

Why GAO Did This Study

The joint explanatory statement for the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009, called for GAO to report on the resources of the HUD OIG in light of HUD's recently expanded roles and responsibilities. In response, GAO (1) compared the budgets, staffing levels, and monetary accomplishments of the HUD OIG to that of comparable OIGs during recent years, and (2) described the results of the HUD OIG's oversight of HUD's programs.

GAO compared the budget and staff resources of the HUD OIG with that of other Cabinet-level department OIGs for the 5-year period from fiscal year 2007 through 2011. GAO also summarized the monetary accomplishments of the HUD OIG and other OIGs as reported in their semiannual reports to the Congress, and compared the results with their total budgetary resources to obtain a return on each budget dollar received.

In addition, GAO summarized and described the HUD OIG's reported oversight coverage and monetary and nonmonetary accomplishments from audit and inspection reports and investigative cases that addressed HUD's largest program offices from fiscal year 2007 through 2011.

What GAO Recommends

GAO is not making any recommendations in this report. The HUD Inspector General concurred with the contents of the draft report.

INSPECTORS GENERAL

HUD Office of Inspector General Resources and Results

What GAO Found

During the 5-year period from fiscal year 2007 through 2011, the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Office of Inspector General (OIG) had budget and staffing resources that were consistent with other OIGs, and a monetary return for each budget dollar which exceeded the average return for Cabinet-level OIGs. During the 5-year period, the HUD OIG had total budgetary resources ranging from \$121 million to \$144 million, consistently ranking it fifth among all Cabinet-level OIGs. However, while the total budgetary resources for all Cabinet-level OIGs increased by about 45 percent over the 5-year period, the HUD OIG's total budgetary resources increased by 19 percent. In terms of staffing, the HUD OIG's full-time-equivalent staff (FTE) consistently ranked in the top four or five of the Cabinet-level OIGs. Also, the HUD OIG's FTEs increased by about 13 percent during the 5-year period, as compared to about a 17 percent average increase for all Cabinet-level OIGs. During the same 5-year period, the HUD OIG reported an estimated average dollar return of about \$13.62 for each HUD OIG total budgetary dollar received, while the 16 OIGs in the Cabinet-level departments reported an estimated average dollar return of about \$11.12 for each OIG total budget dollar received over the same period.

The HUD OIG reported the majority of its audit, inspection, and investigative coverage in the three largest HUD program offices during fiscal years 2007 through 2011. Specifically, of the OIG's reported 905 total audit and inspection reports completed over the 5-year period, 90 percent addressed programs in HUD's Offices of Public and Indian Housing, Housing, and Community Planning and Development, which comprised about 93 percent of HUD's fiscal year 2011 total budgetary resources. Also, of the 6149 investigative cases opened during this same period, almost 95 percent involved programs in these same offices. In addition, the OIG's reports and investigative cases focused on HUD's responsibilities related to recent increases in hurricane and disaster relief funds and HUD's implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act), administered through these HUD program offices. Also, of the almost \$6.94 billion in reported potential monetary savings from the OIG's audits and inspections, approximately \$2.46 billion (about 36 percent), were in the three largest HUD program offices. Of the remaining amount, approximately \$4.45 billion (about 64 percent), was mostly from a financial control deficiency not directly related to the three large program offices, and an additional \$28.4 million resulted from audits and inspections of hurricane relief and disaster assistance not reported as part of a specific HUD program. Of the OIG's reported \$1.39 billion in investigative recoveries during the 5-year period, approximately \$1.2 billion (about 86 percent), was related to mortgage fraud investigations in programs administered by HUD's Office of Housing. The OIG also reported an additional \$866 million in potential savings from other investigative efforts throughout HUD's programs during the 5-year period. In addition, the OIG reported nonmonetary accomplishments primarily from investigations in HUD's three largest program offices, which resulted in 4,759 convictions, pleas, and mistrials, and 5,761 administrative and civil actions during the 5-year period.