



Office of Court Administration

Collection Improvement Program

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

Guadalupe County

February 13, 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 the Guadalupe 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.

Guadalupe 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.*

Guadalupe County provided a list of cases that were adjudicated during the period of June 1, 2015 through July 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 jurisdiction, 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 samples tested for each population are listed below:

- Payment Plans - 37 cases were tested for procedures 8 - 11 listed below.
- Payment Plans with missed payments - 33 cases were tested for procedures 12 - 13 listed below.
- Payment Plans where a *capias pro fine* was issued – 21 cases were tested for procedure 14 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 each jurisdiction 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.*

Each program has staff dedicated to the collection program who works to establish and monitor payment plans. The staffing was verified and staff interviewed during field work.

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.*

All courts 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 varies, depends on the court where the payment plan was established. District Court continues to contact the defendant indefinitely, or until the probationary period ends. County Courts can issue a motion to revoke probation if the defendant is on probation, and will work with the Probation Department to issue a motion to revoke probation if the defendant is on probation. The County Courts at Law continue calling and sending letters every month, indefinitely. The Justice Courts 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 online reporting system, Guadalupe 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 34 cases tested, five (5) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 11.06% and 28.96%.

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 37 cases tested, eight (8) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 15.21% and 27.23%.

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 37 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 11.15%.

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 36 cases tested, no errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 8.07%.

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, nine (9) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is between 21.16% and 33.82%.

The County is partially 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, two (2) errors were noted. Taking into consideration the inherent sampling error, we are 90% confident that the error rate is less than 16.22%.

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.*

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 8.86%.

The County is compliant with the 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).*

Guadalupe 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 Guadalupe 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 \$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
Greg Magness, CIA, CGAP
Edward Smith, CFE, Auditor

REPORT DISTRIBUTION

The Honorable Kyle Kutscher
County Judge
Guadalupe County
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Catherin Horvath
Chief Deputy/Supervisor-Courts
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Teresa Kiel
County Clerk
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Elizabeth Lombard
Deputy District Clerk
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Debbie Crow
District Clerk
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

The Honorable Frank Follis
County Court at Law Judge
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

The Honorable Darrell Hunter
Justice of Peace, Precinct 1
2405 East US 90
Seguin, TX 78155

The Honorable William D. Old III
25th Judicial District Judge
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

The Honorable Sheryl Sachtleben
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 2
2611 N. Guadalupe Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Jo Ann Avalos
Office Manager, Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
2611 N. Guadalupe Street
Seguin, TX 78155

The Honorable Roy W. Richard, Jr.
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3
1101 Elbel Road, Suite 6
Schertz, TX 78154

Ms. Megan Nava
Court Clerk, Justice of Peace, Precinct 3
1101 Elbel Road, Suite 6
Schertz, TX 78154

The Honorable Todd Friesenhahn
Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4
11144 FM 725
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Kristine Sanchez
Chief Clerk, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4
11144 FM 725
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Kristine Klein
County Auditor
307 W. Court Street, Suite 205
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Lori Hernandez
Collections Clerk, County Court
211 West Court Street
Seguin, TX 78155

Ms. Sherry Hartwick
Office Administrator, Justice of Peace, Pct. 1
2405 East
Seguin, TX 78155

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

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

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