

Healthy Homes Risk Analysis

In December 2003 Healthy Homes Government Technical Representatives (GTRs) performed a risk analysis of 33 active Healthy Homes Demonstration and Technical Studies grants. (A total of 52 Healthy Homes grants have been awarded since the beginning of the Healthy Homes Initiative; 11 of these grants are 2003 awards and 9 grants have been closed out or expired). The objective of the risk analysis was to identify and rank grants that most critically needed assistance from the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control (OHHLHC). By ranking grantees relative to performance (low risk, medium risk or high risk) OHHLHC is in a position to optimally allocate funds for compliance monitoring and technical assistance for the purpose of providing resources to grantees so that goals and deliverables proposed grant applications can be achieved.

The risk analysis was based on the most recent GTR assessment of the performance of the grantee in FY 2003. The following criteria, as applicable to a specific grant, were used for this assessment:

- Project Start Up
- Method Development
- Capacity Building/Training
- Education/Outreach
- Assessments
- Interventions
- Project Evaluation
- Quality Assurance/Quality Control
- Reporting
- Financial Responsiveness

GTRs used scores developed in the most recent Performance Assessment, along with a numerical adjustment for Monitoring Status, Management and Satisfaction, to develop a risk rating for each grantee. (The template for the Healthy Homes Risk Analysis is presented as Appendix A.)

If a GTR considered that the numerical risk rating did not reflect an appropriate risk, the GTR was allowed the ability to adjust the numerical rating to reflect the risk considered to be appropriate, provided that a justification was documented. Grantees were assigned High, Medium, or Low Risk status according to the following scores:

- Low Risk -- <30
- Medium Risk -- 31-50
- High Risk -- >50

Results of the risk analysis for the 33 Healthy Homes Demonstration the Technical Studies grantee were distributed as follows:

- Low Risk – 18 grants
- Medium Risk – 12 grants
- High Risk—3 grants

Appendix A

Healthy Homes Risk Assessment

Name of Grant: _____

Period of Performance: _____

GTR: _____

Performance Factor, as applicable	Numerical Rating from 4 th Quarter Performance Assessment	Work Plan Benchmark, as applicable	Actual Cumulative Totals	Comments
Project Startup				
Method Development				
Capacity Building/Training				
Education/Outreach				
Assessments				
Interventions				
Project Evaluation				
Quality Assurance/Quality Control				
Financial Responsiveness (LOCCS Drawdowns)				
Other (e.g., Reporting)				
Average Rating				
Other Factors*				
1. Monitoring				
2. Management				
3. Satisfaction				
Total Adjustment for Other Factors				
Adjusted Rating (Average Rating –				

Points for Other Factors)				
Final Risk (100-Adjusted Rating)				

***Point designation for Other Factors is presented on page 2.**

Other Factors for Adjusting Risk Rating

Other Risk Factors	Point Adjustment
1. Monitoring	
Grantee has not been previously monitored	2
Grantee was monitored during last 2 years	1
Grantee was monitored last year	0
2. Management	
2A. Staff Capacity	
One or more key personnel vacancies has existed for more than 3 months OR grantee has previously failed to notify HUD of changes in key personnel	5
Key positions are currently filled but there has been significant turnover in the past year	1
Key positions are currently filled with experienced people	0
2B. Program Design	
1. Program includes sub-grantees, such as community-based organizations, and communication among partners has been problematic.	2
2. Communication between partners is effective	0
2C. On-Site Monitoring	
1. Grantee does not monitor the work of its sub-recipients and contractors	2
2. Grantee monitors on spot basis and responds to complaints	1
3. Grantee routinely monitors its sub-recipients and contractors	0
3. Satisfaction	
3A. Citizen Complaints	
1. HUD has received citizen complaints about implementation of the program.	2
2. There have been no valid citizen complaints in past year	0
3B. Responsiveness	
1. Grantee has failed to respond to letters of complaint within HUD prescribed timeframes	4
2. Grantee has responded to letters of complaint with timeframes	0
Total (Other Risk Factors)	