

085627

~~1.05.15~~
71.0018

19
23



REPORT TO THE CONGRESS



LM095627

Controls Needed Over The Leasing Of Land Acquired Under The Open-Space Land Program B-168174

Department of Housing and
Urban Development

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

700618
095627

JUNE 16, 1971



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-168174

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

This is our report on controls needed over the leasing of land acquired under the Open-Space Land Program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "James B. Aboody".

Comptroller General
of the United States

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Under the Open-Space Land Program, Federal grants are provided to States and local public bodies (grantees) to acquire and/or develop land to help curb urban sprawl; to assist in preventing the spread of urban blight; to encourage economic urban development; to provide parks and recreational areas; and to preserve conservation, scenic, and historic land areas.

The program is administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As of June 30, 1970, Federal funds of about \$370 million had been appropriated for the program. Of this amount, HUD

--had obligated about \$312 million for the acquisition and/or development of land and

--had disbursed about \$138 million to the States and to local public bodies.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) noted during a survey that certain grantees were leasing land acquired under the program without obtaining HUD's approval, contrary to the requirements of the grant contracts. GAO therefore undertook a review of the program to determine the extent of the leasing activity.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

HUD had not established procedures for ensuring that grantees were obtaining HUD's approval prior to leasing open-space land and had not developed requirements or guidelines relating to the use of revenues received by grantees from the leasing of open-space land. (See p. 6.)

HUD central office officials advised GAO that, because there were relatively few leasing agreements, revenues from leasing open-space land would be insignificant and thus would not warrant the issuance of specific requirements or guidelines for controlling the use of such funds or for ensuring that they would be used for open-space purposes. (See p. 13.)

To determine whether the leasing of open-space land without HUD's approval was a widespread practice, GAO sent questionnaires to 435

grantees that were responsible for 899 individual open-space projects located in three HUD regional office jurisdictions--Chicago, Illinois; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and San Francisco, California.

Of the 410 grantees responding to the questionnaires, 76 reported that they had entered into a total of 700 lease agreements. (See pp. 6 and 7.)

GAO's examination into 21 open-space projects, involving 199 of the 700 reported lease agreements, showed that, of the 199 lease agreements, 183, or about 92 percent, had not been approved by HUD. (See p. 7.) The revenues received by the grantees under the 199 lease agreements totaled about \$714,000. These funds were deposited into the grantee's general operating funds and were not specifically set aside and utilized for open-space land project activities. (See p. 8.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

GAO informed HUD that certain grantees were not complying with the provisions of the open-space contracts relating to the leasing of open-space land and had engaged in such activities without obtaining prior HUD approval.

GAO suggested that HUD (1) establish a system of periodic site inspections of open-space projects to ensure that grantees obtain HUD's approval prior to the leasing of open-space land, (2) establish guidelines for the approval of grantee requests to lease open-space land to ensure that the proposed lease is compatible with the intent of the program and the timely development of the land for open-space uses, and (3) place restrictions on the use of revenues received from the leasing of open-space land. (See p. 15.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

HUD informed GAO that instructions had been issued to all regional administrators requiring:

- That reviews and follow-up reviews be made of certain grants awarded prior to January 1, 1970, on which delays (in the acquisition and/or development of the land) were being experienced and that appropriate action be taken.
- That compliance site inspections be scheduled for certain projects approved during fiscal years 1962 through 1968 and that appropriate action be taken on any contract violations disclosed.
- That all grantees certify to HUD that the terms and conditions of their open-space land grant contracts are being met.

HUD also advised GAO that information relative to its approval of leases and the use of lease revenues would be included in a consolidated program guide which was in process of being drafted.

GAO believes that the actions taken or planned by HUD, if fully implemented, should result in improved administration of the Open-Space Land Program.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

No congressional action is suggested. This report is being submitted to the Congress because of expressed congressional interest in management of urban development programs by Federal, State, and local agencies.

Tear Sheet

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>	
DIGEST	1	
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	4
	Open-Space Land Program requirements	4
	Scope of review	5
2	CONTROLS NEEDED OVER THE LEASING OF LAND ACQUIRED UNDER THE OPEN-SPACE LAND PROGRAM	6
	Leasing of land without required HUD approval	6
	Need to establish guidelines for use of revenues from leasing open-space land	13
	Conclusions and agency actions	14
APPENDIX		
I	Letter dated March 15, 1971, from the Assistant Secretary for Community Develop- ment to the General Accounting Office	19
II	Principal officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development respon- sible for the administration of activi- ties discussed in this report	21

ABBREVIATIONS

GAO	General Accounting Office
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Under the Open-Space Land Program, Federal grants are provided to States and local public bodies (grantees) to acquire and/or develop land to help curb urban sprawl; to assist in preventing the spread of urban blight; to encourage economic urban development; to provide parks and recreational areas; and to preserve conservation, scenic, and historic land areas.

The program is administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As of June 30, 1970, Federal funds of about \$370 million had been appropriated for the program. Of this amount, HUD

--had obligated about \$312 million for the acquisition and/or development of land and

--had disbursed about \$138 million to the States and to local public bodies.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) noted during a survey that certain grantees were leasing land acquired under the program without obtaining HUD's approval, contrary to the requirements of the grant contracts. GAO therefore undertook a review of the program to determine the extent of the leasing activity.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

HUD had not established procedures for ensuring that grantees were obtaining HUD's approval prior to leasing open-space land and had not developed requirements or guidelines relating to the use of revenues received by grantees from the leasing of open-space land. (See p. 6.)

HUD central office officials advised GAO that, because there were relatively few leasing agreements, revenues from leasing open-space land would be insignificant and thus would not warrant the issuance of specific requirements or guidelines for controlling the use of such funds or for ensuring that they would be used for open-space purposes. (See p. 13.)

To determine whether the leasing of open-space land without HUD's approval was a widespread practice, GAO sent questionnaires to 435

grantees that were responsible for 899 individual open-space projects located in three HUD regional office jurisdictions--Chicago, Illinois; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and San Francisco, California.

Of the 410 grantees responding to the questionnaires, 76 reported that they had entered into a total of 700 lease agreements. (See pp. 6 and 7.)

GAO's examination into 21 open-space projects, involving 199 of the 700 reported lease agreements, showed that, of the 199 lease agreements, 183, or about 92 percent, had not been approved by HUD. (See p. 7.) The revenues received by the grantees under the 199 lease agreements totaled about \$714,000. These funds were deposited into the grantee's general operating funds and were not specifically set aside and utilized for open-space land project activities. (See p. 8.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

GAO informed HUD that certain grantees were not complying with the provisions of the open-space contracts relating to the leasing of open-space land and had engaged in such activities without obtaining prior HUD approval.

GAO suggested that HUD (1) establish a system of periodic site inspections of open-space projects to ensure that grantees obtain HUD's approval prior to the leasing of open-space land, (2) establish guidelines for the approval of grantee requests to lease open-space land to ensure that the proposed lease is compatible with the intent of the program and the timely development of the land for open-space uses, and (3) place restrictions on the use of revenues received from the leasing of open-space land. (See p. 15.)

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

HUD informed GAO that instructions had been issued to all regional administrators requiring:

- That reviews and follow-up reviews be made of certain grants awarded prior to January 1, 1970, on which delays (in the acquisition and/or development of the land) were being experienced and that appropriate action be taken.
- That compliance site inspections be scheduled for certain projects approved during fiscal years 1962 through 1968 and that appropriate action be taken on any contract violations disclosed.
- That all grantees certify to HUD that the terms and conditions of their open-space land grant contracts are being met.

HUD also advised GAO that information relative to its approval of leases and the use of lease revenues would be included in a consolidated program guide which was in process of being drafted.

GAO believes that the actions taken or planned by HUD, if fully implemented, should result in improved administration of the Open-Space Land Program.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CONGRESS

No congressional action is suggested. This report is being submitted to the Congress because of expressed congressional interest in management of urban development programs by Federal, State, and local agencies.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Open-Space Land Program, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, was established under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1500), and was designed to help curb urban sprawl; to assist in preventing the spread of urban blight; to encourage economic urban development; to provide parks and recreational areas; and to preserve conservation, scenic, and historic land areas.

The Secretary of HUD is authorized--under section 702 of the act, which deals with the acquisition of undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped land, and under section 705 of the act, which relates to the acquisition of developed land in urban areas--to provide financial assistance in the form of grants to States and to local public bodies to acquire and/or develop land for Open-Space Land Program purposes. Federal financial participation is not to exceed 50 percent of the total project cost of acquiring and/or developing land under this program.

As of June 30, 1970, Federal funds of about \$370 million had been appropriated for this program. Of this amount, HUD had obligated about \$312 million for specific projects under sections 702 and 705 of the act and had disbursed about \$138 million to the States and to local public bodies.

OPEN-SPACE LAND PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Applications for Federal financial assistance for acquiring and/or developing land under this program are initiated by States or local public bodies.

Applications are approved by the HUD regional offices, and, upon approval, grantees are required to enter into specific contracts with HUD. The contracts set forth the general conditions and terms of the Open-Space Land Program grants.

Contract provisions relating to the use of land acquired under the program state that grantees (1) must retain the land permanently for the purposes outlined in the approved applications or (2) must obtain the written approval of the Secretary of HUD before leasing, selling, or transferring any land acquired under the program.

HUD guidelines provide that, in the event that the land is not immediately utilized for the purposes outlined in the approved application, the grantee may lease the land on a short-term basis. Such leasing generally occurs when certain delays are expected in the development of the land. In May 1966 the Secretary delegated this approval authority to the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development. We have been advised by HUD officials that each request from a State or local public body for approval to lease land is reviewed and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Under the provisions of the grant contracts, the approval of a request to lease land is contingent upon the grantee's submitting documentation to demonstrate that (1) under the proposed lease the land will be used for purposes consistent with those stated in the HUD-approved application for the acquisition of the land and (2) the lease agreement will contain adequate controls for ensuring that the land will be preserved for Open-Space Land Program uses.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review of this program was directed primarily toward determining the extent of the leasing activity being conducted by the grantees and included an evaluation of HUD's policies, procedures, and practices for monitoring the uses made of the land acquired under the program.

Our review was made at HUD's central office in Washington, D.C., and at regional offices in Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. We mailed questionnaires to 435 public bodies having responsibilities for 899 open-space projects in three HUD regional office jurisdictions. The questionnaire was designed to determine whether the land acquired under the program had been leased, sold, or transferred. We also reviewed, in detail, 21 open-space projects and made site visits to these projects.

CHAPTER 2

CONTROLS NEEDED OVER THE LEASING OF LAND

ACQUIRED UNDER THE OPEN-SPACE LAND PROGRAM

Our review showed that certain grantees were not complying with the terms and conditions of the HUD grant contracts which related to the leasing of land acquired under the Open-Space Land Program. We found that grantees had leased land without obtaining HUD's approval, contrary to the requirements of the grant contracts, and that other grantees had leased land for periods beyond those approved by HUD. HUD had not developed requirements or guidelines relating to the use of revenues received by grantees from the leasing of open-space land.

Details on these matters are presented in the following sections.

LEASING OF LAND WITHOUT REQUIRED HUD APPROVAL

HUD guidelines provide that grantees may lease--for specific periods of time--open-space land that is not to be utilized in the near future for the purposes outlined in the approved grant applications. The grant contracts provide, however, that prior approval of such leasing must be obtained from the Secretary of HUD.

During a survey we conducted at the HUD regional office level, we noted that land acquired under this program had been leased without the knowledge or approval of the Secretary. To determine whether this practice was widespread, we mailed questionnaires to 435 grantees in three HUD regional office jurisdictions, which requested information relative to their leasing activities. These grantees were responsible for 899 individual open-space projects. The number of open-space projects managed by each grantee ranged from one to 23--an average of two projects for each grantee.

Grantees in HUD's Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco regions were chosen to receive questionnaires because

of the significant amount of Federal funds that had been awarded to grantees in these regions. As of June 30, 1968, about 68 percent of the total number of open-space projects that had been approved by HUD after inception of the program were in these three regions. At that date, the three regions had awarded and obligated funds totaling about \$143 million for open-space grants.

Following is a summary of the results we obtained from our questionnaire survey of grantees in the three regions.

HUD region	Number of grantees		Reporting lease agreements	Number of lease agreements reported
	Receiving question- naires	Responding		
Chicago	222	213	35	505
Philadelphia	140	124	18	62
San Fran- cisco	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>133</u>
Total	<u>435</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>700</u>

To determine whether the 76 grantees had obtained HUD's approval prior to entering into the lease agreements, we discussed the results of our questionnaire survey with HUD officials in each of the three regions. These officials stated that, although the documentation or records for ascertaining the specific number of grantees that might have requested and obtained HUD's approval were not readily available because of a recent departmental reorganization, they were of the view that very few of the grantees had requested such approval.

To determine whether grantees involved in leasing had, in fact, requested and obtained HUD approval, we selected for further review 21 projects representing 199 of the 700 reported lease agreements. Also our review was directed toward determining the purposes for which the land was leased and the disposition of the lease revenues by the grantees.

Our review showed that the grantees had not submitted 183, or about 92 percent, of the 199 lease agreements to

HUD for its review and approval. Under the 199 agreements, the grantees had leased the land for a variety of purposes including commercial, residential, and grazing and other agricultural uses. Our review of the lease agreements showed that the grantees, for the most part, had leased the land for purposes which, in our opinion, would not have adversely affected the ultimate use of the land for the purposes outlined in the HUD-approved grant applications.

We believe, however, that, in a number of instances, the leasing of the land may have resulted in delaying the ultimate development of the land for such purposes as parks and recreational areas which were outlined in the grant applications approved by HUD.

At the time of our field review, the grantees' revenues under the 199 lease agreements amounted to about \$714,000. These funds were deposited into the general operating funds of the States or the local public bodies and were not specifically set aside and utilized for open-space land project activities.

Presented below are several examples of leasing activities being conducted by grantees on land acquired under the Open-Space Land Program.

Grantee A

During the period 1967 through 1969, this grantee--a regional park district--applied for and received approval from HUD to acquire about 2,000 acres of land to be used for the development of a regional park. HUD grants for the acquisition of this land amounted to about \$545,000. The HUD-approved grant applications stated that the regional park would be used by the general public for hiking, camping, swimming, and related recreational activities.

Our review showed that the grantee, without HUD's approval, had leased the entire parcel of land to a private livestock company for animal grazing. Officials of the grantee advised us that HUD's approval to lease this land had not been requested because of an oversight on the part of park district officials. They

advised us also that they did not plan to request HUD's approval of the lease agreement and that they would continue to lease the land for grazing purposes.

Revenue received by the grantee under the lease agreement during the period December 1, 1967, to April 30, 1970, amounted to approximately \$35,350. At the time of our review, the grantee was receiving about \$15,000 a year under the leasing agreement with the livestock company.

Grantee B

In May 1966 HUD awarded to this grantee--a county--an \$85,623 grant for acquiring about 1 acre of land to be developed for park and recreational purposes. The land, located within an urban renewal area, was acquired by the county from the local redevelopment authority.

The county received approval from HUD to lease the land--as a public parking lot--during the period August 1, 1966, through March 31, 1967.

In March 1967 the county requested HUD's approval of an extension of the lease through September 1967. In advising the county that the requested 6-month extension had been approved, the HUD Assistant Regional Administrator stated that:

"Because of the need to proceed with the designated open-space use ***, we will not be able to grant any further extensions. It is anticipated that at the end of this extension the land will be employed for its approved open-space use."

In August 1967 the county requested HUD's approval of an extension of the lease for an additional 6-month period through March 1968 and stated that (1) it was unable to begin the development of the land for its approved purpose and (2) there was a lack of public parking facilities in the general area of the open-space site.

County officials told us that they had not been advised by HUD as to whether approval of the second extension was granted. The county nevertheless extended the lease--on a month-to-month basis--from October 1967 through September 1969. The county initiated the development of the park in March 1970.

We were unable to determine why HUD had not acted upon the grantee's second request for extension of the leasing arrangement. Certain information in the project files, however, showed that the HUD regional office had been directed by the central office to advise the grantee that a formal request for an extension of the lease must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development and that no further extensions would be granted to the county after March 1968.

The county received lease revenues of about \$57,000 during the period August 1966 through September 1969.

Grantee C

During the period 1963 through 1965, HUD approved several applications of the grantee--a multicounty park board--for the acquisition of a total of 3,690 acres of land which, according to the grantee's requests, were to be used for park, recreational, conservation, historic, and scenic purposes. HUD grants for the acquisition of this land amounted to about \$1.1 million.

Our review showed that the grantee entered into a number of agreements between March 1, 1964, and March 1, 1966, for the lease of about 1,848 of the 3,690 acres for agricultural purposes. These lease agreements, which were renewable on a year-to-year basis, were approved by HUD.

The grantee, however, without requesting HUD approval, subsequently entered into agreements for the lease of 15 homes that were located on the open-space land. We noted that a number of these homes had been leased several times and that, at the time of our field review, 11 of the 15 homes were still being leased.

An official of the grantee informed us that, prior to our review, the grantee was not aware that the requirement for obtaining leasing approval from HUD included residential dwellings. He stated that, in the future, HUD approval would be requested for all lease agreements.

From March 1964 through May 1970, the grantee received revenues of about \$91,300 from the agricultural leases and about \$60,000 from the residential leases.

Grantee D

In September 1964 HUD approved the application of this grantee--a State--to acquire 1,711 acres of land to be developed as a park which would provide areas for picnicking, bathing, boating, and other recreational-type activities. HUD's grant for the acquisition of this land amounted to about \$954,900.

At the time of acquisition, 23 residential dwellings were located on the land and 12 were being leased. Subsequent to the acquisition of the land, the grantee, without the approval of HUD, extended nine of the 12 leases and entered into 26 additional leases of land for residential, agricultural, and commercial purposes. The first lease agreements by the grantee were entered into in November 1964--2 months after HUD approved the grantee's application to acquire the land. As of September 30, 1970, 25 lease agreements--18 residential and seven agricultural--were in effect.

The seven agricultural leases which were in effect as of September 30, 1970, covered 603 of the 1,711 acres of open-space land. Information was not readily available to enable us to ascertain the area of land that was leased for residential purposes.

Grantee officials told us that they were not aware of the requirement that HUD must approve the leasing of land that was acquired under this program. These officials informed us that they planned to notify HUD of the existing leases--25 at the time that our fieldwork was completed--and that, in the future, HUD's approval

would be requested before extending existing lease agreements or entering into new lease agreements.

From the inception of leasing activities in November 1964 through September 30, 1970, the State received leasing revenues of about \$103,650.

- - - -

In our opinion, the above examples indicate a need for HUD to establish controls to ensure that grantees participating in the Open-Space Land Program, as a minimum, are complying with the terms of their grant contracts which require that grantees, prior to leasing any land acquired under the program, obtain HUD's approval. We believe that such controls should provide for adequate monitoring to determine, on a continuing basis, that the grantees are adhering to the contract requirements.

We noted that in May 1967 HUD's Office of Audit directed its regional audit managers to make a review of the Open-Space Land Program. This review resulted in six reports which were issued to each of the regional administrators in six of HUD's seven regions.

One of the reports cited two projects for which the lease of open-space land had been approved by a HUD regional director instead of having been referred to the HUD central office for approval. The review, however, did not identify any cases where the grantees had entered into lease agreements without requesting HUD's prior approval.

We were advised by HUD Office of Audit officials that this program review was the only review that the office had made of the Open-Space Land Program and that additional work had not been planned on the program during the period ending June 1971.

NEED TO ESTABLISH GUIDELINES FOR USE
OF REVENUES FROM LEASING OPEN-SPACE LAND

Prior to the initiation of our review, HUD had not established any requirements or guidelines for grantees to follow regarding the use of revenues from the leasing of land acquired under the Open-Space Land Program. HUD central office officials informed us that, because there were relatively few leasing agreements, any revenues from the leasing of land would be insignificant and thus would not warrant the issuance of specific requirements or guidelines for controlling the use of such funds or for ensuring that they would be used for open-space purposes, such as developing parks or providing recreational areas.

Although HUD had not established requirements or guidelines relating to the use of lease revenues, the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development pointed out, in correspondence to a HUD regional office in January 1970, that HUD was in favor of using such revenues for the development of open-space land. During our review of specific open-space projects, however, we noted that HUD, in approving the leasing agreements for several grantees, had not advised the grantees that lease revenues should be used for the development of open-space land.

We discussed the above matters with HUD officials of the three regions included in our review. These officials stated that, in their opinion, HUD should issue specific instructions to grantees requiring that leasing revenues be used for open-space activities, such as the acquisition, development, or maintenance of open-space land.

In August 1970 HUD adopted guidelines for issuance to future applicants for open-space grants which provided that HUD's approval of grantees' requests to lease open-space land be subject to such restrictions on the use of the lease revenues as HUD deemed appropriate. The guidelines provided, in effect, that:

1. Where the entire amount of the grant had been disbursed, HUD could require the grantee to pay an amount of the lease revenues equal to HUD's proportionate investment in the leased land.

2. Where the entire amount of the grant had not been disbursed, HUD could require that lease revenues in an amount equal to HUD's proportionate investment in the leased land be applied against the undisbursed portion of the grant.

These guidelines, however, did not provide any instructions to the grantees requiring that leasing revenues be used for the acquisition, development, or maintenance of open-space land.

Because of the significant amounts of revenues that grantees have been receiving from the leasing of open-space land (see p. 8), we believe that HUD should develop and implement measures to ensure that the funds received by grantees from the leasing of land acquired under the Open-Space Land Program are used for open-space activities, such as the development of parks and recreational areas.

CONCLUSIONS AND AGENCY ACTIONS

Our review showed--contrary to the expressed views of HUD officials--that there was a considerable amount of leasing activity under the Open-Space Land Program. Our review showed also:

- That HUD had not established procedures, including periodic site inspections, for monitoring open-space projects, and that, as a result, HUD was unaware of the magnitude of the leasing activities or of the number of grantees who had engaged in such activities without HUD's approval.
- That grantees under the program had not complied with the terms of their grant contracts which required that the grantees obtain HUD's approval prior to entering into lease agreements involving land acquired under the program.
- That the revenues that the grantees included in our review received from the leasing of land and residences, in our opinion, were significant.

--That HUD had not provided grantees with guidelines relating to the use of revenues received from the leasing of land acquired under the program.

In a letter dated July 31, 1970, we informed HUD that our review had shown that grantees had not complied with the contract provisions relating to the leasing of open-space land and had engaged in leasing activities without obtaining HUD's approval. We suggested that HUD (1) establish a system of periodic site inspections of open-space projects to ensure that grantees obtain HUD's approval prior to the leasing of open-space land, (2) establish guidelines for the approval of grantee requests to lease open-space land to ensure that the proposed lease is compatible with the intent of the program and the timely development of the land for open-space uses, and (3) place restrictions on the use of revenues received from the leasing of open-space land.

In a letter dated August 21, 1970, the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development¹ advised us that HUD, for the past several years, had taken a number of measures to increase postapproval management of the Open-Space Land Program and that, within the next several months, additional procedures would be established to provide for more effective monitoring of projects approved under the program.

The Assistant Secretary advised us also that HUD was examining into the most effective and responsive measures that could be taken regarding the disposition of the Federal Government's interest in revenues from leasing open-space land and the interim uses of the land by the grantees.

In a letter dated March 15, 1971 (see app. I), the Assistant Secretary for Community Development, in commenting on our draft report, stated that, although the Department had not attempted to investigate or resolve any of the

¹Effective March 1, 1971, the responsibility for the administration of the Open-Space Land Program was transferred from the Office of Metropolitan Planning and Development to the newly established Office of Community Development.

specific cases identified in the report, steps were being taken by the Department to examine into all Open-Space Land Program grants in a manner similar to that which we followed in our review.

The Assistant Secretary advised us that instructions issued on December 16, 1970, required that HUD regional administrators (1) make reviews and follow-up reviews of all even-numbered grants awarded prior to January 1, 1970, on which delays were being experienced in the acquisition and/or development of the land for the purposes outlined in the approved grant applications and take appropriate action and (2) schedule compliance site inspections of all odd-numbered projects approved during fiscal years 1962 through 1968 and take appropriate action on all contract violations disclosed during the site inspections.

In addition, the Assistant Secretary stated that a memorandum, dated January 6, 1971, to all HUD regional administrators contained instructions for making contract compliance reviews and required that a certification be obtained from each grantee regarding its compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant contract.

The Assistant Secretary stated also that information relative to HUD's approval of leases and the use of lease revenues would be included in a consolidated program guide which was in the process of being drafted.

In view of the actions taken or planned by HUD relating to correcting the weaknesses noted during our review, we are not making any specific recommendations. We believe that these actions, if fully implemented, should result in improved administration of the Open-Space Land Program.

As part of our continuing review of HUD programs, however, we plan, at a later date, to examine into the actions taken to improve the management of the Open-Space Land Program.

APPENDIXES



DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20410

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

IN REPLY REFER TO:

MAR 15 1971

6
Mr. B. E. Birkle
Assistant Director
Civil Division
General Accounting Office
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. Birkle:

Secretary Romney has asked me to thank you for furnishing him a copy of your draft report to the Congress titled "Need to Establish Controls Over the Leasing of Land Acquired Under the Open Space Land Program."

We have reviewed the draft and have no substantive suggestions to make on it at this time. The report is generally accurate from our perspective, although we have not attempted to investigate or resolve any of the specific cases identified in the study. As indicated in the study, we are taking steps to examine all such grants along a line similar to that taken by your staff.

Following is a summary of progress to date on implementing procedures discussed in Assistant Secretary Jackson's letter to you of August 1970. On December 16, 1970, Assistant Secretary Jackson sent a memorandum to all Regional Administrators concerning program goals for 1971. Included in this memorandum were instructions to: review and follow-up on all even numbered grants made prior to January 1, 1970, which are experiencing delays and to take any further appropriate action, and schedule contract compliance site inspections for all odd numbered Title VII projects approved during Fiscal Years 1962-68 and to take appropriate action on any contract violations disclosed. On January 6, 1971, Assistant Secretary Jackson sent to all Regional Administrators a memorandum providing procedures for contract compliance reviews and advance copies of the questionnaire and certification form. Further action on this form has been temporarily halted pending official OMB review and clearance of the questionnaire. Such authorization is expected shortly. A site inspection form for use by field staff has been

APPENDIX I

completed. The question of leases and revenues received from such leases will be handled in the consolidated open space program guide which is now in the process of being drafted.

We very much appreciate the fine cooperation of the GAO staff assigned to this study. The study has been helpful to us.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Floyd H. Hyde". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "F" and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Floyd H. Hyde
Assistant Secretary

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF
 THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
 RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES
 DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (note a):		
Robert C. Weaver	Feb. 1961	Dec. 1968
Robert C. Wood	Jan. 1969	Jan. 1969
George W. Romney	Jan. 1969	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR METROPOL- ITAN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT:		
Charles Haar	July 1967	Jan. 1969
Samuel C. Jackson	Feb. 1969	Feb. 1971
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE (note b):		
Don Hummel	July 1966	Feb. 1969
Howard J. Wharton (acting)	Feb. 1969	Mar. 1969
Lawrence M. Cox	Mar. 1969	Feb. 1970
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (note c):		
Floyd H. Hyde	Mar. 1971	Present

^aFormerly the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

^bResponsibility for section 705 of the Housing Act of 1961, acquisition of developed land, was transferred to the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development in February 1970.

^cEffective March 1, 1971, responsibility for the administration of the Open-Space Land Program was transferred from the Office of Metropolitan Planning and Development to the newly established Office of Community Development.