



Office of Court Administration

Collection Improvement Program

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

Hunt County

November 9, 2015

CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter

Executive Summary 1

Detailed Procedures and Findings 2

Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology 8

Appendix B – 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 Hunt 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.

Hunt 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 January 1, 2015 through February 28, 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.*

Hunt County provided a list of defendants who accepted a payment plan or extension as means to pay their court costs, fees, and fines assessed for the period of January 1, 2015 through February 28, 2015. Hunt County provided a population of cases from each of the six (6) collection programs in the county.

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

The County provided a list of 237 eligible cases. In addition, defendants that missed payments and defendants who had a Capias Pro Fine warrant issued were identified in the population of cases.

There were only 13 cases where a Capias Pro Fine was issued. As a result, there are not enough cases to statistically validate the component. Therefore, the cases were sorted into two (2) populations, cases with no missed payment and cases that missed a payment. A statistically-valid, random sample was drawn from each population for testing.

For procedures 8 through 11 below, we tested a total of 49 cases. For procedures 12 and 13 below, we tested a total of 53 cases.

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

A completed survey was obtained from each collection program, and reviewed for information pertinent to the engagement. Survey responses were used to determine compliance in 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.*

All of the collection programs in the County have dedicated personnel which include collection as an essential job function in their job descriptions. While on-site, the auditor met, observed, and discussed the dedicated staff's collection 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 collection programs use a function in the case management software to create payment plans, and the monitoring of the payment plans is done through a mixture of manual and electronic processes. This was confirmed to be the process while on-site during the engagement.

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.*

Most of the Justice of the Peace courts issue Capias Pro Fine for seriously delinquent cases. The courts that do not issue a Capias warrant continue to work the cases by making phone calls and sending letters, or referring the cases to a third-party collection agency. This was confirmed to be the process while on-site during the engagement.

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.*

Per the Regional Specialist, the County is current with reporting requirements based on the reporting activity documented in the OCA's CIP Court Collection Report software.

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 49 cases that were tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 3.89%.

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 49 cases that were tested, one (1) error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 6.77%.

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 49 cases that were tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 3.89%.

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 49 cases that were tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 3.89%.

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 53 cases tested, six (6) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 7.92% and 18.68%.

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 53 cases tested, two (2) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is no higher than 11.46%.

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.*

Due to the limited number of Capias Pro Fine warrants issued, this component was not tested.

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).*

Hunt County is compliant with Article 103.0033 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and 1 TAC §175.3. The County complied with all four (4) of the Operational Components; the County was also compliant with all seven (7) of the Defendant Communication Components.

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 Hunt 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 January 1, 2015 through February 28, 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 \$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

Greg Magness, CIA, CGAP; Audit Manager
Amanda Price, CFE; Auditor

REPORT DISTRIBUTION

The Honorable Wayne Money
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 1-1
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 409
Greenville, TX 75401

The Honorable Jennifer Reeves
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 2
Hunt County
100 Kings Plaza, Ste. F
Commerce, TX 75428

The Honorable David McNabb
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4
Hunt County
112 E. Main
Quinlan, TX 75474

Mr. Jim McKenzie
Director
Hunt County CSCD
4515 Stonewall St.
Greenville, TX 75403

Ms. Olga Cruz
Office Manager
Hunt County CSCD
4515 Stonewall St.
Greenville, TX 75403

Ms. Judy Travis
Chief Clerk, JP 1.1
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 409
Greenville, TX 75401

Ms. Amber Martel
Deputy Clerk, JP 1.1
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 409
Greenville, TX 75401

The Honorable Sheila Lindon
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 1-2
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 412
Greenville, TX 75401

The Honorable Aaron Williams
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3
Hunt County
118 E. Main
Wolfe City, TX 75496

Mr. Jimmy P. Hamilton
County Auditor
Hunt County
P.O. Box 1097
Greenville, TX 75403-1097

Ms. Diane McNair
Assistant Auditor
Hunt County
P.O. Box 1097
Greenville, Texas 75403-1097

Ms. Holly Anderson
Administrative Assistant
Hunt County CSCD
4515 Stonewall St.
Greenville, TX 75403

Ms. Liz Armendariz
Deputy Clerk, JP 1.1
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 409
Greenville, TX 75401

Ms. Sabrina Lilly
Court Clerk, JP 1.2
Hunt County
2801 Stuart St., Ste. 412
Greenville, TX 75401

Ms. Trevalyn Rice
Clerk, JP 3
Hunt County
118 E. Main
Wolfe City, TX 75496

Ms. Christie Roundtree
Chief Clerk, JP 4
Hunt County
112 E. Main
Quinlan, TX 75474

Ms. Dora Jimenez
Deputy Clerk, JP 4
Hunt County
112 E. Main
Quinlan, TX 75474

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

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

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

Mr. Jim Lehman
CIP - Technical Support
Office of Court Administration
205 W. 14th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78711-2066

Mr. Chad Graff
CIP - Technical Support
Office of Court Administration
2110 Warren Dr., 2nd Floor
Marshall, Texas 75672