



**Office of Court Administration**

**Collection Improvement Program**

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

**Bastrop County**

**May 6, 2016**

# 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 the Bastrop 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.

Bastrop 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, 2015 through March 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.*

Bastrop County provided a list of all cases adjudicated during the period of February 1, 2015 through March 31, 2015.

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

After obtaining a population of all adjudicated cases from each court, the cases were researched using the County's online records system to determine the cases that were issued a payment plan. The cases that were issued payment plans were also tested to determine if any payments were missed or if a *capias pro fine* was issued.

The number of sampled cases tested for each population are listed below:

- Payment Plans - 35 cases were tested for procedures 8 - 11 listed below.
- Payment Plans with missed payments - 32 cases were tested for procedures 12 - 13 listed below.
- Payment Plans where a *capias pro fine* was issued – 5 cases were identified as having a *Capias Pro Fine* warrant issued. See procedure 14 listed below.

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

A completed survey was obtained from each collection program within the County. Information within the responses was 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.*

Bastrop County is in the process of centralizing their collection program. However, at the time of the audit, District Courts and County Courts were still operating their own collection departments. Each program has staff dedicated to the collection program who work to establish and monitor payment plans.

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.*

Per the surveys, the Central Collection program utilizes an electronic collection program (i-Flow) to monitor payment plans submitted by the Justice of the Peace Courts. County and District Courts each use a manual system to monitor payment plans.

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.*

Per the surveys, the method to improve the collection on seriously delinquent cases is dependent upon the court where the payment plan was established. District and County Courts can issue a motion to revoke probation if the defendant is on probation. The County Courts-at-Law may also issue a *capias pro fine*, and also continue calling and sending letters every month. The Justice Courts (Central Collection) may issue a *capias pro fine* warrant, or send the defendant to a third-party collector.

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 OCA's Court Collection Reporting system, Bastrop County is current with the CIP reporting requirements.

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 35 cases tested, eight (8) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 10.69% and 35.22%.

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 35 cases tested, one (1) error was noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 10.15%.

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 35 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 6.61%.

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 35 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 6.61%.

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 32 cases tested, five (5) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 9.30% and 24.04%.

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 32 cases tested, five (5) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 9.30% and 24.04%.

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.*

A total of five (5) cases were identified as having a Capias Pro Fine warrant issued. In testing the five cases, no errors were noted. The small population is not sufficient to statistically validate the component.

The County passes this component without further testing.

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).*

Bastrop County 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). The County is compliant with the four (4) Operational Components, and maintained a compliance rate greater than 80% for the seven (7) 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 Bastrop (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, 2015 through March 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 \$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  
Edward Smith, CFE, Auditor

**REPORT DISTRIBUTION**

Ms. Sarah Loucks  
District Clerk  
Bastrop County  
804 Pecan Street  
Bastrop, Texas 78602

Ms. Rose Pietsch  
County Clerk  
Bastrop County  
804 Pecan Street  
Bastrop, Texas 78602

Ms. Laurie Ingram  
County Treasurer  
Bastrop County  
804 Pecan Street  
Bastrop, Texas 78602

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

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

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

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