



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

AUDITOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH

ONE ASHBURTON PLACE, ROOM 1819
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

A. JOSEPH DeNUCCI
AUDITOR

TEL. (617) 727-6200

NO. 2006-0775-3A

**INDEPENDENT STATE AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON THE PHYSICAL CONDITION
OF STATE-AIDED PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS
AND RESOURCES ALLOCATED FOR THE
OPERATION AND UPKEEP
OF THE SHARON HOUSING AUTHORITY
JULY 1, 2003 TO JUNE 30, 2005**

**OFFICIAL AUDIT
REPORT
FEBRUARY 12, 2007**

TABLE OF CONTENTS/EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1

In accordance with Chapter 11, Section 12, of the Massachusetts General Laws, we have conducted a statewide comprehensive audit of the physical conditions and the resources available to provide for the operation and upkeep of the state-aided public housing authorities of the Commonwealth. To accomplish our audit, we performed work at the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and obtained data from surveys and site visits to a selected representative cross-section of 66 Local Housing Authorities (LHAs) throughout the state. The Sharon Housing Authority was one of the LHAs selected to be reviewed for the period July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005. A complete list of the LHAs visited and surveyed is provided in our statewide report No. 2005-5119-3A. Our on-site visits were conducted to follow up on survey data we obtained in order to: observe and evaluate the physical condition of the state-regulated LHAs, review policies and procedures over unit site inspections, determine whether LHA-managed properties were maintained in accordance with public health and safety standards, and review the state modernization funds awarded to determine whether such funds have been received and expended for their intended purpose. In addition, we reviewed the adequacy of the level of funding provided to each LHA for annual operating costs to maintain the exterior and interior of the buildings and housing units, as well as capital renovation infrastructure costs to maximize the public housing stock across the state, and determined whether land already owned by the LHAs could be utilized to build additional affordable housing units. We also determined the number of vacant units, vacancy turnaround time, and whether any units have been taken off line and are no longer available for occupancy by qualifying families or individuals in need of housing.

AUDIT RESULTS

5

1. RESULTS OF INSPECTIONS – NONCOMPLIANCE WITH STATE SANITARY CODE

5

DHCD's Property Maintenance Guide, Chapter 3(F), requires that inspections of housing units be conducted annually and upon each vacancy to ensure that every dwelling unit conforms to minimum standards for safe, decent, and sanitary housing as set forth in Chapter II of the State Sanitary Code. On November 3 and 4, 2005, we inspected 10 of the 102 state-aided housing units managed by the Authority and noted 65 instances of noncompliance with Chapter II of the State Sanitary Code, including broken glass windows, peeling paint on walls and ceilings, mold, mildew, and other health and safety hazards. In response to our audit, the Authority cited a lack of available funds to address the problems noted.

2. MODERNIZATION INITIATIVES NOT FUNDED

7

In response to our questionnaires, the Authority indicated that there is a need for modernizing its managed properties. Specifically, the Authority provided a list of capital modernization projects for which funding has been formally requested from DHCD, of which some remain unfunded. Deferring or denying the Authority's modernization needs may result in further deteriorating conditions that could render the units and

buildings uninhabitable. Moreover, if the Authority does not receive funding to correct these conditions (which have been reported to DHCD), additional emergency situations may occur, and the Authority's ability to provide safe, decent, and sanitary housing for its elderly and family tenants could be seriously compromised. In response to our report, the Authority cited sporadic and limited funding from DHCD as the main reason for the Authority's modernization needs not being addressed.

3. STATUS OF OPERATING SUBSIDIES EARNED, RECEIVED, AND OUTSTANDING **9**

The Contract for Financial Assistance between the Authority and DHCD requires DHCD to subsidize the Authority to meet its expenses. Our review of the Authority's operating subsidy accounts indicated that \$28,861 was due the Authority, contrary to DHCD's records, which indicated that \$25,991 was due the Authority. The Authority and DHCD should determine the correct amount of operating subsidy owed and properly reflect the balance in its books of account.

4. OFFICIAL WRITTEN PROPERTY MAINTENANCE PLAN NOT ESTABLISHED **10**

During our audit, we found that the Authority did not incorporate DHCD's Property Maintenance Guide into its policies and procedures. Specifically, we noted that the Authority did not have an official preventive maintenance plan to inspect, maintain, repair, and upgrade its existing housing units. Such a plan would establish procedures to ensure that Authority-managed properties are in decent, safe, and sanitary condition, as defined by Chapter II of the State Sanitary Code. In response to our audit, the Authority provided us with a maintenance plan; however, the plan did not provide a date of implementation and lacked any indication of management review and approval.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION **12**

APPENDIX I **13**

State Sanitary Code Noncompliance Noted **13**

APPENDIX II **13**

Photographs of Conditions Found **17**

INTRODUCTION

Background

In accordance with Chapter 11, Section 12, of the Massachusetts General Laws, we have conducted a statewide comprehensive audit of the physical conditions and the resources available to provide for the operation and upkeep of the state-aided public housing authorities of the Commonwealth. To accomplish our audit, we performed work at the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and obtained data from surveys and site visits to a selected representative cross-section of 66 Local Housing Authorities (LHAs) throughout the state. The Sharon Housing Authority was one of the LHAs selected to be reviewed for the period July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2005. A complete list of the LHAs visited and surveyed is provided in our statewide report No. 2005-5119-3A.

Our on-site visits were conducted to follow up on survey data we obtained in order to: observe and evaluate the physical condition of the state-regulated LHAs, review policies and procedures over unit site inspections, determine whether LHA-managed properties were maintained in accordance with public health and safety standards, and review the state modernization funds awarded to determine whether such funds have been received and expended for the intended purpose. In addition, we reviewed the adequacy of the level of funding provided to each LHA for annual operating costs to maintain the exterior and interior of the buildings and housing units, as well as the capital renovation infrastructure costs to maximize the public housing stock across the state, and determined whether land already owned by the LHAs could be utilized to build additional affordable housing units. We also determined the number of vacant units, vacancy turnaround time, and whether any units have been taken off-line and are no longer available for occupancy by qualifying families or individuals in need of housing.

Audit Scope, Objectives, and Methodology

The scope of our audit included an evaluation of management controls over dwelling unit inspections, modernization funds, and maintenance plans. Our review of management controls included those of both the LHAs and DHCD. Our audit scope included an evaluation of the physical condition of the properties managed; the effect, if any, that a lack of reserves, operating and modernization funds, and maintenance and repair plans has on the physical condition of the LHAs'

state-aided housing units/projects; and the resulting effect on the LHAs' waiting lists, operating subsidies, and vacant units.

Our audit was conducted in accordance with applicable generally accepted government auditing standards for performance audits and, accordingly, included such audits tests and procedures as we considered necessary.

Our primary objective was to determine whether housing units were maintained in proper condition and in accordance with public health and safety standards (e.g., the State Sanitary Code, state and local building codes, fire codes, Board of Health regulations) and whether adequate controls were in place and in effect over site-inspection procedures and records. Our objective was to determine whether the inspections conducted were complete, accurate, up-to-date, and in compliance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations. Further, we sought to determine whether management and DHCD were conducting follow-up actions based on the results of site inspections.

Second, we sought to determine whether individual LHAs were owed prior-year operating subsidies from DHCD and whether the untimely receipt of operating subsidies from DHCD may have resulted in housing units not being maintained in proper condition.

Third, in instances where the physical interior/exterior of LHA-managed properties were found to be in a state of disrepair or deteriorating condition, we sought to determine whether an insufficient allocation of operating or modernization funds from DHCD contributed to the present conditions noted, and the resulting effect, if any, on the LHA's waiting lists and vacant unit reoccupancy.

To conduct our audit, we first reviewed DHCD's policies and procedures to modernize state-aided LHAs, DHCD subsidy formulas, DHCD inspection standards and guidelines, and LHA responsibilities regarding vacant units.

Second, we sent questionnaires to each LHA in the Commonwealth requesting information on the:

- *Physical condition of its managed units/projects*
- *State program units in management*
- *Off-line units*
- *Waiting lists of applicants*

- *Listing of modernization projects that have been formally requested from DHCD within the last five years, for which funding was denied*
- *Amount of funds disbursed, if any, to house tenants in hotels/motels*
- *Availability of land to build affordable units*
- *Written plans in place to maintain, repair, and upgrade its existing units*
- *Frequency of conducting inspections of its units/projects*
- *Balances, if any, of subsidies owed to the LHA by DHCD*
- *Condition Assessment Reports (CARs) submitted to DHCD*
- *LHA concerns, if any, pertaining to DHCD's modernization process in place*

The information provided by the LHAs was reviewed and evaluated to assist in the selection of LHAs to be visited as part of our statewide review.

Third, we reviewed the report entitled “Protecting the Commonwealth’s Investment – Securing the Future of State-Aided Public Housing.” The report, funded through the Harvard Housing Innovations Program by the Office of Government, Community and Public Affairs, in partnership with the Citizens Housing and Planning Association, assessed the Commonwealth’s portfolio of public housing, documented the state inventory capital needs, proposed strategies to aid in its preservation, and made recommendations regarding the level of funding and the administrative and statutory changes necessary to preserve state public housing.

Fourth, we attended the Joint Legislative Committee on Housing’s public hearings on March 7, 2005 and February 27, 2006 on the “State of State Public Housing;” interviewed officials from the LHAs, the Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and DHCD; and reviewed various local media coverage regarding the condition of certain local public housing stock.

To determine whether state-aided programs were maintained in proper condition and safety standards, we (a) observed the physical condition of housing units/projects by conducting inspections of selected units/projects to ensure that the units and buildings met the necessary

minimum standards set forth in the State Sanitary Code, (b) obtained and reviewed the LHAs' policies and procedures relative to unit site inspections, and (c) made inquiries with the local Boards of Health to determine whether any citations had been issued, and if so, the cited LHA's plans to address any reported deficiencies.

To determine whether the modernization funds received by the LHAs were being expended for the intended purposes and in compliance with laws, rules, and regulations, we obtained and reviewed the Quarterly Consolidated Capital Improvement Cost Reports, Contracts for Financial Assistance, and budget and construction contracts. In addition, we conducted inspections of the modernization work performed at each LHA to determine compliance with its work plan.

To determine whether LHAs were receiving operating subsidies in a timely manner, we analyzed each LHA's subsidy accounts for operating subsidies earned and received and the period of time that the payments covered. In addition, we made inquiries with the LHA's Executive Director/fee accountant as necessary. We compared the subsidy balance due the LHA per DHCD records to the subsidy data recorded by the LHA.

To assess controls over waiting lists, we determined the number of applicants on the waiting list for each state program and reviewed the waiting list for compliance with DHCD regulations.

To assess whether each LHA was adhering to DHCD procedures for preparing and filling vacant units in a timely manner, we performed selected tests to determine whether the LHA had uninhabitable units, the length of time the units were in this state of disrepair, and the actions taken by the LHA to renovate the units.

AUDIT RESULTS

1. RESULTS OF INSPECTIONS – NONCOMPLIANCE WITH STATE SANITARY CODE

The Department of Housing and Community Development's (DHCD) Property Maintenance Guide, Chapter 3(F), requires that inspections of dwelling units be conducted annually and upon each vacancy to ensure that every dwelling unit conforms to minimum standards for safe, decent, and sanitary housing as set forth in Chapter II of the State Sanitary Code. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, we reviewed inspection reports for 10 of the 102 state-aided housing units at the Sharon Housing Authority. On November 3 and November 4, 2005, we conducted inspections of these 10 units consisting of the following Authority-managed properties: five units in the 667-1 development, two units in the 667-2 development, and three units in the 705-1 development. The Authority's Executive Director recommended we visit and inspect these specific units due to identified problems that need to be addressed with modernization money.

For the 667-1 development, which consists of 10 buildings, our inspections found the roofs are in poor condition with many missing shingles, including the office/community building. At this development, there are six handicapped units where the second egress is not handicapped accessible. Specifically, we noted a concrete step instead of a ramp outside of the back exit/entrance that does not allow wheelchair access. Additionally, our inspections of the various buildings in the 667-1 development identified that the exterior doors leading into the common area of the buildings did not have any locked security. This is a severe safety issue that the Authority had previously requested money from DHCD to rectify, yet was denied. Lastly, our inspections of the units found mildew and mold damage in the bathrooms, some flooring with cracked and missing tiles, and chipping and peeling ceilings.

For the 667-2 development, which consists of one two-story building, our inspections found rippled and severely stained wall-to-wall carpeting in both the living rooms and the bedrooms, cracks in the walls, mold and mildew on the bathroom ceilings, and chipped and permanently stained counter tops in the kitchen. However, the most serious problem noted in this building was that there was only one egress to the living/kitchen area, which could result in second-floor tenants becoming trapped should a fire occur in the common area. This development is the newer of the two elderly developments, and currently the Authority is trying to upgrade the fire alarm system to include a sprinkler system.

The 705-1 development is a three-story dwelling consisting of eight units. Our inspections of three of the units noted ceilings peeling with mildew and water damage, cracked and raised tile flooring, ripped wall-to-wall carpeting in the living area, and a unit entry door that is warped and difficult to close and lock. In a bedroom in one of the units, the windowsill is not completely affixed to the building, and in the other bedroom the windowsill is broken. Additionally, within the common area, a handrail is missing; the walls have holes; the flooring tile is broken, cracked, and missing; and the windows do not have screens.

In summary, our inspections noted 65 instances of noncompliance with Chapter II of the State Sanitary Code, including broken windows; peeling paint; mold, mildew, and water damage to walls and ceilings; missing tiles; rippled wall-to-wall carpeting; floor damage; deteriorated and crumbling concrete walls; no second egress; and missing handrails on some of the family units. (Appendix I of our report summarizes the specific State Sanitary Code noted, and Appendix II includes photographs documenting the conditions found).

The photographs presented in Appendix II illustrate the pressing need to address the conditions noted, since postponing the necessary improvements would require greater costs at a future date, and may result in the properties not conforming to minimum standards for safe, decent, and sanitary housing.

Recommendation

The Authority should follow up with and continue to advocate and apply for funding from DHCD to correct the deficiencies noted during our inspections of the interior (dwelling units) and exterior (buildings) of the Authority, as well as other issues that need to be addressed. DHCD should obtain and provide sufficient funds to the Authority to ensure safe, decent, and sanitary housing for its tenants.

Auditee's Response

In response to this issue, the Authority stated, in part:

Several of the problems that were noted, i.e. 2nd egresses, security doors, number of outlets, rear exits not being handicapped accessible and bathrooms without windows are structural issues. At this time, the Authority is in the process of upgrading fire safety systems at the 667-2 development. The scope of work will include replacing bedroom windows, several hallway doors, the ventilation system and adding sprinklers to apartments.

Also, some of the citations listed such as mold and mildew might in fact be tenant related issues and fall under housekeeping. Certainly some items listed are in need of repair or replacement, but the Authority does not have the funds to rectify these problems.

The Authority has had to make some hard choices in spending the dollars we do have. Do we replace broken hot water heaters or kitchen countertops? Do we replace leaky faucets and fix clogged toilets or replace windows with condensation?

How do we handle handicapped accessible apartments that have parquet floors that crumble underneath the weight of the wheelchair? Where will we get the funds to install the proper flooring? Should the Authority repair benign cracks in the wall or replace broken stoves or refrigerators? These are the types of hard choices the Authority has to face on a daily basis

I would like to comment on several of the photographs. The front section of the roof shown in the first photo has been replaced. The shed in the second photo collapsed during a snowstorm. This structure is behind the community building and not accessible. The Authority does want to tear it down and remove it, but cannot afford to do so at this time. The photos 3, 5 and 6 are common areas located at our 705-1 family development. The fence around the dumpster and the side doors leading into the building have not been repaired because we lack the funding.

2. MODERNIZATION INITIATIVES NOT FUNDED

In response to our questionnaires, the Authority informed us that there is a need for modernizing its managed properties. Specifically, since 1994, the Authority has formally requested that DHCD finance 10 modernization projects, only three of which were funded, as shown below.

<u>Priority Listing</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Development</u>	<u>Funded</u>	<u>Unfunded</u>
1994	Electrical/Fire Safety Malfunctioning Fire Alarm System	667-1		10/26/94

	Personal Safety/Security	667-1		10/26/94
	Doorways Not Handicapped Accessible			
	Dangerous Site Condition	667-1		10/26/94
	Sidewalk and Roadway – Hazardous Conditions			
	Building Envelope	667-1		10/26/94
	Exterior Painting			
	Personal Safety/Security	667-1		10/26/94
	Lack of Security Door Entry System			
1999	Electrical/Fire Safety – Upgrade Fire Alarm System	667-1	Funded	
	Building/Site Security – Security System for Front Entrance Doors	667-1	Funded	
	Deteriorated Paving/Sidewalks	667-1	Funded	
2001	Building/Site Security – Intercoms – Installation	667-1		Denied
	Building Envelope – Roofing – Re-roofing	667-1		Denied

Deferring or denying needed modernization funding may result in further deteriorating conditions that could render the units and buildings uninhabitable. If the Authority does not receive funding to correct these conditions (which have been reported to DHCD), additional emergency situations may occur, and the Authority’s ability to provide safe, decent, and sanitary housing for its elderly and family tenants could be seriously compromised. Lastly, deferring the modernization needs of the Authority into future years will cost the Commonwealth’s taxpayers additional money due to further deterioration, inflation, higher wages, and other related costs.

In June 2000, Harvard University awarded a grant to a partnership of the Boston and Cambridge Housing Authorities to undertake a study of state-aided family and elderly/disabled housing. The purpose of the study was to document the state’s inventory of capital needs and to make recommendations regarding the level of funding and the administrative and statutory changes necessary to give Massachusetts local housing authorities the tools to preserve and improve this important resource. The report, “Protecting the Commonwealth’s Investment – Securing the Future of State-Aided Public Housing,” dated April 4, 2001, stated, “Preservation of existing housing is the fiscally prudent course of action at a time when Massachusetts faces an increased

demand for affordable housing. While preservation will require additional funding, loss and replacement of the units would be much more expensive in both fiscal and human terms.”

Recommendation

The Authority should continue to appeal to DHCD for the necessary modernization funds to address the conditions identified above.

Auditee's Response

In response to this issue, the Authority stated, in part:

The Authority has many capital improvements needs, and we have requested help from the Department of Housing and Community Development using the Condition Assessment Reports (CAR). Even though we have applied for funding, the opportunity to do [so] has been sporadic and limited. The Authority has also applied for Community Preservation Funds through the town of Sharon. The grant submissions are asking for replacement of 32 year old roofs at the 667-1 development, as well as the common area floors and the stairways at the 705-1 development.

3. STATUS OF OPERATING SUBSIDIES EARNED, RECEIVED, AND OUTSTANDING

The Contract for Financial Assistance between the Authority and DHCD requires DHCD to subsidize the Authority to meet its expenses. During our audit, we requested and received from DHCD a statement of operating subsidy balances due and outstanding for each LHA of the Commonwealth as of June 30, 2005. During our field visits to the LHAs, we reviewed the subsidy records to determine whether the amounts were in agreement with balances provided by DHCD.

Our review of the Authority's operating subsidy accounts indicated that \$28,861 was due the Authority, contrary to DHCD's records, which indicated that \$25,991 was due the Authority as of June 30, 2005. During our audit fieldwork, we noted that the Authority received \$27,000 from DHCD on September 14, 2005. Because of the discrepancy between the balance information provided by the Authority and DHCD, it is not apparent what the correct subsidy balance should be.

Recommendation

The Authority should communicate with DHCD to determine whether the correct amount of operating subsidy due the Authority is recorded in its financial statements. Second, DHCD

should work with each LHA to resolve any variances by obtaining quarterly financial statements from each LHA so that it can monitor, be aware of, and reconcile operating subsidies due to and from each LHA. Third, in order for the Authority to receive the subsidies it is entitled to on a timely and accurate basis, it is necessary that all variances are reconciled and that DHCD is providing the requisite adequate contribution.

Auditee's Response

The Authority chose not to respond to this issue.

4. OFFICIAL WRITTEN PROPERTY MAINTENANCE PLAN NOT ESTABLISHED

During our audit, we found that the Authority did not incorporate the DHCD's Property Maintenance Guide into its own policies and procedures. Specifically, we noted that the Authority did not have an official preventive maintenance plan to inspect, maintain, repair, and upgrade its existing housing units.

DHCD's Property Maintenance Guide states, in part:

The goal of good property maintenance at a public housing authority is to serve the residents by assuring that the homes in which they live are decent, safe and sanitary . . . every housing authority must have a preventive plan which deals with all the elements of its physical property and is strictly followed . . . The basic foundation for your (LHA) maintenance program is your inspection effort . . . the basic goals of an inspection program are to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of your maintenance effort. This will be achieved when you (LHA) have a thorough program of inspections when you observe all parts of the (LHA's) physical property, document the results of the inspections thoroughly, and convert the findings into work orders so that the work effort can be scheduled and organized. Inspections are the systematic observation of conditions and provide the foundation for capital improvements and long range planning, as well as a record of present maintenance needs.

A preventive maintenance program would also:

- Assist in capital improvement planning by assessing the current and future modernization needs of the Authority,
- Enable the Authority to establish procedures to assist in its day-to-day operating activities to correct minor maintenance problems, and
- Schedule major repairs with the assistance of DHCD.

We recognize that without adequate funds and resources, a plan is difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Nevertheless, without an official property maintenance program in place, the

Authority cannot ensure that its managed properties are in decent, safe, and sanitary condition in accordance with the State Sanitary Code.

Recommendation

The Authority should comply with the DHCD's Property Maintenance Guidelines by establishing an official written maintenance preventive plan, and DHCD should obtain and provide the necessary funds and resources to ensure that this plan is enacted.

Auditee's Response

In response to our audit, the Authority indicated that it follows the criteria incorporated in DHCD's Property Maintenance Guide. A copy of the Authority's maintenance policies and procedures was included with the Authority's response.

Auditor's Reply

Although the Authority provided us with a copy of its preventive policies and procedures subsequent to the completion of our audit fieldwork, the document did not indicate when the maintenance plan took effect and lacked any indication of management (i.e., Board of Directors and Executive Director) review and approval. We will review any and all corrective actions taken by the Authority during our next scheduled audit.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

1. Sharon Housing Authority-Managed State Properties

The Authority's state-aided housing developments, the number of units, and the year each development was built, is as follows:

<u>Development</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>	<u>Year Built</u>
667-1	64	1974
667-2	24	1984
689	8	1992
705-1	<u>6</u>	1984
Total	<u>102</u>	

2. Availability of Land to Build Affordable Housing Units

The Authority does not have any land available to build affordable housing; however, 11 acres of town-owned land abuts Authority property. Since the Authority has a waiting list of applicants, it should contact the town and DHCD to consider constructing additional housing.

APPENDIX I

State Sanitary Code Noncompliance Noted

Hixson Farm Road 667-1 Development

<u>Location</u>	<u>Noncompliance</u>	<u>Regulation</u>
15 B Hixson Farm Road	Mildew and water damage on bathroom ceiling	105 CMR 410.500
	Unsecured exterior door	105 CMR 410.480
	Condensation between exterior window panes in living/dining room	105 CMR 410.500
23 A Hixson Farm Road	Unsecured exterior door	105 CMR 410.480
	Floor defects, trip hazard in living /dining room	105 CMR 410.504
	Ceiling paint chipping and cracking	105 CMR 410.500
	Water damage on bathroom ceiling	105 CMR 410.500
	Rear door needs paint repair	105 CMR 410.500
	Roof shingles need full repair	105 CMR 410.500
	Hallway stairwell bottom defective	105 CMR 410.500
27 D Hixson Farm Road	Unsecured exterior door	105 CMR 410.480
	Living room/dining room and bedroom ceiling paint chipping and cracking	105 CMR 410.500
31 B Hixson Farm Road	Unsecured exterior door	105 CMR 410.480
	Kitchen floor cracked	105 CMR 410.500
	Floor damage, trip hazard in kitchen	105 CMR 410.504
	One electrical outlet in bathroom	105 CMR 410.252
	Bathroom ceiling mildew and water damage	105 CMR 410.500

33 B Hixson Farm Road Handicapped Unit	Permanent stained floor	105 CMR 410.500
	Unsecured exterior door	105 CMR 410.480
	Floor damage in all rooms	105 CMR 410.500
	Missing tiles causing trip hazard in all rooms	105 CMR 410.504
	One electrical outlet in bathroom	105 CMR 410.252
	Outlet fixture not handicapped accessible	105 CMR 410.251
	Kitchen and bathroom mildew and water damage	105 CMR 410.500
	Kitchen counter top damage	105 CMR 410.500
	Bathroom tub dented and chipped	105 CMR 410.150
	Rear bedroom exit not handicapped accessible	105 CMR 410.450
	Roof shingles need full repair	105 CMR 410.500
Outside Area	Decrepit shed	105 CMR 410.500

Hixson Farm Road
667-2 Development

<u>Location</u>	<u>Noncompliance</u>	<u>Regulation</u>
#13 at 26 Hixson Farm Road	Carpet flooring needs repair	105 CMR 410.500
	Living room and bedroom carpet a trip hazard	105 CMR 410.504
	Living room walls cracked	105 CMR 410.500
	Bedroom walls cracked	105 CMR 410.500
	One electrical outlet	105 CMR 410.500
	Mildewed ceilings, no window in bathroom	105 CMR 410.500
	Kitchen counter has chips/cracks under sink cabinet	105 CMR 410.100
	No second egress	105 CMR 410.450
	Exterior siding damage	105 CMR 410.500

<u>Location</u>	<u>Noncompliance</u>	<u>Regulation</u>
#19 at 26 Hixson Farms Road	Mildew in bathroom	105 CMR 410.500
	Kitchen counters stained and worn	105 CMR 410.500
	No second egress	105 CMR 410.450

21 South Pleasant Street
705-1 Development

<u>Location</u>	<u>Noncompliance</u>	<u>Regulation</u>
#2 at 21 South Pleasant Street Basement Unit	Living room ceiling needs replastering	105 CMR 410.500
	Kitchen ceiling needs replastering	105 CMR 410.500
	Bathroom ceiling needs replastering due to water damage and mildew	105 CMR 410.500
#4 at 21 South Pleasant Street 1 st floor	Entry door coming apart and warped	105 CMR 410.480
	Kitchen floor cracked/trip hazard	105 CMR 410.500
	Hallway floor tiles missing	105 CMR 410.500
	Hallway area walls cracked	105 CMR 410.500
	No second egress	105 CMR 410.450
	Bathroom ceiling needs replastering from water damage	105 CMR 410.500
	Bathroom sink cracked	105 CMR 410.150
#6 at 21 South Pleasant Street 2 nd Floor	Living room/dining room carpet ripped, tile raised and missing from kitchen floor	105 CMR 410.504

	Hallway area missing tile	105 CMR 410.504
	Kitchen wall defective above stove	105 CMR 410.500
	Electrical outlet not covered in bedroom #2	105 CMR 410.250
	Bedroom # 1 window broken	105 CMR 410.480
	Bedroom #2 gap between frame and building structure	105 CMR 410.500
	Bathroom ceiling needs replastering	105 CMR 410.500
	Hallway needs replastering, water damage near smoke detector	105 CMR 410.500
21 South Pleasant Street Exterior and Common Area	Outside wall missing cement	105 CMR 410.500
	Stockade fence broken	105 CMR 410.500
	No screens on common porch windows	105 CMR 410.551
	Handrail missing and hardware juts out of wall	105 CMR 410.500
	Outside door rusted	105 CMR 410.500
	Exterior door aged with wear and tear	105 CMR 410.500

APPENDIX II

Photographs of Conditions Found

667-1 Development

Hixson Farm Road Community Building - Roof Shingles Need Repair



667-1 Development, Hixson Farm Road – Decrepit Shed



705-1 Development, #21 South Pleasant Street – Broken Fence



705-1 Development, #21 South Pleasant Street, Apt. 6 – Water Damage Near Smoke Detector



705-1 Development – Outside Door Rusted



705-1 Development, #21 South Pleasant Street – Exterior Door Aged with Wear and Tear

