



**Office of Court Administration**

**Collection Improvement Program**

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

**Bexar County**

**June 26, 2017**

# CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter	
Executive Summary .....	1
Detailed Procedures and Findings .....	2
Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology .....	6
Appendix B – Report Distribution.....	7

# 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 Bexar 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.

Bexar 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 February 1, 2016 to March 31, 2016, 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.*

Bexar County provided a list of cases that were adjudicated during the period of February 1, 2016 through March 31, 2016.

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

After obtaining a population of all adjudicated cases from the program, the cases were examined to eliminate the cases that were ineligible for testing (i.e. dismissed, drivers safety course, juvenile, etc.). The eligible cases were then randomly sorted, and imported into the test sheet.

The number of samples tested for each population are listed below:

- Payment Plans - 43 cases were tested for procedures 8 - 11 listed below.
- Payment Plans with missed payments - 42 cases were tested for procedures 12 - 13 listed below.

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

A completed survey was obtained and reviewed from the program for pertinent information to the engagement. The responses were used to determine compliance with procedures 4 - 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 central program has staff dedicated to the collection program to establish and monitor payment plans. The staffing was verified and staff interviewed during field work.

The County is compliant with the 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 Collections Department utilizes a computer based software (I-Plow) to monitor the defendant's compliance with the terms of the payment plans.

The County is compliant with the 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.*

If the defendant becomes seriously delinquent with the terms of the payment plan, the case is referred back to the originating court for further action.

The County is compliant with the 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.*

Per the online OCA's reporting system, Bexar County is current with the CIP reporting requirements.

The County is compliant with the 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 43 cases tested, four (4) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 3.23% and 19.94%.

The County is compliant with the 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 43 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 6.70%.

The County is compliant with the 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 43 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 6.70%.

The County is compliant with the 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 43 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 6.70%.

The County is compliant with the 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 42 cases tested, four (4) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 3.29% and 20.29%.

The County is compliant with the 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 42 cases tested, three (3) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 1.96% and 17.27%.

The County is compliant with the 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.*

The central collections department is not able to issue *capias pro fines*. Non-compliant cases are referred back to the originating court for further action. No test performed for 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).*

Bexar County is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3.

## **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 Bexar 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 February 1, 2016 through March 31, 2016, 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 \$10.00 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**

David Cueva, CFE; Audit Manager  
Edward Smith, CFE, Auditor



**REPORT DISTRIBUTION**

The Honorable Nelson W. Wolff  
County Judge  
Bexar County  
Paul Elizondo Tower  
101 W. Nueva, 10th Floor  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-3482

The Honorable Ron Rangel, 379<sup>th</sup> Criminal District Court  
Cadena-Reeves Justice Center  
300 Dolorosa, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Antonio, TX 78205

The Honorable John A. Longoria, Bexar County Court at Law No. 5  
Cadena-Reeves Justice Center  
300 Dolorosa, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Antonio, TX 78205

The Honorable Robert Tejada, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Place 1  
The Honorable Ciro Rodriguez, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Place 2  
3505 Pleasanton Road  
San Antonio, TX 78221

The Honorable Roberto Vazquez, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 Place 1  
The Honorable Monica Lisa Caballero, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 Place 3  
7723 Guilbeau Road, Suite 105  
San Antonio, TX 78250

The Honorable William Donovan, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 Place 1  
The Honorable Jeff Wentworth, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 Place 2  
8918 Tesoro Drive, Suite 300  
San Antonio, TX 78217

The Honorable Rogelio Lopez, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 Place 1  
The Honorable Yolanda Uresti, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 Place 2  
2711 S.E. Loop 410 South  
San Antonio, TX 78222

Mr. Mike Lozito  
Director of Judicial Services  
207 N. Comal  
San Antonio, TX 78207

Ms. Pam Rodriguez  
Court Collections Administrative Supervisor  
207 N. Comal  
San Antonio, TX 78207

Ms. Leticia Martinez  
Compliance Manager  
207 N. Comal  
San Antonio, TX 78207

Ms. Susan Yeatts, CPA  
Bexar County Auditor  
101 W. Nueva, Suite 800  
San Antonio, TX 78205

Mr. David Smith  
Bexar County Manager  
Paul Elizondo Tower  
101 W. Nueva, 10th Floor  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-3482

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

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

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

Ms. Amanda Stites  
Court Services Manager  
Office of Court Administration  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Ms. Daphne Webber  
Regional Specialist  
205 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78711-2066