities, and that SHA's payments would be used to defray the costs for the officers. The contracts did not include a detailed scope of services or require the agency to provide information needed to evaluate the program. Specifically, the contracts failed to:

- describe the duties and responsibilities of the officers,
- provide that services were exclusively for public housing properties,
- provide that officers would conduct foot and bike patrols,
- state the hours during which services would be provided, or
- require the law enforcement agency to provide progress reports and evaluations.

These omissions were inexcusable considering HUD had provided a model law enforcement contract in the NOFA application kits. HUD included the model to help public housing officials develop and administer fair and productive contracts with local law enforcement agencies. The model included a detailed scope of services that identified specific police duties and responsibilities, reporting procedures, and evaluation methods. The model identified the type and time frames for specialized patrols and the type of workload data to be collected. The model provided for the law enforcement agency to prepare quarterly progress reports and evaluations of requests for services, and included examples of daily logs to accumulate

data on hours worked, requests for service, referrals to the housing authority or other appropriate agencies, suspicious persons, drug paraphernalia confiscated, arrests, and other related activities. The model also provided methods to evaluate response times and compare crime and workload for prior years.

Without proper agreements, the SHA lacked assurance that the law enforcement agency would provide the intended services, and accumulate and provide the information necessary to evaluate program performance. Furthermore, the SHA did not obtain necessary information to determine what services were provided, and whether law enforcement expenditures of \$203,156 accomplished any benefit.

1995 drug prevention activities were unsupported

The SHA's 1995 application stated it would use \$246,270 for drug prevention activities to targeted adolescents. SHA planned to use grant funds to pay salaries and other expenses for SHA staff, Sarasota Family YMCA, Boys & Girls Club of Sarasota County, Inc., Sarasota Day Nursery, Girls Incorporated of Sarasota County, and other providers.

During the audit period, SHA paid a total of \$174,820 to several providers without executing any contracts or written agreements with any of them. SHA's files also did not contain documentation to: (1) demonstrate the SHA solicited for the services in a free and open manner, (2) justify payment based on time and materials in lieu of a fixed fee per participant, (3) evidence selection based on clear and accurate description of the services to be provided, and (4) show a cost or price analysis was prepared. SHA did not require any of the providers to accumulate and submit information to evaluate the programs.

SHA's payments to these providers were not supported by payroll and employee activity records, activity rosters, or participant sign-in sheets. For example, SHA paid \$3,250 to sponsor a little league baseball team, but had no documentation to show whether any residents actually participated or how this constituted drug prevention.

Reports to HUD were meaningless and late

Four semiannual financial and progress reports and four Outcome Monitoring Reports were required for the 1994 and 1995 grants. Because SHA did not develop a system to gather, evaluate, and monitor outcomes or benefits, it did

Finding 1

not have adequate information needed to provide the required reports to HUD. The progress reports, one of which was over 6 months late, did not disclose the program's performance or effect, if any, related to reducing crime in the targeted developments. The SHA did not submit any of the required Outcome Monitoring Reports to HUD. Furthermore the 1994 and 1995 grant periods had expired, and the SHA had not prepared final financial and performance reports. Accordingly, neither HUD, the SHA, nor the taxpayer had any assurance that these funds provided intended benefit to this community.

Auditee comments

The SHA generally agreed with our finding and has implemented corrective action to improve control over the program. The SHA recently hired a Resident Services Coordinator who is responsible for oversight of the grants, analyses of program related data, and approving invoices for payment. The Resident Service Coordinator has established a reporting procedure to ensure timely submission of reports and that documentation exists to support them.

The SHA is in the process of negotiating contracts with the Sarasota Police Department and drug prevention providers for the use of 1996 and 1997 PHDEP funds. These contracts, based on HUD's models, specify the services to be provided, records maintained and reports to be provided, and goals which will be evaluated. The Sarasota Police Department provided supporting data for the 1994 grant and has begun providing data on a daily basis and summary support data for its current invoice. Also, the SHA has implemented a system for tracking and reporting crime information.

OIG evaluation of
auditee comments

We believe the SHA's actions will strengthen control over its program. The additional supporting data was adequate to support 1994 law enforcement activities.

Recommendations

We recommend your office require the SHA to:

- 1A. Submit proposed contracts for your review and approval. Your office should assure the contracts include a detailed scope of services and prescribe

submission of information needed to evaluate program results.

- 1B. Reimburse its PHDEP grants, repay HUD from non-federal funds, or provide adequate support for the unsupported costs.
- 1C. Prepare and submit final financial and performance reports for the 1994 and 1995 PHDEP grants which evaluate the SHA's performance against its plans.
- 1D. Submit semi-annual reports for the 1996, 1997, and future PHDEP grants which are timely and include the necessary information to monitor outcomes.
- 1E. Improve its contract administration to ensure proper procurement, contract execution, and effective monitoring.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

SHA Spent \$37,891 on Ineligible Activities and Allowed Grant Funds to Expire

The SHA improperly charged the PHDEP for costs incurred prior to the grant award and for costs incurred after the grant expiration date. Also, the SHA did not carry out all planned activities and did not use all 1994 and 1995 funds within the grant period. As a result, costs totaling \$37,891 were ineligible and must be repaid. Unused grant funds totaling \$80,732 must be recaptured.

Program requirements

Title 24 CFR 761.15(d) states that costs may not be incurred before the grant agreement's effective date. Title 24 CFR 761.30 (b) states the grant period may not exceed 24 months from the date of execution unless HUD approves an extension. HUD will not consider requests for retroactive extensions and will permit only one extension for a maximum 6 month period. Grantees must remit any funds remaining at the end of the grant term to HUD.

Costs incurred before grant award

The 1994 grant agreement was effective January 27, 1995. On August 14, 1995, the SHA executed a contract with the local law enforcement agency. The contract stated the effective date was retroactive to November 1, 1994. In August 1995, the law enforcement agency submitted its first invoice in the amount of \$80,513, covering an 11 month period from November 1, 1994, through September 30, 1995. The SHA paid for the services and charged the costs to the 1994 grant. The invoice included costs of \$21,958 incurred prior to the grant agreement, which were ineligible under HUD rules.

Costs incurred after grant award

The SHA's 1995 grant expired on August 25, 1997. However, the SHA continued to charge costs to the 1995 grant through March 31, 1998. Costs of \$14,863 were ineligible because the SHA incurred them after the grant expiration date of August 25, 1997.

Expired grant funds

The SHA did not carry out all activities promised in its PHDEP applications. At March 31, 1998, the SHA had \$1,070 of grant funds on hand and had not drawn down or spent \$7,319 from the 1994 grant and \$73,413 from the 1995 grant. The SHA had not requested or obtained HUD approval to extend the expiration dates. Since both grant

Finding 2

agreements had expired and the SHA can no longer incur expenditures for the grants, the SHA should reimburse HUD \$1,070 for the funds on hand and relinquish \$80,732 which it was unable to target for drug elimination activities within the grant period.

Auditee comments

The SHA generally agreed with the finding. SHA officials said they would request a HUD waiver for costs incurred before and after the grant period.

Recommendations

We recommend your office:

- 2A. Disallow the ineligible costs of \$37,891 and instruct the SHA to reimburse the PHDEP Program or HUD from non-federal funds.
- 2B. Recapture unspent grant funds of \$80,732.

Management Controls

In planning and performing our audit, we obtained an understanding of the management controls that were relevant to our audit. Management is responsible for establishing effective management controls. Management controls include the organization plan, methods and procedures adopted to ensure that goals are met. Management controls include the processes for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations. They include the systems for measuring, reporting, and monitoring program performance.

Significant controls

We determined the following management controls were relevant to our audit objectives:

- Eligibility of grant activities
- Measurement of program results
- Disbursement of funds

We evaluated all the relevant control categories identified above by determining the risk exposure and assessing control design and implementation.

Significant weaknesses

It is a significant weakness if management controls do not give reasonable assurance that resource use is consistent with laws, regulations, and policies; that resources are safeguarded against waste, loss, and misuse; and that reliable data is obtained, maintained, and fairly disclosed in reports.

Our review identified weaknesses in the SHA's administration of its programs. These weaknesses included poor contracting, and an inadequate system for determining eligibility of program expenditures, and evaluating, monitoring and reporting program outcomes. These weaknesses are discussed in the Findings section of this report.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

Follow-Up On Prior Audits

We reviewed the SHA's audited financial statements for the period covering April 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997. A public accounting firm conducted the audit. Finding Number 2 related to failed ratings on certain management assessment program indicators. The failed ratings included issues related to the drug grant programs as follows:

- The board had not adopted policies and implemented procedures to track crime and crime related problems.
- The SHA could not document that it had a cooperative system for tracking and reporting crime to local police authorities.
- The SHA could not document that the drug grant program goals were related to drug and crime rates.

Similar issues are reported in the Findings section of this report.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

Schedule Of Ineligible and Unsupported Costs and Cost Efficiencies

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Ineligible</u> ¹	<u>Unsupported</u> ²	<u>Cost Efficiency</u> ³
1B		\$ 174,820	
2A	\$37,891		
2B			\$80,732

¹ Costs clearly not allowed by law, contract, HUD, or local agency policies or regulations.

² Costs not clearly eligible or ineligible but which warrant being contested (e.g., lack of satisfactory documentation to support the eligibility of the cost, etc.).

³ Efficiencies are an estimate of future savings from recommendations which prevent improper obligations, avoid more unneeded expenditures, or increase revenues.

(THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)

Auditee Comments



Housing Authority
of the City of
Sarasota

Victoria A. Main
Executive Director

JUL 13 1998

Ms. Nancy H. Cooper
District Inspector General for
Audit-Southeast/Caribbean, 4AGA
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
75 Spring Street, SW, Room 330
Atlanta, GA 30303-3388

Dear Ms. Cooper,

This letter is in response to your draft report regarding your review of the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). We welcome the opportunity to comment on the report and its findings.

As you know, I became Executive Director of the Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota (SHA) in January 1998. I was not the Director during the period you examined and most of the staff involved in PHDEP have turned over as well. As a result, we have had to rely on records we could piece together to document the concerns you have outlined in your report. I believe that we now have gathered documentation to support the past expenditures under the PHDEP program you have questioned. The documentation includes timesheets, arrest reports and summary information on special projects conducted during the period and is available for your review.

On my second day as Executive Director, I requested technical assistance from HUD's Office of Community Safety and Conservation (OCSC). I placed this request because of my intense concern regarding the status of the present and past PHDEP grants. The request focused on the need to (1) evaluate what the existing PHDEP grants were originally programmed to do (2) identify what the existing PHDEP grants were being used for and (3) identify the steps we needed to take to address the drug related criminal activity in and around public housing.

OCSC furnished a consultant who evaluated the grants and we were provided with the direction needed to reprogram the grants. We subsequently requested and

1300 Sixth Street
Sarasota, Fl. 34236
tel (941) 361 6210
fax (941) 366 4661

received approval from the HUD field office for a reprogramming and extension to allow us to effectively use the funds. As a result, we are in the process of negotiating contracts with the Sarasota Police Department and the drug prevention providers. These contracts, based on HUD models, specify the services to be provided, records to be maintained and reports to be provided, and goals which will be evaluated. The Sarasota Police Department has already begun providing data on a daily basis and summary support data for its invoice. Weekly meetings are held between the Property Managers and assigned police officers to discuss common issues.

The Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota continues to demonstrate its understanding and commitment to solid grant management and achievement of a successful Public Housing Management Assessment Program score. The Board has passed resolutions containing policies relating to implementation of the PHDEP grants and its support for resident organizations. SHA has implemented a cooperative system for tracking and reporting crime to local police authorities and clearly can demonstrate that current goals are related to drug and crime rates.

One of the first positions I created and filled was a Resident Services Coordinator. The incumbent of this position is responsible for oversight of the grants and analyses of program related data on a monthly basis, prior to approving payment of invoices. The Resident Services Coordinator has established a reporting procedure to ensure that reports are submitted to HUD on a timely basis and that substantive documentation exists to serve as backup material to the reports. Evaluation is a monthly occurrence to ensure that required modifications to programs are being made in a timely fashion. I believe that we are now in an excellent position to move forward with the PHDEP grants and see a reduction in drug related criminal activity in public housing. In the meantime, we have analyzed data for the FY 1994 and FY 1995 PHDEP grants and a Performance Summary Report is attached.

The liaison between the Resident Services Coordinator and the Accounting Department is very strong. Questions regarding how program charges should be made are discussed and the incorrect charges outlined in your report have been rectified.

Due to SHA's inability to administratively manage its grants in the past, SHA did not account for some of its activities appropriately. Eligible activities were performed outside the period of the grant. However, requests to waive 24 CFR 761.15(d) and 761.30(b) were not submitted to HUD in a timely fashion. A waiver request is being prepared now for consideration by HUD. Documentation of the eligible activities performed will be provided.

The recovery of SHA is well underway, with strong new staff members, significant training investments, implementation of internal controls, and written procedures. We believe that we are beginning to see significant improvements in the management of our very limited resources and can assure HUD that the lack of management controls will NOT occur again at SHA.

We are confident that the additional documentation available, along with favorable consideration of our waiver request will ensure that funds do not have to be recaptured by the Department. Such a recapture would be devastating to SHA and would slow recovery significantly.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Sam Daugherty and the other members of the Inspector General's staff who have been so supportive in our recovery efforts. His suggestions regarding internal controls has been greatly welcomed.

I hope this information is useful to you. I look forward to working with you to resolve these issues. I am available on (941) 361-6210 to discuss the report further.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Victoria A. Main". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "V" and "M".

Victoria A. Main
Executive Director

Performance Summary Report

Public Housing Drug Elimination Program Grant

FY 1994 and FY 1995

Crime Statistics

Calls	1995	1996	% Change
Homicide	1	0	-100
Rape	2	6	67
Robbery	47	28	-68
Agg. Assault/Battery	32	33	3
Burglary	64	55	-16
Narcotics Violations	137	218	37
Narcotics Arrests	209	291	28
Total Calls for Service	5098	4797	-6
Totals	7585	7424	-2

Calls	1994	1995	% Change
Homicide	1	1	0
Rape	2	2	0
Robbery	41	47	13
Agg. Assault/Battery	64	32	-100
Burglary	63	64	1
Narcotics Violations	128	137	7
Narcotics Arrests	772	20.9	-270
Total Calls for Service	4335	5098	15
Totals	5406	7585	29

During 1994, 18 special drug operations were conducted in and around targeted public housing developments with Tactical Narcotics, Street Level Narcotics Unit, State Beverage Agents, Uniform Services, and Street Crimes Unit resulting in 78 arrests were conducted.

During 1995, 13 special operations were conducted in and around public housing developments. This resulted in 96 drug arrests.

Since 1994, the Trespass Enforcement activities have resulted in 90 arrests.

Due to under-staffing and for efficiency of operations, officers sometimes did

perform other duties, overflow calls for service outside of their assigned public

housing areas. This was required of all officers. However, primary duties and calls responded to were in and around SHA public housing developments. This is evident from reports now on file at SHA.

Above baseline services have been defined as sponsored neighborhood cleanups, parties, vigils, walks, and other related activities, Trespass Enforcement Program, and high visibility signs. Activities available to the SHA residents during the years 1994, 1995, and 1996 also included truancy program, Boy Scouts, cultural field trips, Girl Scouts, affiliation with Girls, Inc., recreational baseball, racquetball trips, Tampa Bay Bucs Games, Offshore Grand Prix activities, local wrestling events, after-school tutoring program, HIPPY, and the bicycle registration program.

Though monthly reports were not maintain, we now have this information on file at SHA. This information is specific to all SHA public housing development areas.

We currently have all time sheets and calls for service for each officer assigned to SHA properties during the FY 1994, 1995, and 1996. Monthly reports, including time sheets, have been received on time, are required before reimbursement, and are maintained on file.

A contract for services rendered and to be rendered under the 1996 and 1997 grant, is being negotiated and will be completed and signed by July 31, 1997. The inter-local agreement, though not a contract, did outline the services that would be rendered to SHA. These services, according to reports now on file, were rendered. Duties and responsibilities of the CRT were outlined in 1990: these are the services that SHA contracted for.

The reports on file now, indicate that SPD did provide services, not exclusively, but primarily to SHA. Hours of service were not outlined in the Inter-local agreement, but the time sheets and service call logs, do indicate that SHA did receive primary services from the assigned officers.

Evaluation of Progress

Evaluations were not conducted on previous grants. However, periodic evaluations are required under PHDEP FY 1996 and FY 1997 grants. This evaluation will include surveys from the Drug Elimination Task Force and residents. SHA evaluation will combine these surveys with actual data from monthly reporting. Therefore, the evaluation process will compare actual effectiveness and outcomes with perception and utilization.

Resident Participation

Residents were not aware of and taking advantage of prevention services offered. The contracts for FY 1996 and FY 1997 have included requirements for recruitment of adult resident program volunteers as a programs outcome and

part of the scope of services.

We have established active resident associations in three developments. These associations have been involved in the development of recent grant applications.

We are in the process of formally organizing the other developments. The Courts and Orange Avenue developments will be combined, with resident approval, into one resident association because of their close proximity and similarities. Bertha Mitchell will have its own association. Both of these associations will be in the 30-day election period by the end of July.

In addition, PHDEP FY 1996 and FY 1997 grants have been revised to include resident surveys to evaluate our progress and make recommendations. These surveys will be conducted every six (6) months.

1995 Drug Prevention Activities

Contracts are now in place for all providers of prevention services under the 1996 and 1997 grants. The 1994 and 1995 grants did not request reports for services rendered. However, this information is now on file.

Not only are contracts established, but firm reporting monthly is established. Outcomes and measurements have been established.

HUD Reports

Project management tools have been established to insure that all reporting and all activities are done on time (attached) for the 1996 and 1997 grants.

Distribution

Secretary's Representative, 4AS
State Coordinator, Florida State Office, 4DS
Area Coordinator, Jacksonville Area Office, 4HS
Director , Office of Public Housing, 4DPH
Director , Office of Public Housing, 4HPH
Audit Liaison Officer, 3AFI
Director, Administrative Service Center, 4AA
Acquisitions Librarian, Library, AS (Room 8141)
General Counsel, C (Room 10214)
Associate General Counsel, Office of Assisted Housing and Community Development, CD
(Room 8162)
Counsel to the IG, GC
Public Affairs Officer, G
HUD OIG Webmaster-Electronic format via Electronic mail- Morris_F._Grissom@Hud.Gov
Director, HUD Enforcement Center, 1240 Maryland Avenue, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20024
Chief Financial Officer, F (Room 10166) (2)
Deputy Chief Financial Officer for Finance, FF (Room 10164) (2)
Director, Office of Budget, FO (Room 3270)
Director, Housing and Community Development Issue Area, U.S. GAO, 441 G Street N.W.,
Room 2474, Washington DC 20548
Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, P (Room 4100)
Comptroller/Audit Liaison Officer for Public and Indian Housing, PF (Room 5156) (3)
Assistant to the Deputy Secretary for Field Management, SDF (Room 7106)
Assistant to the Secretary for Labor Relations, SLD (Room 7118)
The Honorable John Glenn, Ranking Member, Committee on Governmental Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington DC 20515-4305
The Honorable Fred Thompson, Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington DC 20515-4305
The Honorable Dan Burton, Chairman, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight,
United States House of Representatives, Washington DC 20515-6143
Mr. Pete Sessions, Government Reform and Oversight Committee, Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20510-6250
Ms. Cindy Sprunger, Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations, Room 212,
O'Neil Office Building, Washington DC 20515
Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota
Gary Hoyt, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners, Housing Authority of the City of Sarasota