

California State Auditor

B U R E A U O F S T A T E A U D I T S

Department of Justice:

It Is Beginning to Address Our Recommendations to Improve Controls Over the California Witness Protection Program



November 1999
99024

The first copy of each California State Auditor report is free.
Additional copies are \$3 each. You can obtain reports by contacting
the Bureau of State Audits at the following address:

**California State Auditor
Bureau of State Audits
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-0255 or TDD (916) 445-0255 x 216**

OR

**This report may also be available
on the World Wide Web
<http://www.bsa.ca.gov/bsa/>**

Permission is granted to reproduce reports.



CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR

KURT R. SJOBERG
STATE AUDITOR

MARIANNE P. EVASHENK
CHIEF DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

November 24, 1999

99024

The Governor of California
President pro Tempore of the Senate
Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Governor and Legislative Leaders:

As required by the 1999-2000 Budget Act, the Bureau of State Audits presents its audit report concerning its evaluation of the Department of Justice's (department) claims review process for the Witness Protection Program.

This report follows up on our prior audit report and concludes that the department has begun to address the recommendations in our prior audit report, but has additional steps it must take. In particular, it must ensure that it has adequate staff to administer the rapidly expanding program and to conduct audits of district attorneys' offices that participate in the program.

Respectfully submitted,

KURT R. SJOBERG
State Auditor

BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS

555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone: (916) 445-0255 Fax: (916) 327-0019

CONTENTS

<i>Summary</i>	1
<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Audit Results</i>	7
Recommendations	13
<i>Response to the Audit</i>	
Office of the Attorney General	15

SUMMARY

Audit Highlights . . .

The Department of Justice (department) is making progress toward establishing additional controls over the California Witness Protection Program (CWPP). However, the following issues remain:

- No formal management review process exists for approving CWPP applications and reimbursement requests.*
 - The department has yet to perform periodic field audits to ensure that district attorneys' offices claim only allowable costs.*
 - There is no procedure in place to perform periodic reconciliations between program and accounting records.*
-

RESULTS IN BRIEF

In February 1999, the Bureau of State Audits (bureau) issued a report concluding that the State's Department of Justice (department) lacked certain controls over the California Witness Protection Program (CWPP), which it administers. Although the department has taken steps to address the recommendations in our prior audit report, the CWPP still lacks a few controls that could prevent problems from arising as more witnesses enter the program. Our current audit examines the actions the department has taken since then to implement the original recommendations.

The CWPP assists district attorneys' offices by encouraging key individuals to testify in state criminal justice proceedings because it can shield witnesses from intimidation by those associated with criminal activity. The CWPP covers the costs the district attorneys incur for services including relocating witnesses, changing their identities, and providing them with food and housing. The department had assigned only one program analyst to run the CWPP's daily operations.

To prevent potential backlogs in case approval and claims processing, the department has recently hired a temporary program analyst to assist the sole program analyst who runs the program. The department also plans to use the part-time analyst to review the primary analyst's work. However, consistent management oversight of the program, a necessary control, does not yet exist.

Because of the confidential nature of the CWPP, the department does not require district attorneys' offices to submit traditional documentation of costs claimed, such as receipts and invoices. However, because the CWPP also does not review these records at the district attorneys' offices, this lack of traditional documentation contributes to problems for the department with monitoring the propriety of witness expenses. While the department has requested approval to hire an auditor for periodic field audits of district attorneys' compliance with the program, it has been unsuccessful and has completed no audits to date. The department has developed new forms to ensure that the district

attorneys' offices, as well as approved witnesses, meet program requirements and that staff document the reasons for its accepting or denying applicants. However, the department is only in the initial stages of developing a process for periodic reconciliations between program and accounting records to determine if reimbursements to the district attorneys' offices for witness expenses were prompt and accurate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To make certain it spends CWPP funds for only appropriate services rendered for approved witnesses, the department should take these actions:

- Establish a formal management review process for approving CWPP applications and reimbursement requests.
- Continue with plans to ensure adequate staffing for program and audit activities.
- Perform periodic field audits to ensure that district attorneys' offices are claiming only allowable costs and administering the program consistently.
- Continue with plans to develop and perform periodic reconciliations between program and accounting records to account for all CWPP transactions.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The department agrees with our recommendations and is continuing to take steps to implement them. ■

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Established in response to district attorneys' fears that witnesses in the State's criminal justice proceedings may be too afraid to testify in criminal cases, the California Witness Protection Program (CWPP) affords witnesses the necessary protection that encourages them to expose the actions of dangerous criminals. The program protects not only witnesses, but their families, friends, or associates whom the witnesses' ongoing or anticipated testimony may endanger. Assembly Bill 856, enacted in September 1997, provides statutory authority for the CWPP by adding Title 7.5, sections 14020 through 14033, to the California Penal Code. The State's Department of Justice (department), which the attorney general heads, is responsible for administering the CWPP. The legislators who created the CWPP intended that its funding would augment, not supplant, existing county witness protection programs.

The CWPP allows this protection when there is credible evidence that a particular witness may suffer intimidation or retaliatory violence. Cases relating to organized crime, gang activities, drug trafficking, or other activities posing a high degree of risk to the witness receive priority. The department has estimated that witnesses are afraid to cooperate with prosecutors in 75 percent to 100 percent of the violent crimes committed in some gang-dominated neighborhoods. According to the attorney general's office, the success ratio of investigations and prosecutions by sheriff and police departments and district attorneys' offices declines when witnesses refuse to testify.

The CWPP reimburses county district attorneys' offices for the costs of armed protection, relocation, acquiring appropriate documents to establish a new identity, moving or storing personal possessions, housing expenses, and basic living expenses for qualified witnesses. Basic living expenses include food, transportation, utility costs, and health care. The initial period of protection is six months. However, if the district attorney determines during the course of a trial that a witness needs

protection for additional time, the CWPP may grant an extension. Services may continue up to three months after the district attorney determines it no longer needs the witness to testify.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FUNDING UNDER THE WITNESS PROTECTION PROGRAM

Conditions of the Witness Agreement Form

The witness must agree to do the following:

- Testify truthfully in and provide all necessary information to appropriate law enforcement officials concerning all criminal proceedings.
- Obey all laws.
- Take all necessary steps to avoid detection by others during the period of protection.
- Comply with all legal obligations and civil judgments.
- Cooperate with all reasonable requests from officials providing the protection.
- Disclose all outstanding legal obligations, including those concerning child custody and visitation rights.
- Disclose any probation or parole responsibilities.
- Regularly inform the appropriate district attorney's office or law enforcement designee of the witness's current address.

Failure to comply with any of the above may be a condition for termination from the program.

To receive CWPP funding, a district attorney's office must first obtain approval from the department that a witness is eligible for the program. The district attorney's office prepares an application detailing the case, potential threats to the witness, and information about the witness and submits it to the department for written approval. The department may also give emergency authorization by telephone. Once it has approved a case, the department prepares a CWPP agreement confirming the types and period of service, number of persons to receive support, and amount of assistance needed. Witnesses must also sign an agreement form documenting their willingness to comply with certain conditions.

Throughout the period of protection, the district attorney's office submits reimbursement claims to the department, listing its expenses. However, the underlying support for these claims, such as invoices and receipts, remains at the district attorney's office to protect the witness's identity and location.

CURRENT SIZE OF THE PROGRAM

The department received yearly appropriations of \$3 million in fiscal years 1997-98 through 1999-2000 for the CWPP. Money for the CWPP comes from the Restitution Fund, which the California State Board of Control oversees. Although the attorney general has the discretion to assess the district attorneys' offices a matching amount for program funding, department staff informed us that a matching requirement will be considered only when CWPP funds become low.

The department reports increasing use of the CWPP from its inception through mid-October 1999. As the table below indicates, during this time the department opened 424 witness protection cases, an increase of 239 percent since our February 1999 report. Of these cases, most were related to gang and narcotics activity.

TABLE

California Witness Protection Program Case Statistics

Case Statistics	Total as of 12/31/98	Total as of 10/21/99	Percent Increase
Cases opened	125	424	239%
Cases active	69	292	323%
Cases closed	56	132	136%
Number of witnesses	154	504	227%
Number of family members	207	711	243%
Number of defendants	275	789	187%

Source: The California Witness Protection Program.

The department has indicated that it spent \$843,000 through late September 1999 and committed an additional \$1,379,000 of program funds for approved cases. Program expenditures increased 223 percent from January 1999, reflecting the district attorneys' more frequent use of the program. Currently, 35 of the 58 counties in the State participate in the program. We indicated in our February 1999 report that only 25 counties were participating.

RESULTS OF OUR PRIOR AUDIT REPORT ON THE WITNESS PROTECTION PROGRAM

In February 1999, the Bureau of State Audits issued a report titled *Department of Justice: Has Taken Appropriate Steps to Implement the California Witness Protection Program, but Additional Controls Are Needed*. The report concluded that the department had already adopted important measures to establish administrative controls over the CWPP that covered both program operation and witness protection. However, the department lacked certain controls that could prevent problems from arising as the program grows.

The unique nature of the program, which allows the department to move quickly to help district attorneys' offices protect witnesses, presents special procedural problems for the department in approving witness applications and monitoring their expenses. We concluded that the CWPP lacked consistent management oversight, and that it may have insufficient staff to deal with future growth. Also, the department had not clarified certain policies or documented the bases for some program decisions. Finally, the department did not always ensure that it had all the proper supporting documents before it reimbursed district attorneys' offices for witness protection services.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The 1999-2000 Budget Act again requires us to audit the department's process for reviewing claims for the CWPP to ensure that expenditures are allowable and made for witnesses who meet all criteria for program eligibility, a mandate identical to that of our original audit. In our current audit, we examined the actions the department has taken to implement the recommendations from our February 1999 report.

In general, to determine the department's responsiveness to these recommendations and to better understand corrective actions it has taken, we reviewed its 60-day and six-month follow-up responses to our original report and interviewed program staff. For those recommendations that the department has not yet fully addressed, we determined the current status of corrective actions and the department's future plans.

For the remaining recommendations, we reviewed evidence of actions the department took and determined whether program staff complied with any changes in policy or procedure. Specifically, we reviewed the reasonableness of the workload analyses the department prepared to justify its request for additional program and audit staff. We also analyzed the related budget change proposals for completeness, reasonableness, and adequacy. Further, we examined selected witness files to determine whether the department's newly developed document checklist was included in the files and used to ensure that the department had reviewed all essential documents before it reimbursed any expenses. ■

AUDIT RESULTS

THE DEPARTMENT HAS NOT YET IMPLEMENTED FORMAL MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT

The Department of Justice (department) continues to provide only limited management oversight of the one program analyst who, until recently, was solely responsible for the direct administration of the California Witness Protection Program (CWPP). This analyst has been responsible for approving original applications and mendments, reviewing and processing claims, initiating payments, and making most decisions on program policies and procedures. The analyst also responds to all questions from the district attorneys' offices, processes all forms, tracks all ledgers and accounts, and maintains all program records. Usually, no other department employee reviews the applications and claims. Upon the analyst's request, a manager may get involved when extenuating circumstances arise or when additional expertise is needed for decisions on certain cases; however, there is no routine management review or approval of cases.

Management only gets involved with unusual or extremely sensitive cases.

In our February 1999 report, we concluded that a more formal management review procedure would assist in further ensuring the accuracy of the work and relieve concerns that inadvertent mistakes or judgment errors might go undetected. For the time being, the department has plans to initiate a peer review of some of the program analyst's work, and is further exploring the feasibility of implementing a management review of the program. To aid in the proposed peer review and to assist the program analyst with the program's daily functions, the department authorized a second analyst position on a temporary basis. This position was recently filled by a part-time retired annuitant. Once the analyst is trained, the department hopes to have the second analyst review the original analyst's work on applications.

The department cites limited program resources as the rationale for not implementing a formal management review. Meanwhile, management only remains involved with issues and decisions for cases that are unusual or extremely sensitive. While a peer review could help in detecting errors or omissions, a formal management review remains a more prudent control. In administering a program where individual judgment determines

whether an application is accepted, a transaction is appropriate, or an expense is reimbursed, an individual in a supervisory role should be more routinely involved in ensuring that staff follow procedures and exercise appropriate judgment. Such a control procedure provides a stronger safeguard necessary in ensuring the accuracy of the work and decreasing the likelihood of errors.

USING THE NEW CHECKLIST SHOULD HELP TO ENSURE THE DEPARTMENT HAS ALL ESSENTIAL DOCUMENTS BEFORE IT DISBURSES PROGRAM FUNDS

We also recommended that the department deny payments on claims when crucial documents, such as applications and witness agreements, are missing or incomplete. According to the CWPP policies and procedures manual, the department should not reimburse district attorneys unless it has applications and witness agreement forms on file. However, because of the urgent nature of transactions with witnesses in criminal proceedings, the program analyst gives emergency approval by phone to allow immediate protection for these witnesses. The district attorneys' offices must then submit the necessary paperwork within five working days.

Promptly submitting documents ensures witnesses are contractually bound to comply with program requirements.

Promptly submitting the proper forms will help to ensure that the witnesses are contractually bound to comply with the program requirements for testifying or for complying with all legal obligations. However, in our prior review, we noted instances in which the department paid claims even though district attorneys had not submitted or completed all essential documents. To prevent this from happening again, the department created a checklist of crucial documents that should be kept in each case file. This document lists each required form. Staff must check whether the form has been received and filled out accurately. The checklist also reminds staff not to process reimbursement requests until district attorneys submit the completed documents.

In September 1999, the department began using the checklist for new cases. To ensure it used the checklist properly, we examined selected new witness files. Staff included a correctly completed checklist in each file and made no reimbursements without the proper documentation. If the department continues to use it properly, the checklist will provide a good control to ensure that the department has all essential documents before it expends program funds.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS REQUESTED ADDITIONAL PROGRAM AND AUDIT STAFF

The department has taken steps to find staff who can assist the CWPP primary program analyst and complete field audits of district attorneys' offices. Because the department had not trained anyone else to do the program analyst's work, but the program was expected to grow, we previously recommended that the department conduct a workload analysis to ascertain CWPP's staffing needs. We also recommended that the department find staff who could serve as backup when the primary program analyst was absent, to help prevent work backlogs and deteriorating controls and ensure that witness protection claims and reimbursements were handled expeditiously.

Similarly, we recommended that the department conduct periodic field audits to ensure that district attorneys' offices claim reimbursement for only allowable program costs and administer the program consistently. To date, the department has not performed any field audits. These audits are important to verify the propriety of claimed costs because, with the strict confidentiality requirements of the program, the district attorneys do not provide detailed invoices. Thus, the program analyst has no way of independently ensuring the propriety of expenditures or of knowing with any certainty that underlying support for the claims actually exists.

To address our recommendations, in February 1999 the department submitted a budget change proposal to the Department of Finance that requested three positions: a full-time CWPP program analyst, a part-time office assistant, and a part-time auditor. The proposal included a summary of the estimated time the program analyst spends on each approved case, but did not have similar estimates of the time required to conduct audits of district attorneys' offices. In April 1999, the Department of Finance rejected the department's requests, indicating that the absence of projections for the number of cases it expected the CWPP to receive annually made it difficult to determine appropriate staffing levels. Instead, it noted that the department already has provisional language in the Budget Act that allows funds to be transferred from local assistance to state operations for the CWPP. According to the Department of Finance, this provisional language gives the department sufficient flexibility to transfer funds supporting the requested positions on a year-to-year basis, until the workload data justifies the positions on a permanent basis.

Without workload analyses demonstrating the need for permanent staff, the Department of Finance rejected the department's request.

The department took two steps to address the Department of Finance's concerns and its own staffing needs. First, as we discussed earlier, in September 1999 it hired an analyst on a temporary basis to assist with program work. In hopes of permanently augmenting its staff, it also submitted a second budget change proposal in August 1999, which included data about the rapid increases in program participation. In this proposal, the department requested the same program staff, but asked for overtime funding to allow current staff to conduct training workshops and field audits. The department also estimated the time it would take for periodic audits of the district attorneys' offices, but did not include this workload analysis with the proposal. As of October 1999, the Department of Finance had not yet responded.

The Department's Estimates of Time Needed for Each Approved Case and for Audits Appear Reasonable

To justify the department's request for additional program staff, the program analyst performed a workload analysis and estimated the time spent on each case. Although this analysis was based on estimates rather than on documented time spent on each case, the analyst has handled every case since the inception of the program and has the experience necessary to make reasonable estimates. We think the analysis, which concludes that the program analyst spends approximately 13 hours on each approved case, is reasonable.

Given the nearly 240 percent increase in caseloads to date this year, the lack of other permanent program staff, and the current program analyst's increased use of overtime reported to us, we believe that the need for a permanent analyst is genuine. The department has not provided a specific analysis of the need for the office assistant, and we therefore are not commenting on this additional request. We also do not think that the analyst's use of overtime to give training is appropriate. With an additional analyst, one could give training during normal working hours without jeopardizing CWPP functions.

Given the 240 percent increase in caseloads this year, the need for an analyst is genuine.

We also think the assessment made by the department's audit unit that a half-time auditor could conduct 9 to 10 annual audits of district attorneys' offices and prepare related reports is reasonable; however, the department could conduct more audits if it revised its current plans for the scope of the audits. Currently, the department has proposed reviewing all cases at counties with fewer than 25 total cases. We think this is not

By revising the scope of work, the department could conduct more audits.

necessary unless conditions at a district attorney's office indicate a significant lack of adequate controls over the program. Even with a reduced number of case files examined, the auditors would be able to conclude on the adequacy of internal controls and procedures at a district attorney's office and oversee program costs. In the August budget change proposal, the department requested overtime funding, rather than an additional, part-time auditor, to cover the costs of these audits. Because it believes staff presently do not have the time to conduct field audits of the district attorneys' offices during regular working hours, the department plans to pay them overtime to get the audits done. However, we believe the department should request additional part-time staff instead of funding for overtime.

THE DEPARTMENT IS DEVELOPING A PROCESS TO RECONCILE PROGRAM AND ACCOUNTING RECORDS

The department is currently in the beginning stages of developing a process to reconcile the program records with the department's accounting records. Our prior audit revealed that a formal reconciliation process did not exist, so the program analyst had no way of knowing whether a claim was paid and if so, whether the payment was correct, prompt, or recorded accurately. A reconciliation would ensure that the department records all CWPP transactions properly and that the two sets of records agree.

The department is still planning the reconciliation. The department indicates it has assigned a software consultant to design and develop a program that will perform an electronic reconciliation. The consultant has begun to design the program and is currently working with the program analyst to convert all witness case files to a database format. Following this conversion, the consultant and the program analyst plan to test the program to ensure that the electronic reconciliation is accurate and complete and meets the program's needs.

REVISIONS TO CLARIFY THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL ARE IN PROGRESS

The department indicates it is currently in the process of amending its policies and procedures manual to ensure consistent and appropriate use of CWPP funds. During our

prior review, we determined that the department’s manual lacked clear policies covering housing and utility deposits and meal receipts. Without these policies, the district attorneys’ offices were inconsistent in managing deposits and retaining meal receipts. To clarify the accounting for these items, the department has indicated it has drafted revisions for the manual, which are awaiting management review. Because the policies are still in a draft stage, we have not reviewed them or assessed their reasonableness. The department anticipates that it will distribute the updated manual to the district attorneys’ offices in December, but in the meantime, the program analyst has been informing district attorneys by telephone how to account for these issues.

THE DEPARTMENT HAS A PROCESS FOR DOCUMENTING ITS REASONS FOR DENYING CERTAIN CASES

The department indicates it has begun to maintain written records documenting the reasons it has denied certain applicants to the CWPP. Under certain circumstances, county district attorneys request an immediate approval by telephone for CWPP funding. During our prior audit, we observed that the program analyst had not maintained any records documenting applications denied by telephone. To ensure consistency with these decisions, we recommended the department maintain written documentation of the reasons for denial. This documentation would also serve as a convenient reference upon which to base any subsequent decisions in similar cases. The department has responded to this recommendation by developing a case denial form to document all cases that it turns down. This form appears reasonable and includes space to describe details of the case and why it was denied. The form was recently completed and the department indicated that it was used to document the one case denied since that time. The program analyst hopes to eventually document all prior denials on the new form and keep all denial forms in a binder to be used as a basis for future decisions.

The department’s new case denial forms will serve as a reference for future decisions in similar cases.

THE DEPARTMENT INDICATES IT HAS PROVIDED BRIEFINGS ON TRAINING ISSUES

Although it has not conducted the training workshops we recommended, the department has indicated that it has taken

other opportunities to inform representatives from district attorneys' offices about the administration of the CWPP. In our previous audit report, we recommended that the department hold a workshop to answer questions, address and develop procedures for possible situations, and better acquaint district attorneys' offices with the program. The program analyst has identified briefings at which the department explained certain aspects of the program to the California District Attorney's Investigator's Association, the International Association of Law Enforcement Analysts, and the Santa Cruz and Santa Clara County District Attorney's Offices. Nevertheless, holding a few workshops on the CWPP open to all district attorneys' offices would allow comprehensive discussions of program issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To make certain it spends CWPP funds for only appropriate services rendered for approved witnesses, the department should take these actions:

- Establish a formal management review process for approving CWPP applications and reimbursement requests.
- Continue with plans to ensure adequate staffing for program and audit activities.
- Perform periodic field audits to ensure that district attorneys' offices are claiming only allowable costs and administering the program consistently.
- Continue with plans to develop and perform periodic reconciliations between program and accounting records to account for all CWPP transactions.
- Distribute an updated policies and procedures manual that clarifies accounting requirements for housing and utility deposits and meal receipts.
- Continue to provide district attorneys' offices with information about the CWPP and its policies and procedures and offer workshops.

We conducted this review under the authority vested in the California State Auditor by Section 8543 et seq. of the California Government Code and according to generally accepted government auditing standards. We limited our review to those areas specified in the audit scope section of this report.

Respectfully submitted,



KURT R. SJOBERG
State Auditor

Date: November 24, 1999

Staff: Lois Benson, CPA, Audit Principal
Robert A. Hughes

Agency's comments provided as text only.

Office of the Attorney General
1300 I Street, Suite 1730
Sacramento, California 95814

November 12, 1999

Mr. Kurt Sjoberg
California State Auditor
Bureau of State Audits
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Audit of the California Witness Protection Program

Dear Mr. Sjoberg:

The Department of Justice has reviewed the draft report issued by the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) regarding the California Witness Protection Program (CWPP). On behalf of Attorney General Bill Lockyer, I am responding to your recommendations as follows:

1) **Establish a formal management review process for approving CWPP applications and reimbursement requests.**

The primary CWPP analyst designed a new *Application* form and a new *List of Expenditures* form, which require review and approval by a manager. Effective December 1, 1999, a manager at the DOJ Administrator II level or above will be assigned to review and approve the agreements and the requests for reimbursement.

2) **Continue with plans to ensure adequate staffing for program and audit activities.**

A retired annuitant at the Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA) level was hired on September 1, 1999. This part-time employee does not satisfy the needs of the increasing workload. A Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for FY 2000/2001 was submitted on August 5, 1999, reiterating the need for additional staff. The request included a full-time AGPA, a part-time Office Technician (Typist), and overtime funds to

perform audit work equivalent to a half-time auditor. This BCP was again denied by the Department of Finance. The Department will explore other alternatives to fulfill this need.

3) Perform periodic field audits to ensure that district attorney's offices (DA's) are claiming only allowable costs and administering the program consistently.

BSA has indicated that the Department should reduce its sampling in order to conduct more field audits. The Department will determine the sampling size and techniques for each audit based on the risks found in the controls in place at each district attorney's office and conduct its field work accordingly. The Department does not believe that it would be cost efficient to conduct a minimum sample at those smaller agencies. For example, if the department sends an auditor to Stanislaus County, where there are 8 cases that total \$70,000, it would not be cost efficient to ask that the auditor travel to Stanislaus County to conduct 2 cases (25% sampling rate).

The BCP submitted by this department for overtime funds has been denied by the Department of Finance. Resources will be redirected to provide for a full-time auditor to work half-time on the CWPP audits.

4) Continue with plans to develop and perform periodic reconciliations between program and accounting records to account for all CWPP transactions.

A software consultant was assigned by the Department's Hawkins Data Center to design and develop a Microsoft Access program that will electronically reconcile funds between the Department's Accounting Office and the CWPP. The software consultant is 99 percent completed with the design of the program. All CWPP Microsoft Excel files have been transferred to the Access database and are currently being checked for accuracy. This transfer is 95 percent completed. On November 15, 1999, the software consultant will complete the last phase of the project, which will tie all CWPP data to a central Department database. At that point, both systems will run consecutively for two months to ensure the new Access database is functioning correctly. At the end of the second month, the program will start monthly reconciliations with Accounting.

5) Distribute an updated policies and procedures manual that clarifies accounting requirements for housing and utility deposits and meal receipts.

The CWPP manual has been revised to clarify issues regarding housing deposits, utility deposits, and meal receipts and is pending management review. In the interim, agencies have been notified (telephonically) and given clarification on properly accounting for these issues. The revised manual is anticipated to be printed in December 1999 and distributed immediately thereafter. A letter will accompany each updated manual highlighting the changes especially regarding housing and utility deposits.

6) **Continue to provide district attorney's offices with information about the CWPP and its policies and procedures and to offer workshops.**

The primary CPP analyst continues to give presentations to law enforcement agencies and organizations when time permits. Continued utilization of this analyst to create and implement the recommended workshops causes the program to modify operations during this time, thus creating a hazardous situation for witnesses. Even though a retired annuitant secondary analyst has been hired, that analyst is half-time and on a special conversion project, thereby not available for 100 percent backup in the absence of the primary analyst. However, it is the goal of this program to offer training workshops when additional staffing needs are met. That goal was mentioned in a BCP for FY 2000/2001 reiterating the need for additional staff – including a full-time AGPA; however, that BCP was denied by the Department of Finance.

Sincerely,

(Signed by: Steve Coony)

STEVE COONY, Chief Deputy
Administration and Policy

For BILL LOCKYER
Attorney General

cc: Martin Ryan, Bureau of Investigation
Georgia Fong, Program Evaluation and Audits Section

cc: Members of the Legislature
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Attorney General
State Controller
Legislative Analyst
Assembly Office of Research
Senate Office of Research
Assembly Majority/Minority Consultants
Senate Majority/Minority Consultants
Capitol Press Corps