

AUDIT REPORT



CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER
BUREAU OF MANAGEMENT AUDIT
WILLIAM C. THOMPSON, JR., COMPTROLLER

Audit Report on the Department of Probation's Administration of the Restitution Program

MJ02-140A

February 27, 2003

To the Citizens of the City of New York

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In accordance with the Comptroller's responsibilities contained in Chapter 5, § 93, of the New York City Charter, my office has audited the New York City Department of Probation to determine whether it effectively administers the receipt and disbursement processes for the restitution program. The Department of Probation is responsible for supervising probationers by monitoring and enforcing their compliance with the conditions of their probations. Our audit resulted in the findings and recommendations that are presented in this report. The findings and recommendations were discussed with City officials; their comments were considered in the preparation of this report.

Audits such as this provide a means of ensuring that City resources are used effectively, efficiently, and in the best interest of the public.

I trust that this report contains information that is of interest to you. If you have any questions concerning this report, please e-mail my audit bureau at audit@comptroller.nyc.gov or telephone my office at 212-669-8945.

Very truly yours,

William C. Thompson, Jr.

Report: MJ02-140A
Filed: February 27, 2003

Table of Contents

AUDIT REPORT IN BRIEF1

INTRODUCTION3

 Background3

 Objective3

 Scope and Methodology.....3

 Discussion of Audit Results.....5

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS6

 CRU Had Adequate Internal Controls over Receipt and Disbursement of Restitution Funds6

 Collection Rate Is Significantly Higher since 1997.....7

 CRU Does Not Follow Comptroller’s Directive #11 With Regard to Stop Payments.....8

 CRU Lacked Adequate Guidelines and Documentation For Its Searches for Missing Beneficiaries.....10

ADDENDUM – DOP Response

*The City of New York
Office of the Comptroller
Bureau of Management Audit*

**Audit Report on the
Department of Probation's Administration of
The Restitution Program**

MJ02-140A

AUDIT REPORT IN BRIEF

This audit determined whether the Department of Probation's (DOP) Central Restitution Unit (CRU) effectively administers the receipt and disbursement processes of restitutions that are imposed as a special condition of probation. DOP supervises probationers by monitoring and enforcing their compliance with the conditions of their probations.

Audit Findings and Conclusions

CRU has adequate internal controls over its receipt and disbursement practices. In addition, its collection rate of restitution payments has increased significantly since 1997. The CRU Director attributed this increase to its automated Restitution Accounting System and more stringent enforcement measures taken by DOP probation officers.

However, there were some weaknesses in its procedures. CRU could have saved \$5,140 (62%) of the \$8,260 it spent for stop payments in June 2001 had it established a minimum amount of \$25 for checks to be issued stop payments, as required by Comptroller's Directive #11. In addition, CRU did not adequately document its efforts to locate missing beneficiaries who are owed restitution funds.

Audit Recommendations

We made four recommendations, all of which are listed below. DOP should:

- Establish a dollar limit, not below \$25, for checks for which the agency issues stop payments, in accordance with Comptroller's Directive #11.
- Use the online method for issuing stop payments to lower the cost of banking fees.
- Set parameters regarding its search efforts to ensure that its resources are being used efficiently.

- Ensure that CRU staff more fully documents their efforts to locate missing beneficiaries.

DOP Response

In its response, DOP agreed to implement all of the report's recommendations.

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Department of Probation (DOP) is responsible for supervising probationers by monitoring and enforcing their compliance with the conditions of their probations. Probationers are convicted offenders whose sentences have been suspended and who are freed under the supervision of a probation officer. In cases of non-violent crimes involving property, as an alternative sentence, the court may direct that a person convicted of the crime pay restitution to a court-designated beneficiary. DOP collects and disburses restitution payments when restitution is imposed as a special condition of probation.

The DOP Central Restitution Unit (CRU) administers the collection, processing, and disbursement of restitution payments; and it acts as an intermediary between the probationer and the beneficiary. During calendar year 2001, CRU collected \$4,104,763 (59%) of the \$6,962,743 owed by probationers. As of December 31, 2001, CRU had 2,603 active probation cases.

CRU maintains restitution account information for all restitution cases in its Restitution Automated System (RAS). The computer system maintains information such as names, addresses, telephone numbers of probationers and beneficiaries, restitution surcharge amounts due, and probationer payment schedules. This information is initially obtained from the court and is given to probation officers assigned to specific cases. The court or the district attorney and the probation officers complete their part of a case establishment form for each case. CRU staff then enter information from the forms into RAS.

In 1991 and 1996, our office conducted audits of DOP's administration of the restitution program. Both audits found major weaknesses in DOP's management of the program. The audits found that DOP failed to assess probationers' ability to pay restitution, which contributed to poor collection rates of 36 percent and 37 percent, reported in those audits.

Objective

The objective of this audit was to determine whether the DOP Central Restitution Unit effectively administers the receipt and disbursement processes for the restitution program.

Scope and Methodology

The time period reviewed in this audit was calendar years 2001 and 2002.

To obtain a general understanding of CRU procedures in administering the collection and disbursement of restitution cases, we reviewed relevant New York State criminal laws, as well as CRU standard operating procedures and Comptroller's Directive #11. We also interviewed the CRU Executive Director and the Administrative Manager of the CRU Operations Unit. In addition, we conducted walkthroughs of CRU, including its Accounts Receivable and Accounts Payable

departments. Finally, we contacted officials from the City Department of Finance to determine whether monthly bank fees paid by DOP for stop payments issued could be lowered.

To determine the DOP collection rate for restitution payments, we obtained and reviewed data from RAS to identify the dollar amount collected versus that owed by the probationers. We analyzed the collection trend for calendar years 1996 through 2001.

To evaluate the internal controls over the receipt and disbursement processes of the restitution program, we:

- Determined whether there was adequate segregation of duties with proper supervisory reviews for both collection and disbursement processes.
- Reviewed daily cash receipt logs, bank deposits, and cash disbursement logs for completeness.
- Determined whether bank reconciliations are performed monthly and are kept on file.
- Determined whether there is supervisory review of checks distributed to beneficiaries.

We reviewed the RAS database to gain an understanding of how restitution payments are processed and accounts maintained. To assess the reliability and completeness of restitution case data entered in RAS, we obtained a random sample of 50 case establishment forms from the 2,603 cases that were active during calendar year 2001. We compared data on the establishment forms to data entered in RAS to determine whether the information was correctly entered in the system. We then randomly selected another list of 50 from the 2,603 cases entered in from RAS and compared the data on the system to the corresponding manual case establishment forms on file.

We evaluated CRU's process of paying unsatisfied accounts with undisbursed funds by reviewing the allocation of undisbursed funds made during calendar year 2001.

We reviewed CRU's practices in issuing stop payments for outstanding checks that have been outstanding for at least six months. Our review included determining: whether stop payments are issued for those checks that were outstanding; and the cost to the City for stop payments. We analyzed the stop payments that were issued in June 2001.

This audit was conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) and included tests of the records and other auditing procedures considered necessary. This audit was performed in accordance with the New York City Comptroller's audit responsibilities as set forth in Chapter 5, § 93, of the New York City Charter.

Discussion of Audit Results

The matters covered in this report were discussed with DOP officials during and at the conclusion of this audit. A preliminary draft was sent to DOP officials and was discussed at an exit conference on January 14, 2003. On January 24, 2003, we submitted a draft report to DOP officials with a request for comments. We received written comments from DOP on February 7, 2003.

In its response, DOP agreed to implement all of the report's recommendations. DOP's response stated, in part:

“I was gratified by your audit and particularly pleased by your crediting my agency with the positive finding that the ‘rate of collection of restitution payments is significantly higher,’ having increased by 21 percentage points since 1997. We are constantly trying to improve the way in which we deliver our services and seek to make them more effective and efficient. In this spirit we also appreciate the effort of your audit in helping us to do our work better through the other findings and recommendations.”

The full text of DOP's comments is included as an addendum to this report.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CRU has adequate internal controls over its receipt and disbursement practices. In addition, its collection rate of restitution payments has increased significantly since 1997. The CRU Director attributed this increase to its automated Restitution Accounting System and more stringent enforcement measures taken by DOP probation officers.

However, there were some weaknesses in CRU's procedures. Our review of CRU's practices in issuing stop payments found that CRU did not follow Comptroller's Directive #11 with regard to stop payments issued for checks outstanding for more than six months. Overall, CRU could have saved \$5,140 (62%) of the \$8,260 it spent for stop payments in June 2001 had it established a minimum amount of \$25 for those checks to be issued stop payments, as required by Comptroller's Directive #11. In addition, we found that CRU did not adequately document its efforts to locate missing beneficiaries who are owed restitution funds.

CRU Had Adequate Internal Controls over Receipt and Disbursement of Restitution Funds

Overall, our audit testing revealed that CRU had good controls over the receipt and disbursement functions of its restitution program.

In its broadest sense, an organization's internal control system consists of the policies and procedures established by management to provide reasonable assurance that the organization's objectives will be achieved. The objectives of an internal control system are to provide reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition, and that transactions are executed in accordance with management authorization and properly recorded.

We reviewed CRU internal controls over receipt and disbursement of restitution funds by examining the following areas:

- Segregation of Duties – “Segregation of duties” means that an individual or small group of individuals should not be in a position to control all aspects of a transaction or business process. For example, different personnel should perform the data entry, transaction approval, and review functions of a transaction. We determined whether CRU had adequate segregation of duties over its cash receipt and disbursement functions. Our testing concluded that receipt, recording, and disbursement of restitution payments were assigned to different employees and that there were appropriate authorizations in place.
- Cash Receipts – CRU received \$4,104,763 in restitution payments during calendar year 2001. We reviewed 25 transactions to determine whether moneys received were appropriately handled and documented. Our review determined that all funds were appropriately handled and documented. Moneys were deposited in the bank on the same day and all necessary documentation was maintained.

- Cash Disbursements – Probationer checks that are received are processed and disbursed to beneficiaries the following month. CRU maintains an accounts payable ledger on RAS that records disbursements. We reviewed 25 transactions and determined that probationer payments were appropriately processed and sent to beneficiaries. All moneys entered in RAS for the month had a corresponding check that was issued to beneficiaries.
- Bank Reconciliations – Bank reconciliations are performed to ensure that only bona fide transactions are recorded in the DOP bank account. This is achieved by comparing the balance recorded in the bank statement with that of the DOP records. We reviewed CRU accounting functions and determined that the unit had performed bank reconciliations. We verified that the bank statements, check registers, and outstanding checks were properly reconciled and that the calculations in the bank reconciliations were correct.
- Data Reliability – Data reliability provides reasonable assurance that data received for processing have been properly authorized and processed, and that data have not been lost, suppressed, added, duplicated, or otherwise improperly changed. We reviewed 50 forms used to establish restitution cases to determine whether they were correctly entered in RAS. Conversely, we reviewed 50 cases selected from RAS to determine whether the entries could be verified by documentation maintained on file. Our data reliability assessment revealed that data generated from RAS were generally found to be reliable and complete.

Collection Rate Is Significantly Higher since 1997

CRU's rate of collection of restitution payments is significantly higher than in previous years. The rate of restitution payments collected to that owed by probationers increased from 38 percent in calendar year 1997 to 59 percent in 2001, an increase of 21 percentage points. The CRU Director attributed the overall increase in the collection rate to the efficiency they achieved through the use of RAS and more stringent enforcement measures taken by DOP probation officers.

The collection rate is calculated by dividing the total amount of restitution owed (invoiced) by the total restitution amount collected for the year. We asked CRU officials for their target collection rate. CRU officials told us that they did not have a target collection rate, but that their goal is to collect 100 percent of what is owed. However, the officials stated that this is unrealistic because of their experience with the population (i.e., convicted criminals) they deal with.

The Executive Director of CRU provided us the collection rates for calendar years 1997 through 2001. We verified the accuracy of the collection rates by reviewing printouts of monthly reports generated by the RAS accounts receivable journals. Table I below lists the collection rates from calendar years 1997 through 2001.

TABLE I

Amount of Restitution Invoiced and Collected
Calendar Years 1997 through 2001

Year	Amount Invoiced	Amount Collected	Collection Rate
1997	\$6,467,727	\$2,431,004	38%
1998	5,984,566	2,675,741	45%
1999	6,793,446	3,665,850	54%
2000	5,855,081	4,531,077	77%
2001	\$6,962,743	\$4,104,763	59%

As shown in Table I, the collection rate went from 38 percent in 1997 to 59 percent in 2001. In 2000, the collection rate jumped to 77 percent. The Executive Director stated that this increase was due to the unit's having closed all cases that had actually been closed for persistent inability to collect restitution but that had remained in the active case group. This reorganization of the active case group artificially raised the collection rate for that period. Overall, officials attributed the improved collection rate over recent years to the RAS system, which they said allowed them to more accurately track arrears and keep more precise records of funds collected and distributed.

CRU Does Not Follow Comptroller's Directive #11
With Regard to Stop Payments

CRU did not follow Comptroller's Directive #11 regarding the dollar limit of checks for which it places stop payments. We found that CRU would have saved \$5,140 (62%) of the \$8,260 it spent for stop payments in June 2001 had it limited its stops to checks worth \$25 or more, as required by the directive.

Comptroller's Directive #11 establishes basic guidelines for safeguarding the City's cash and the use of bank accounts. With regards to outstanding checks, Directive #11, § 6.3, states:

“Agencies should consider the expense in bank charges and administrative time of stop payment orders on checks for small amounts. Stops should be placed on checks outstanding over six months only when the value of the check is over \$25. Smaller items should still be cancelled on the City's records.”

According to CRU's written procedures, it issues stop payments for all checks that are outstanding for six months or more. In calendar year 2001, CRU issued stop payments for 1,007 checks at a cost of \$20 per stop, for which total bank fees cost \$20,140. (In August 2002, Fleet Bank—the bank used by CRU for restitution payments—raised the fee to \$25 per stop.)

We selected for review stop payments issued in June 2001. That month CRU issued stop payments for 413 checks at a cost of \$8,260. We found that 257 (62%) of the 413 checks were valued at less than the \$25 minimum stated in Directive #11. In fact, the values of 243 checks were less than the \$20 fee for the stop payments; many of these checks were for less than \$1.

Directive #11 states that an agency should take cost and staff resources into account when setting the dollar limit. The directive does not state what the amount should be, only that it not be below \$25. It is also important to keep in mind that these checks are “stale” (over six months old) and the chance that they will be cashed is minimal. The checks might have been destroyed, or, according to one CRU official, some recipients may not want to cash them because they believe that the checks are inadequately small. Accordingly, CRU could consider setting a higher dollar limit, perhaps \$50 or \$100, for checks on which it places stop payments. Table II below shows the cost savings DOP would have attained for June 2001 if it had set a \$25, \$50, or \$100 dollar limits for checks that had stop payments placed on them.

TABLE II

Cost Savings for Stop Payments Issued June 2001

Category	No. of checks over six months old	Cost per stop payment	Total cost of stop payments	Savings	
				Amount	%
All checks	413	\$20	\$8,260	--	--
Checks \$25 and up	156	\$20	\$3,120	\$5,140	62%
Checks \$50 and up	119	\$20	\$2,380	\$5,880	71%
Checks \$100 and up	88	\$20	\$1,760	\$6,500	79%

As shown in Table II, DOP would have realized a savings of \$5,140—62 percent of the \$8,260 that it spent that month—had it merely followed the minimum dollar limit for checks as stated in Directive #11. However, CRU could set a higher dollar limit for stop payments if it so chooses. If the agency set a \$50 or \$100 limit for checks for which it places stop payments, it could have realized possible savings of \$5,880 (71%) and \$6,500 (79%), respectively.

We also reviewed bank charges for stop payments issued. Currently, CRU uses a manual method of issuing stop payments for outstanding checks whereby it sends Fleet Bank a list of checks for which it requests that stops be issued. A representative from the bank told us that DOP has the option of performing the stop payment service online. According to the representative, this option became available in June 2001. Online communication would reduce present stop payment costs from \$25 per check to as low as \$6 per check.

In calendar year 2001, DOP placed stops on 1,007 checks at a cost of \$20,140. For the checks that had stops issued in June 2001, only 156, or 38 percent of them, were valued at \$25 or more. Table III below shows the cost savings in stop payment fees for June 2001 and the estimated savings for that calendar year had the online method been available and used during that entire period and had the percentage of checks valued at \$25 or less that were stopped in June 2001 been the same throughout the year.

TABLE III

Possible Cost Savings for Stop Payments Issued Calendar Year 2001

Period	No. of checks with stop payments A	Total Cost of stop payments B	No. of checks \$25 and up C	Total Cost of Stop Payments (\$6 per stop) D (C x \$6)	Savings E (B - D)
June 2001	413	\$ 8,260	156	\$ 936	\$ 7,324
Entire Year	1,007	\$ 20,140	*380	\$ 2,280	\$ 17,860

*Estimated (1,007 times 38 percent)

As shown in Table III, DOP could have saved \$7,324 in banking fees for June 2001 and an estimated \$17,860 for the year, had the less costly online method of issuing stop payments been available and used during the entire year.

Recommendations

DOP should:

1. Establish a dollar limit, not below \$25, for checks for which the agency issues stop payments, in accordance with Comptroller's Directive #11.

Agency Response: "The Department is in agreement with this recommendation and will establish a dollar limit, not below \$25, for checks for which the agency issues stop payments. This policy will take effect April 2003."

2. Use the online method for issuing stop payments to lower the cost of banking fees.

Agency Response: "The Department agrees with the cost saving measures that would be gained through use of an online system for issuing stop payments. The Department has already entered into discussions with the Department of Finance and Fleet Bank regarding the process by which to implement such an online system. The Department is planning to have the online system in place by the beginning of fiscal year 2004."

CRU Lacked Adequate Guidelines and Documentation For Its Searches for Missing Beneficiaries

CRU did not have adequate guidelines for its searches for missing beneficiaries who are owed unclaimed restitution funds, nor did it adequately document its searches for the period we reviewed. Our review of CRU's methods for searching for missing beneficiaries found no evidence that searches were performed in six of 25 randomly selected cases we reviewed.

New York State's Criminal Procedure Law, § 420.10 (7), sets forth the following rule regarding undisbursed restitution payments:

“The term ‘undisbursed restitution payments’ shall mean those payments which have been remitted by a defendant but not disbursed to the intended beneficiary and such payments have gone unclaimed for a period of one year and the location of the intended beneficiary cannot be ascertained by such official or organization after reasonable efforts.”

If the beneficiaries cannot be found after reasonable efforts by CRU, the money accrued from restitution payments is deemed undisbursed funds. These funds, after remaining unclaimed for one year, may subsequently be disbursed to other beneficiaries whose accounts have not been paid in full (unsatisfied accounts). CRU retains 20 percent of the undisbursed funds as reserves in the event some missing beneficiaries subsequently contact DOP. CRU last distributed undisbursed funds in May 2001. At that time, there were 229 accounts with unclaimed funds totaling \$412,416—CRU disbursed \$329,932 of that amount.

Before placing any funds in the undisbursed funds account, DOP is required by law to conduct a diligent search for missing beneficiaries. In addition to contacting the probation officer about the whereabouts of the beneficiary, CRU sends a letter to the last known addresses on file for the beneficiaries, informing them that they are owed restitution payments. CRU also conducts a search using the following sources of information:

- Powerfinder – a computerized national telephone directory.
- NYSPIN (New York State Personal Identification Number) – A database containing information on all persons who have been fingerprinted.
- Anywho – An Internet telephone directory.
- ARTS (Adult Restructuring Tracking System) – DOP's own probationer tracking database.
- New York City Police Department Arrest Report – A computerized criminal booking system.

According to the CRU Executive Director, CRU personnel complete a beneficiary search form, which is a list of search methods that were used, and place it in the case file. The Executive Director acknowledged that he has no guidelines regarding how many sources to use, or when particular sources should be used.

We reviewed a random sample of 25 of 229 cases in the undisbursed fund account as of May 2001 to verify that CRU searched for the beneficiaries, as required. There was a total of \$11,668 in the 25 cases we reviewed. There were no beneficiary search forms in the files for six (24%) of the 25 cases reviewed, suggesting that no search was conducted. In addition, the files for the remaining 19 cases had only minimal search information. Fourteen of the case files contained copies of letters that were sent to the beneficiary. Ten of the cases indicated that only

one source (e.g., Powerfinder) was used. In addition, a number of the search forms did not indicate the steps taken by CRU. That is, the forms may have stated that the beneficiary was not found, but did not state whether the search revealed potential matches, nor did they state whether CRU attempted to contact anyone.

We discussed this issue with the CRU Executive Director, who agreed that his unit had done very little in terms of beneficiary searches in previous years. He stated, however, that his unit's search of beneficiaries is currently more extensive and better documented. We reviewed a few files for current cases and verified that the searches were better documented, and backup documentation—printouts from internet searches—was included in the case files. However, the unit still has no search guidelines regarding how many sources to use, or when particular sources should be used. To optimize the productivity and efficiency of its staffing resources, CRU should consider setting parameters regarding its searches (such as the number of sources used) based on the amounts undistributed funds. For example, CRU may conduct a more extensive search for a beneficiary who is owed \$500 than for one who is owed \$5.

Recommendations

DOP should:

3. Set parameters regarding its search efforts to ensure that its resources are being used efficiently.

Agency Response: “We agree that a more extensive effort should be made to locate beneficiaries who are owed more substantial amounts of restitution. The Department will devise search guidelines that set parameters regarding the number of sources to be used based on the dollar amount owed to the beneficiary. The CRU Beneficiary Search Form will be revised to reflect the new guidelines. These changes will take effect April 2003.”

4. Ensure that CRU staff more fully documents their efforts to locate missing beneficiaries.

Agency Response: “The Department will continue its efforts to more fully document its searches conducted to locate beneficiaries owed restitution. The CRU will ensure that documentation such as completed beneficiary forms, copies of correspondence sent to beneficiary, and printouts from Internet searches are placed in the case files. All steps taken by the CRU to locate a beneficiary will be documented. This procedure will be in place by the beginning of fiscal year 2004.”

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION
33 Beaver Street
New York, New York 10004

ADDENDUM
Page 1 of 3

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER



February 5, 2003

Mr. Greg Brooks, Deputy Comptroller
The City of New York
Office of the Comptroller
Executive Offices
1 Centre Street – 5th Floor
New York, New York 10007-2341

Re: **Audit # MJ02-140A – Audit Report on the Department of Probation's
Administration of the Restitution Program**

Dear Mr. Brooks:

This letter constitutes the formal response of NYC Department of Probation to the above-mentioned draft report.

I was gratified by your audit and particularly pleased by your crediting my agency with the positive finding that the "rate of collection of restitution payments is significantly higher," having increased by 21 percentage points since 1997. We are constantly trying to improve the way in which we deliver our services and seek to make them more effective and efficient. In this spirit we also appreciate the effort of your audit in helping us to do our work better through the other findings and recommendations. Specifically we respond that:

Recommendation #1

DOP should establish a dollar limit, not below \$25, for checks for which the agency issues stop payments, in accordance with Comptroller's Directive #11.

Response

The Department is in agreement with this recommendation and will establish a dollar limit, not below \$25, for checks for which the agency issues stop payments. This policy will take effect April 2003.

CREATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR A SAFER CITY; PROTECTING LIVES, CHANGING LIVES AND SAVING LIVES

TELEPHONE: (212) 361-8977

FAX: (212) 361-8985

Recommendation #2

DOP should use the online method for issuing stop payments to lower the cost of banking fees.

Response

The Department agrees with the cost saving measures that would be gained through use of an online system for issuing stop payments. The Department has already entered into discussions with the Department of Finance and Fleet Bank regarding the process by which to implement such an online system. The Department is planning to have the online system in place by the beginning of fiscal year 2004.

Recommendation #3

DOP should set parameters regarding its search efforts to ensure that its resources are being used efficiently.

Response

We agree that a more extensive effort should be made to locate beneficiaries who are owed more substantial amounts of restitution. The Department will devise search guidelines that set parameters regarding the number of sources to be used based on the dollar amount owed to the beneficiary. The CRU Beneficiary Search Form will be revised to reflect the new guidelines. These changes will take effect April 2003.

Recommendation #4

DOP should ensure that CRU staff more fully document their efforts to locate missing beneficiaries.

Response

The Department will continue its efforts to more fully document its searches conducted to locate beneficiaries owed restitution. The CRU will ensure that documentation such as completed beneficiary forms, copies of correspondence sent to the beneficiary, and printouts from Internet searches are placed in the case files. All steps taken by the CRU to locate a beneficiary will be documented. This procedure will be in place by the beginning of fiscal year 2004.

If you require additional information or have any questions, our Department contact is Cary Tamlar, Director of Internal Audit, who can be reached at (212) 232-0598.

Sincerely,



Martin F. Horn
Commissioner of Probation

- cc: Edward Carey, Assistant Director, NYC Office of the Comptroller
- Susan Kupferman, Director, Mayor's Office of Operations
- Judith LaPook, Chief of Staff
- Richard White, Deputy Commissioner, Adult Operations
- Cary Tamler, Director of Internal Audit
- file