

SPECIAL REVIEW

**NEUSE RIVER
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

FEBRUARY 1994

SPECIAL REVIEW

**NEUSE RIVER
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

APRIL 1994

DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIAL REVIEW

In accordance with G.S. § 147-64.5 and G.S. § 147-64.6(c)(14), copies of this report have been distributed to the public officials listed below. Additional copies are provided to other legislators, state officials, the press, and the general public upon request.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Honorable James B. Hunt, Jr.	Governor of North Carolina
The Honorable Dennis A. Wicker	Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina
The Honorable Harlan E. Boyles	State Treasurer
The Honorable Michael F. Easley	Attorney General
Mr. J. Richard Futrell	State Budget Director
Mr. Edward Renfrow	State Controller
Mr. S. Davis Phillips	Secretary, Department of Commerce
Mr. James J. Coman	Director, State Bureau of Investigation

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Appointees of the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations

Senator Marc Basnight, Co-Chairman	Representative Daniel T. Blue, Jr., Co-Chairman
Senator J. Richard Conder	Representative Fred Bowman
Senator George B. Daniel	Representative C. Robert Brawley
Senator C. R. Edwards	Representative Marie W. Colton
Senator R. L. Martin	Representative David H. Diamont
Senator Beverly Perdue	Representative Ruth M. Easterling
Senator Aaron W. Plyler	Representative Milton F. Fitch, Jr.
Senator Jim Richardson	Representative Joe Hackney
Senator Robert G. Shaw	Representative George M. Holmes
Senator J. K. Sherron, Jr.	Representative H. M. Michaux, Jr.
Senator Ed Warren	Representative Martin L. Nesbitt

Other Legislative Officials

Representative David G. Balmer	Minority Leader of the N.C. House of Representatives
Mr. Thomas L. Covington	Director, Fiscal Research Division

Other Parties

Mr. W. David McFadyen, Jr.	District Attorney for Prosecutorial District Three B
Mr. Roy Fogle	Executive Director of the Neuse River Council of Governments
Mr. Charles C. Master	Inspector General, U.S. Department of Labor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Letter of Transmittal	1
Overview	2
Introduction	3
Findings and Recommendations	4
Statement of Financial Impact	20
Exhibit A - Reconstructed Letter	21
Exhibit B - Response from the Executive Director of the Neuse River Council of Governments	22

April 12, 1994

The Honorable James B. Hunt, Jr., Governor
The Honorable Michael F. Easley, Attorney General
Mr. W. David McFadyen, District Attorney
Prosecutorial District Three B
Secretary S. Davis Phillips
North Carolina Department of Commerce
Mr. Roy Fogle, Executive Director of the
Neuse River Council of Governments
Mr. Charles C. Master, Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services
Members of the General Assembly of North Carolina

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to General Statute 147-64.6(c)(16), we have completed our special review into allegations concerning the Neuse River Council of Governments. The results of our review, along with recommendations for corrective actions are contained in this report.

General Statute 147-64.6(c)(12) requires the State Auditor to provide the Governor, the Attorney General, and other appropriate officials with written notice of apparent instances of violations of penal statutes or apparent instances of malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance by an officer or employee. In accordance with that mandate, and our standard operating practice, we are providing copies of this special review to the Governor, the District Attorney for Prosecutorial District Three B, the Attorney General, the Director of SBI, and other appropriate officials.

Ralph Campbell, Jr.
State Auditor

cc: Mr. Charles C. Master, Office of Inspector General
Department of Health and Human Services

OVERVIEW

The Neuse River Council of Governments is a multi-county planning region for the following nine counties: Carteret, Craven, Duplin, Greene, Jones, Lenoir, Onslow, Pamlico and Wayne. The Council provides the organizational mechanism for local government members to pool scarce financial resources to provide assistance such as: economic, community and business development, environmental problems, water resources, solid waste disposal, housing, highways and transportation, emergency medical services, and planning for programs for older adults and job training for economically disadvantaged adults and youth.

The Council has thirty-five employees including an Executive Director who reports to a Board of Directors. The Council's operating expenditures for fiscal year 1992-93 were \$6,685,486. Revenues consisting of state, federal, and local monies for fiscal year 1992-93 were \$6,729,996.

INTRODUCTION

We were requested by the District Attorney of Prosecutorial District Three B to review the Neuse River Council of Governments' (COG) Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) records to determine if there were any financial improprieties.

The following procedures were used to conduct our special review:

1. Interviews with employees of the COG.
2. Interviews with individuals external to the COG.
3. Examination of time sheets and personnel records.
4. Examination of records pertaining to the JTPA program.
5. Examination of JTPA participant files.
6. Examination of records pertaining to the Neuse River Community Development Corporation, Inc.

This report presents the results of a special review conducted pursuant to G. S. 147-64.6(c)(16) rather than an annual financial audit. The COG contracts annually with a private accounting firm to perform a financial audit.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Neuse River Council of Governments Has Inconsistently Represented Its Affiliation with the Neuse River Community Development Corporation, Inc.

According to the Executive Director (Executive Director) of the Neuse River Council of Governments (COG), he, the former Service Delivery Director for the COG, elected officials and community leaders began discussing a low income housing program in the late 1980's. In order to take advantage of funds that were available to non-profits but were not available to the COG, the Neuse River Community Development Corporation, Inc. (NRCDC) was formed in June 1991.

The NRCDC was incorporated as a non-profit entity in order to assist the residents of Carteret, Craven, Duplin, Greene, Jones, Lenoir, Onslow, Pamlico, and Wayne Counties by raising their economic, educational, and social levels. NRCDC planned an affordable housing project which would be located in New Bern, North Carolina. The proposed development, named Lawson Creek Estates, is to consist of thirty single-family detached homes that will be built on a land that will be donated by the City of New Bern. In 1992, the estimated price level for the homes ranged from \$26,240 to \$38,376 each (these estimates have increased since then due to increased lumber prices). The plan is designed to provide low income individuals with the opportunity to purchase a home. The prospective home buyers may apply for first mortgages at a 6% rate and a 30 year amortization with a balloon mortgage and/or second mortgage after 20 years. The mortgage would be subsidized by the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta.

According to the Federal Home Loan Bank Application For Affordable Housing Program that was prepared by COG employees and a consultant paid by the COG, the project would be funded by the following sources:

Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta	\$662,600	Loan Funds, First Mortgages
City of New Bern	100,000	Land
Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc.	25,000	Grant
Community Development Block Grant	142,000	Grant
Eastern N.C. Poverty Committee	100,000	Loan Funds, Down Payments

The Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc. (Reynolds Foundation) granted the NRCDC \$25,000 on June 3, 1992 "...for operating support for the construction of affordable housing for low-income families."

On July 16, 1992, the former Service Delivery Area Director (SDA Director) for the COG, the person spearheading the NRCDC, wrote a memo to the Finance Director for the COG, requesting that she prepare a revised budget for the Reynolds' funds. On August 27, 1992, the Finance Director wrote the Reynolds Foundation requesting approval to change the use of the funds, since construction had not started at this time. On September 1, 1992, the Reynolds Foundation responded to her request by stating that the requested approval to revise the use of the \$25,000 must be approved by the Reynolds Foundation Board, since the expenses listed in her letter were not included in the original grant proposal.

On September 4, 1992, the former SDA Director wrote a memo to the Executive Director, stating that he wanted to file an official complaint against the Finance

Director because she had jeopardized the Reynolds Foundation grant by writing to them to get approval to revise the budget without his authorization. In addition, he stated in the letter:

This event could also jeopardize my public relations assignment to intercede on behalf of the COG and NRDA with minority elected officials on other areas of concern.

If Z. Smith Reynolds decides not to fund the CDC Housing initiative, I frankly would be hard pressed to explain it. Jasper Ormond is very excited about the East Greene School Housing Project and is also a Board Member of the NRCDC.

On September 8, 1992, the Finance Director wrote a letter to the Executive Director addressing the complaints made against her by the former SDA Director. In the letter she stated that her intent in writing the Reynolds Foundation was to get approval for the expenditure of the funds since construction had been delayed. As Finance Director for the COG, she would be generating the checks and would be held responsible for any questioned or disallowed costs. In addition, she stated that "Unless specifically authorized by you (the Executive Director), I will no longer do financial work on any matters for (the former SDA Director). My work will be for NRCOG/NRDA grants only..."

According to the Finance Director, she was never instructed by the Executive Director to do any financial work for the NRCDC after her September 8, 1992 letter to him.

On November 17, 1992, the President of the NRCDC Board, the Treasurer of the NRCDC Board, and the former SDA Director, signed a BB&T signature card and

opened a checking account in the NRCDC name. On November 18, 1992, a \$25,000 check from the Reynolds Foundation was deposited into the account. According to the Executive Director, he never told the Finance Director that the former SDA Director would handle the check. He said he was amazed when he found out that the former SDA Director had set-up a separate checking account for the NRCDC and had not deposited the Reynolds Foundation check in the COG's accounts.

The NRCDC was organized as a separate entity with a separate governing board; however, the NRCDC operations were performed by COG employees at COG facilities. According to the President of the NRCDC Board, all operating activities were performed by the former SDA Director and his staff, except for the occasional Board meetings where he presided over the meeting. He said that he presided over the meetings, but the agenda had been prepared by the former SDA Director or someone on the COG staff. The President said that he signed documents that were prepared and presented to him by the former SDA Director.

In the Federal Home Loan Bank Application for Affordable Housing Program that was prepared by COG employees, it stated that:

For more than twenty years, the primary role of the Neuse River Council of Governments d/b/a Neuse River Community Development Corporation has been to bring local governments together and help them jointly plan and achieve economic and community development goals. The Council often serves as the implementing arm of federal and state programs while at the same time reflecting local government needs and priorities. The newly formed Neuse River Community Development Corporation will be one of the seven affiliate organizations of the Neuse River Council of Governments.

In letters that were written to the Reynolds Foundation by the law firm and the CPA firm representing the NRCDC, both stated that the NRCDC was a separate entity

from the COG and that NRCDC may contract with the COG for specific services. We were given a copy of a contract that described these services, but it was unsigned. We never received a signed copy. According to the Executive Director, he had never seen a signed copy.

While legally the two organizations may be independent, in reality, the NRCDC was operated by COG employees during their regular working hours at the COG facilities. In addition, the President of the NRCDC Board is the Executive Director of the Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc. which is a contractor for the COG's JTPA program, which was supervised by the former SDA Director (See findings 2, 3, and 4).

According to the November 15, 1993 NRCDC Board Minutes, the COG has relinquished its position as the lead agency on the Lawson Creek Housing project. The City of New Bern agreed to take over the lead role.

During our review, we determined that COG employees worked on the Affordable Housing Project during their regular working hours. According to one Job Developer, she spent approximately 75% of her time working on the Project between October 1992 and December 1992, 50% of her time working on the Project between January 1993 and March 1993, and 33% of her time working on the Project between April 1993 and September 1993. Her salary was paid 100% out of JTPA funds. Based on the percentages of time she provided, approximately \$11,775 of her salary was inappropriately paid from JTPA funds, since the work did not relate directly to a JTPA program. We also determined that the COG hired a consultant that worked on the Affordable Housing Project and other projects. The consultant was paid \$20,500 in fiscal year 1991-1992, and \$19,400 in fiscal year 1992-1993. We were unable to

quantify the exact amount of time the consultant spent working on the Affordable Housing Project due to the lack of specifics on the invoices he submitted, but based on the available information, it appears that the majority of his time was spent working on the Affordable Housing Project in fiscal year 1991-1992. The consultant was paid from Economic Development funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG develop procedures for operating separate corporations in the future. The COG should organize projects in such a way as to maintain control over funds and employees. In addition, we recommend the COG reimburse the JTPA program for the time JTPA personnel worked on the Affordable Housing Project.

2. The Former Neuse River Council of Governments Service Delivery Area Director Wrote Four Checks to "Cash" Totaling \$21,400 Without Authorization.

On November 17, 1992, the President of the Neuse River Community Development Corporation, Inc. (NRCDC) Board, the Treasurer of the NRCDC Board, and the former Neuse River Council of Governments (COG) Service Delivery Area (SDA) Director signed a bank signature card and opened a checking account in the NRCDC name. On November 18, 1992, a \$25,000 check from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc. (Reynolds Foundation) was deposited into the account. Between February 4, 1993 and April 5, 1993, The former SDA Director wrote four checks to "Cash" totaling \$21,400 out of the account. All four checks were signed by him and had "for consulting services" written on them.

According to the NRCDC Board President, the Board had not authorized the disbursement of \$21,400 by the former SDA Director.

According to the Executive Director of the COG, the former SDA Director left work on September 22, 1993, after the Executive Director began asking questions concerning a \$170,000 invoice from a COG vendor, and never returned. On September 29, 1993 the COG's attorney instructed the former SDA Director to return any NRCDC records that he had.

According to the President of the NRCDC Board, the former SDA Director visited him on September 30, 1993 in order to give him NRCDC records that he had. At that time, the former SDA Director presented him with a letter for his signature (Exhibit A). The letter was dated February 2, 1993, and stated that the NRCDC was going to pay the former SDA Director \$21,400 in consulting fees for "...additional administrative support work..." that he performed for the NRCDC. According to the President, he told the former SDA Director that he could not sign the letter. At this time the former SDA Director tore-up the letter, threw it in the trash, and left. The President of the NRCDC Board said that he then delivered the box of NRCDC records that he had been given to the COG. When he returned to his office, he retrieved the letter from the trash and pieced it back together. He later gave the letter to the Executive Director.

The former SDA Director was unavailable to be interviewed about these issues.

Recommendation

We recommend that the NRCDC take what action they deem necessary to recoup the \$21,400.

- 3. The Former SDA Director Changed the Final Rating of a Prospective Contractor.**

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) contracts are awarded to organizations based on the proposals submitted by the organizations. According to Neuse River Council of Governments' (COG) employees, the proposals are rated numerically by three COG employees based on an established set of criteria. The three scores are then averaged to establish a final score for each proposal. The final average score for each proposal is then compared to the others, and listed in descending order. The COG gives priority in awarding contracts starting with the highest score. The contracts are awarded in this manner because of the limited amount of funding available.

According to three COG employees, they were asked by the former SDA Director to rate a proposal submitted by the Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc. (ENCPC) along with other proposals. Each employee rated the ENCPC proposal and submitted their scores for averaging. According to the three employees, the Former SDA Director increased ENCPC's final average score. By increasing the final average score, ENCPC moved up the rating list when compared to the other proposed contractors. Two of the employees then went back and changed their individual scores to agree with the scores assigned by the former SDA Director. The third employee never changed her score.

According to the employees, they do not know the reasoning behind changing the final average score, because they believe that ENCPC would have been awarded a contract without the change. We were unable to reach the former SDA Director in order to ask him. According to the Executive Director of the ENCPC, he did not know that the scores had been changed.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG management establish a policy detailing the procedures to be followed in awarding contracts. In addition, we recommend that employees be instructed to inform management when instances of noncompliance are detected.

4. The Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc. Overcharged the Neuse River Council of Governments by \$10,539.

The Neuse River Council of Governments (COG) entered into a cost based contract with the Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc. (ENCPC) in the amount of \$100,000. The contract was funded under the Job Training Partnership Act, (JTPA). The contract was to provide services to eligible JTPA participants in a computer and office equipment repair and maintenance program. The program was designed to instruct eligible JTPA participants on how to maintain and repair computers by having actual "hands-on" instruction.

ENCPC purchased fifty computers and supporting equipment for the computer repair and maintenance program with COG agreeing to reimburse them for thirty-five of the computers. ENCPC purchased fifty computers, six printers, six fax modems and three CD-ROM's for \$51,189 which included a special discount of \$2,500. ENCPC sent the COG an invoice for thirty-five hard drives, thirty-five monitors, one CD-ROM, two printers, two fax modems, and miscellaneous computer parts for thirty-five computers, totaling \$45,204.25 which was paid by COG.

After examining the original invoice from the vendor that sold the equipment to the ENCPC, we determined that ENCPC had overcharged the COG by \$10,539.22. When we asked the Executive Director of ENCPC about the overbilling of \$10,539.22, he was unable to provide us with an explanation. It should be noted that

the Executive Director of the ENCPC is also the President of the Neuse River Community Development Corporation.

Recommendation

We recommend the COG request reimbursement of \$10,539.22 from the ENCPC. In addition, we recommend that the COG examine original invoices from vendors in the future and not rely on typed lists prepared by the contractors.

5. JTPA Funds Are Being Used to Make Questionable Tuition Payments to Educational Institutions.

One of the programs available through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is the Dislocated Worker Program. A benefit of this program is that dislocated workers who need to learn new skills taught in a classroom setting can be provided institutional training. This training helps them make the transition to other employment.

During our review at the Neuse River Council of Governments (COG), we examined payments made with JTPA funds to four year educational institutions. We question the following transactions.

- ◆ JTPA funds have been used to send a participant to graduate school at a private university. Since the first summer session of 1992 through the 1993 fall semester \$6,270 has been paid to this institution. Previously, JTPA funds were used for this participant to obtain her undergraduate degree at this same university. We question the use of JTPA funds to send a participant to graduate school, particularly at a private university which normally is much more expensive than a state-supported university.

- ◆ Another participant who earned her associate nursing degree from a community college in August, 1980 is being provided JTPA funds to take nursing classes at a state supported university. The participant is a dislocated worker that served in an administrative role at the company she worked. Through the 1993 spring semester \$2,621 has been expended to pay this participant's tuition. We question JTPA funds being used to provide training to a participant in a profession in which they are already educated.
- ◆ JTPA funds are being used to pay the tuition for the child of a participant although eligibility criteria are not being met in accordance with the JTPA regulations. To be eligible, the child must be a "family member of a self-employed worker that is unemployed as a result of general economic conditions in his community. Further, the majority of the applicant's support must have been derived from the family business." Even though the participant was self-employed, according to COG records we reviewed, his wife provides the majority of the child's support. JTPA funds of \$675 have been paid for the 1993 fall semester for this participant's child to attend a state supported university.
- ◆ We also determined that through the 1993 spring semester \$2,819 of JTPA funds had been spent for the tuition of another participant's child at a state supported university. The participant was not dislocated from self-employment as required by eligibility criteria and therefore would not be entitled to these JTPA funds.
- ◆ We determined that JTPA funds were used to send a retired retail banker to truck driving school under the dislocated worker program. Since the employee is retired, he would not be considered dislocated. Based on the documentation in the participant's file, it did appear that he was a dislocated worker. However, based on a conversation with his wife, we determined that he accepted early retirement from the bank where he was employed. JTPA payments for his tuition totaled \$236 and he was reimbursed for motel expenses from February, 1992 through April, 1992 in the amount of \$1,043.

While we found that only some of these occurrences violate JTPA regulations, we question the reasonableness of all these transactions. We contacted program representatives at both the state (North Carolina Department of Commerce) and federal (Inspector General for the United States Department of Labor) level and were

told that the regulations did not specifically disallow these payments where eligibility criteria were met.

Recommendation

We recommend that in areas where JTPA guidelines are not specific in the way that funds can or cannot be spent, management exercise prudence and good judgement in the expenditures of these funds.

6. The 1993 Summer Youth Program Lacked In Performance.

We reviewed the Neuse River Council of Governments' (COG) 1993 Summer Youth Program participant files. These participants were assigned to the COG's in-house job developers. The job developers were to assist the participants in obtaining summer employment. A review of the files revealed that none of the assigned participants obtained summer employment through the COG's job developers. However, seven participants did obtain employment through their own efforts. In interviews with a sample of the participants, several expressed disappointment in what they perceived as a lack of effort from the job developers in assisting them in obtaining summer employment. After the initial enrollment, some participants did not receive any further contact from the job developers.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG's job developers take a more proactive approach in assisting youth in finding summer employment or allow contractors to assume the duties.

7. The Neuse River Council of Governments Granted Sick Leave and Vacation Leave to Temporary Employees.

During our review, we found that all four of the 1993 temporary summer interns earned vacation leave and sick leave. Vacation and sick leave benefits are usually restricted to permanent employees, not temporaries. Three of the four were paid with Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) funds. In addition, all of the interns, one of which was only 14 years old, were paid at a rate of \$10 per hour. These benefits and wages represent less than a prudent use of funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG discontinue the practice of providing temporary summer interns with vacation and sick leave. In addition, we recommend that the COG pay the summer interns at a rate more appropriate for a teenager working during the summer.

8. The Neuse River Council of Governments Purchased Twenty Interactive Video Computers Without the Benefit of a Pilot Program.

The Neuse River Council of Governments (COG) purchased twenty interactive video computers (computers) for the On-The-Job Training Program (OJT) at a cost of \$185,722. The interactive video computers are to provide training instructions on twenty-three different occupations such as, electricians and pipefitting. The COG plans on placing the computers with the OJT employers and contractors for their use. In addition, the COG purchased 101 paper training outlines that were developed to be used by the OJT employers at a cost of \$140,000.

The computers are to be used to train OJT participants on site. However, this system had never been used by employers in the area before. And in the Neuse River service

delivery area, two-thirds of the occupations that employers need to fill are not on the computers that the COG purchased. The COG did not pre-determine how many of the computers would be utilized by employers.

We question the purchase of such a large number of computers (twenty) without first testing the utilization of the equipment. There are currently only two or three Service Delivery Areas in the country that utilize the interactive video computers.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG devise an implementation plan that would direct personnel to test for utilization before investing so much in equipment.

9. The On-The-Job Training Program Needs Improvement.

We examined a sample of twenty On-The-Job Training (OJT) participant files out of a total of forty-five for the 1992-1993 fiscal year. We found the OJT program to be severely lacking in serving the participants. Of the seven participants we were able to interview, five indicated that they received little training and/or that the program was of little or no benefit to them. Also, the participants complained of a lack of contact with the Neuse River Council of Governments' (COG) counselors and insufficient follow-up. This lack of communication sometimes resulted in the COG not being aware of the termination of participants. Two participants quit working after only one week at the OJT site. Another lasted only two weeks. Despite their limited stays at the OJT sites, their termination codes indicated satisfactory completion of the project had been obtained. Normally the COG's OJT program contracts participants for 800 hours or six months. Satisfactory completion of a project means meeting either one of these criteria or specific goals set by the employer. On the notices used

to separate participants from the program, it was noted that these particular participants had completed project objectives. It is obvious that the time criteria nor established objectives had not been met. The COG OJT program also failed in its ultimate goal of permanent placement for the participants.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG improve its OJT Program by providing better services to participants, such as communicating with participants during training, and verification that participants have completed their project goals.

10. An On-The-Job Training Contractor Was Paid In Advance In Violation of Policy.

During our review of the On-The-Job Training Program, we noted one instance where the Neuse River Council of Governments (COG) had paid a contractor in advance of the participant completing the project. The procedures call for payments to be made to the contractors after satisfactory completion of the contract requirements. The situation was aggravated when the participant quit prior to the completion of the project. As of November 1993, the COG had made no attempts to recover the \$1,190 that was paid in advance.

Recommendation

We recommend that the COG comply with its payment policy to contractors by only paying after satisfactory completion of the project.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL IMPACT

The following schedule represents a quantification of the items examined during our special review. We cannot completely quantify the tangible benefits or detriment, if any, to the taxpayer resulting from the findings of our review. We are simply noting those areas where the system of internal controls were either circumvented or should be enhanced.

1)	Twenty Interactive Video Computers.	\$185,722
2)	Questionable Educational Expenses.	13,664
3)	Salaries of the COG Employee and the COG Consultant for time spent working on the Affordable Housing Project (\$11,775 + (50% x \$20,500))	22,025
4)	Checks written to cash. Note 1	21,400
5)	Overcharge by the Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc. Note 2	10,539
6)	Advance Payment to a Contractor.	<u>1,190</u>
	TOTAL FINANCIAL IMPACT	<u>\$254,540</u>

Note (1) The former SDA Director reimbursed the NRCOG \$7,927.68 on November 19, 1993 and \$13,472.22 on December 9, 1993.

(2) The Eastern North Carolina Poverty Committee, Inc., reimbursed the NRCOG \$10,539.22 on January 5, 1994, after we informed the NRCOG of the overcharge.

Names/Addresses

Brenda	Bacote			
R. E.	Bengal	1233 National Avenue	New Bern	
Lucy	Benton	2105 Oaks Drive	New Bern	
Gerald	Blango	619 Third Avenue	New Bern	
Dennis	Bridges	240 Middle Street	New Bern	
Paul	Brock			
John	Chance	P.O. Box 5152	New Bern	28560
Dennis P.	Clovie	706 Broad Street	New Bern	
Willie	Coley	305 Spring Street, #2	New Bern	
Marion	Collins	508 Third Avenue	New Bern	
Odessa	Cooper	1030 Williams Road	New Bern	
Phyllis	Corley	224-B First Street	New Bern	
Roy	Covington	614 Fox Chase Village	New Bern	
Robert	Coward	422 Stoneyhill Trail	New Bern	
Roberta	Coward	422-A Stoneyhill Trail	New Bern	
Hayes	Crary, Sr.	1502 Kimberly Road	New Bern	
April Renee	Davis	1103 Highway 70 East	New Bern	
Michael	Dunn	250 Gremland MHP	New Bern	
Cecils	Exxon	1301 Broad Street	New Bern	
Rinzo	Faulks	1801 St. John Street	New Bern	
Grace	Fenell	809 Clark Avenue	New Bern	
Barbara	Fields	708 Second Avenue	New Bern	
Barbara	Fields			
Vandilla	Gawson	775 Williams Road	Grifton	28530
Annette	Gibbs	220 Mile Road	Vanceboro	28586
Shontina	Green	37 Douglas Drive	New Bern	
Bobby	Green	37 Douglas Drive	New Bern	
D. Braxton	Green	1614 McKinley Avenue	New Bern	28563
Paula	Harris	2-D Pinebrook, Apt.	New Bern	
Michael	Hoggett	885 Williams Road	Grifton	28530
Johnna	Huber	3914-O Cherry Point	New Bern	
Arnita	James	901 Greenpark Terrace	New Bern	
Annie	Jones	1712 Pembroke Avenue	New Bern	
Christine	Jones	700 Fox Chase	New Bern	
Sheridon	Jones			
Christine	Jones	Lot 700 Fox Chase Village	New Bern	
Christine	Jones	1105-F George Street	New Bern	
Anthony	Joyner	1803 Charles Street	New Bern	
Frankie	Joyner	514-B Williams Street	New Bern	
Anthony	Joyner			
Violet	Kelly			
Edmond J.	Kent			
Rosetta	Korgenay			

Names/Addresses

Margaret	Lawrence	1145 NC Highway 43	Vanceboro	28586
Phillip L.	Lehman	4512 Highway 17 South	Bridgeton	28519
I. Keys	Lewis	P.O. Box 1127	New Bern	
Shannon	Lilly	616 Second Avenue	New Bern	
Diana	Lockett	108 Tarheel Drive	Havelock	28532
Dorese	Matthew	2960 Hill Neck Road	New Bern	
Kenneth	Matthews	220 Carolina Pines Blvd.	New Bern	
Rechetta	McCotten	1612 Dillahunt Street	New Bern	
Vanessa	McCullough			
D. Lee	McKoy	P.O. Box 803	Bayboro	28515
Nancy	McLamb	Box 440, Fox Chase Village	Cherry Point	
Joann	Melton			
Carla	Memborn	1035 Main Street	New Bern	
Kesha L.	Midgett			
Shawn	Montique			
Victoria	Moore	1716 Greenpark Terrace	New Bern	
Janice	Nicholson	1311 Kinston Street	New Bern	
Bessie	Pender	601-B Street	New Bern	
Michael	Raife	224-B First Street	New Bern	
Shelia	Roach			
Janina C.	Rodgers	1703 Greenpark Terrace	New Bern	
Kelly	Schuemaker	106 Leslie Lane	Havelock	28532
Evelyn	Scott	685 Fox Chase Village	New Bern	
Dorothea	Seabrook			
C. F.	Simmons	P.O. Box 808	New Bern	
Ferriors	Slade	525 Thurman Road	New Bern	
June L.	Smoley	P.O. Box 669	Bridgeton	28519
Joseph	Triscan			
Bryant J.	Wheeler	101 Riverside Drive	Havelock	28532
Becky S.	Wheeler	101 Riverside Drive	Havelock	28532
Jeraldine	Wilson	1414 Mockingbird Lane	New Bern	28562
Gloria	Wilson	1414 Mockingbird Lane	New Bern	28562
Frances	Wilson	706 Broad Street	New Bern	
Mary	Woolford	V-173 Trent Court	New Bern	
Mary	Wooten	775 Williams Road	New Bern	

Businesses/Addresses

B & E Services
Bridges Mobile Home Renters
Dillahunt Realty
Strictly Rentals

P.O. Box 2930
P.O. Box 3243
906 Queen Street
37 East Plaza

New Bern
New Bern
New Bern
Havelock 28532

Neuse River Community Development Corporation
November 19, 1993

<u>Date</u>	<u>What</u>	<u>Whom</u>	<u>Results</u>
02/06/92	Board Meeting		
03/31/92	Board Meeting		
06/03/92	Letter	To: George Graham From: Mary Mountcastle Z-Smith Reynolds	Granting - \$25,000
06/25/92	Board Meeting		
07/16/92	Memo	To: Linda Little From: David Turrentine	Requesting a revised budget for Z. Smith Reynolds Funds.
08/25/92	Memo	To: David Turrentine From: Linda Little	Stating Z. Smith Reynolds funds are to be used during construction.
08/27/92	Letter	To: Mary Mountcastle From: Linda Little	Requesting authorization to change purpose of funds.
09/01/92	Letter	To: Linda Little From: Thom Lambeth	Stating that Reynolds' Board would have to approve budget changes in November.
09/04/92	Memo	To: Roy Fogle From: David Turrentine	Filing complaint against Linda Little for writing Mountcastle.
09/08/92	Memo	To: Roy Fogle From: Linda Little	Stating that she would no longer do financial work for NR CDC unless instructed otherwise.
11/18/92	Bank Account opened		\$25,000 deposit.
12/07/92	Board Meeting		
01/15/93	Paid Koontz & Salinger		\$1,950.00
01/15/93	Paid Howard, From, Stallings & Hutson, P.A.		1,014.35

Neuse River Community Development Corporation

Page 2

November 19, 1993

01/15/93	Paid the Food Palace		\$ 164.77
01/15/93	Paid the PostMaster		340.00
02/04/93	Cash		\$5,000.00
02/06/93	Paid the PostMaster		51.00
02/11/93	Cash		9,000.00
02/22/93	Cash		7,000.00
04/05/93	Cash		400.00
09/29/93	Memo	To: Roy Fogle From: Doris Drake	Housing Program status.
09/30/93	Memo	To: File From: Roy Fogle	Documenting conversation with George Graham.