



Office of Court Administration

Collection Improvement Program

**Independent Auditor's Report
on Court Collections**

El Paso County

August 29, 2016

CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter

Executive Summary	1
Detailed Procedures and Findings	2
Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology	7
Appendix B – Management Response.....	8
Appendix C – Report Distribution.....	9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Audit Results

The Collection Improvement Program (CIP) Audit Department of the Office of Court Administration (OCA) has performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the CIP Technical Support Department of the OCA and El Paso County (County). The procedures were performed to assist you in evaluating whether the collection program of the County has complied with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Title 1, §175.3 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC).

Our testing indicates the collection program for the County is compliant with the requirements of Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3. In testing the required components, no findings were noted.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an examination of the County, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the County's financial records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters may have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

El Paso County's management is responsible for operating the collection program in compliance with the requirements of Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the CIP Technical Support Department of the OCA, and we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

The compliance engagement was conducted in accordance with standards for an agreed-upon procedures attestation engagement as defined in the attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

Objective

The objective of the engagement was to determine if the County complied with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

Summary of Scope and Methodology

This compliance engagement covers cases for which court costs, fees, and fines were assessed during the period of June 1, 2015 through July 31, 2015 but were not paid at the time of assessment. Cases were tested beyond the audit period to determine compliance with all components of the collection program. The procedures performed are enumerated in the Detailed Procedures and Findings section of this report.

Reporting of Sampling Risk

In performing the procedures, the auditor did not include a detailed inspection of every transaction. A random sample of cases was tested as required by 1 TAC §175.5(b). In consideration of the sampling error inherent in testing a sample of a population, a specific error rate cannot be reported; however, we can report the range within which we have calculated the error rate to fall.

DETAILED PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

1. *Obtain a population of all adjudicated cases in which the defendant does not pay in full within one (1) month of the date court costs, fees, and fines are assessed.*

El Paso County provided multiple lists of defendants who accepted an extension and/or payment plan as a means to pay their court costs, fees, and fines assessed during the period of June 1, 2015 through July 31, 2015. The lists were combined to create a population of 11,240 cases.

2. *Select a randomly-generated, statistically-valid sample of cases to be tested.*

A randomly-generated, statistically-valid sample of cases was generated from the population of cases submitted by the County. During testing, cases that did not meet the definition of an eligible case were skipped. In order to calculate the number of eligible cases present in the sample, a ratio proportionate calculation was performed to adjust the population. The results of these calculations produced the following numbers:

- 1,535 cases with payment plans – tested in procedures 8 – 11 below.
- 858 cases with missed payments – tested in procedures 12 and 13 below.
- 636 cases with a capias notice issued – tested in procedure 14 below.

3. *Obtain a completed survey, in a form prescribed by CIP Audit, from the jurisdiction.*

A completed survey was obtained from the County. The survey was reviewed for information pertinent to the engagement. Survey responses were used to determine compliance with procedures 4 through 6 below.

4. *Evaluate the survey to determine if each local collection program has designated at least one (1) employee whose job description contains an essential job function of collection activities. Answers received will be verified during field work.*

The County's Financial Recovery Division (FRD) employs more than 20 staff members whose job description contains collection activities as their essential job function.

While on-site, the auditor met, observed, and discussed the FRD staff's collection duties and responsibilities.

The County is compliant with this component.

5. *Evaluate the survey to determine if program staff members are monitoring defendants' compliance with the terms of their payment plans or extensions. Answers will be verified through testing of Defendant Communication components.*

The County's FRD monitors defendants' compliance with the terms of their payment plan and/or extension with collection software systems. FRD runs weekly reports to identify cases in the case management software that were referred by Court staff as a payment plan case. The report is reconciled with the list of defendants that established payment plans.

Defendants that failed to report to the FRD office to establish a payment plan are contacted by the staff. If a defendant fails to comply with the terms of an extension or defaults on a payment plan, notices and telephone calls are made using the i-Plow system.

While on-site, the auditor observed, and discussed the processes and procedures for the monitoring of defendants' payment plans.

The County is compliant with this component.

6. *Evaluate the survey to determine if the program has a component designed to improve collection of balances more than 60 days past due. Answers will be verified through testing of Defendant Communication components.*

El Paso County utilizes several methods to collect balances more than 60 days past due. The County continues the collection process of sending notices and making telephone calls for the collection of these balances. Once this process is exhausted, the case is either referred back to the court for a Capias Pro Fine, or referred to a third-party collection agency. For probation cases, the probation officer is notified the defendant is delinquent on court costs, fees and fines. The County also utilizes Scofflaw to stop a defendant from registering their vehicle until the court costs, fees, and fine are paid.

While on-site, the auditor observed and discussed the process used for the collection of balances more than 60 days past due.

The County is compliant with this component.

7. *Verify with CIP Technical Support and/or CIP Audit Financial Analyst(s) that the program is compliant with reporting requirements described in 1 TAC §175.4.*

The jurisdiction is current with reporting requirements based on the reporting activity documented in OCA's CIP Court Collection Report software. All monthly reports were submitted for calendar year 2015, which includes the audit period June 1, 2015 through July 31, 2015.

The County is compliant with this component.

8. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if an application or contact information was obtained within one (1) month of the assessment date, and contains both contact and ability-to-pay information for the defendant.*

Of the 42 cases tested, one (1) error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 7.65%.

The County is compliant with this component.

9. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if contact information obtained within the application was verified within five (5) days of obtaining the data.*

Of the 42 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 3.40%.

The County is compliant with this component.

10. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if local program or court staff conducted an interview with the defendant within 14 days of receiving the application.*

Of the 42 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 3.40%.

The County is compliant with this component.

11. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if the payment plans meet the Documentation, Payment Guidelines, and Time Requirements standards defined in TAC §175.3(c)(4).*

Of the 42 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 3.40%.

The County is compliant with this component.

12. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if telephone contact with the defendant within one (1) month of a missed payment was documented.*

Of the 41 cases tested, one (1) error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 7.77%.

The County is compliant with this component.

13. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if a written delinquency notice was sent to the defendant within one (1) month of a missed payment.*

Of the 41 cases tested, one (1) error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 7.77%.

The County is compliant with this component.

14. *Test samples generated in Procedure 2 (above) to determine if another attempt of contact, either by phone or by mail, was made within one (1) month of the telephone contact or written delinquency notice, whichever is later, on any defendant in which a *capias pro fine* was sought.*

Of the 40 cases tested, no error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident the error rate is less than 3.49%.

The County is compliant with this component.

15. *Make a determination, based on results of the testing in Procedures 5 – 14 (above), as to whether the jurisdiction is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3 based on the criteria defined in 1 TAC §175.5(c).*

El Paso County is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with 1 TAC §175.3 based on the criteria defined in 1 TAC §175.5(c). The County is compliant with all 11 components of the Collection Improvement Program.

APPENDICES

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Objective

The CIP Audit Department of the Office of Court Administration applied procedures, which the CIP Technical Support Department (client) and El Paso County (responsible party) have agreed upon, to determine if the County's collection program is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

Scope

This compliance engagement covers cases for which court costs, fees, and fines were assessed during the period of June 1, 2015 through July 31, 2015 but were not paid at the time of assessment. Cases were tested beyond the audit period to determine compliance with all components of the collection program. All cases that included court costs, fees, and fines that totaled \$20.00 or less were removed from testing.

Methodology

Performed the procedures outlined in the Detailed Procedures and Findings section of this report to test records to enable us to issue a report of findings as to whether the County has complied, in all material respects, with the compliance criteria described in Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

In performing the procedures, the 'tests' the auditor performed included tracing source documentation provided by the County to ensure the collection process met the terms of the criteria listed. Source documents include, but are not limited to, court dockets, applications for a payment plan, communication records, capias pro fine records, and payment records.

Criteria Used

Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 103.0033
Texas Administrative Code, Title 1, §175.3

Team Members

Greg Magness, CIA, CGAP
Barbara Skinner, Auditor

Good Afternoon Ms. Skinner,

We have no response and concur with the findings of the audit as it is stated on the proposed draft. We ask that the final report be directed to the "Attention" of Mr. Wallace E. Hardgrove, Budget & Fiscal Policy Executive Director.

Respectfully,

Derek Ware, Manager
Financial Recovery Division
El Paso County,
500 E. San Antonio Ave.,
El Paso, TX 79901
P#915-543-3892 ext. 2371

APPENDIX C

REPORT DISTRIBUTION

The Honorable Veronica Escobar
County Judge
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio, #301
El Paso, Texas 79901

The Honorable Alma Trejo
County Court at Law No. 1
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio, #705
El Paso, Texas 79901

Mr. Derek Ware
Manager, Financial Recovery Division
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79901

Ms. Betsy C. Keller
County Administrator
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio, Suite 302A
El Paso, Texas 79901

Mr. Scott Griffith
Director, Research and Court Services
Office of Court Administration
205 W. 14th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Mr. Aaron Castillo
Regional Collections Specialist
Office of Court Administration
1902 Joe Stephens Ave.
Weslaco, Texas 78596

The Honorable Maria Salas-Mendoza
120th District Court
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio, #605
El Paso, Texas 79901

Ms. Gabby Ferro
Deputy Budget Officer
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio
El Paso, Texas 79901

Ms. Sandra Acevedo
Supervisor, Financial Recovery Division
El Paso County
500 E. San Antonio
El Paso, Texas 79901

Mr. David Slayton
Administrative Director
Office of Court Administration
205 W. 14th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Ms. Jennifer Henry
Chief Financial Officer
Office of Court Administration
205 W. 14th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78711-2066