

STATE OF MINNESOTA

Office of the State Auditor



Rebecca Otto
State Auditor

LAKES AREA DRUG INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION
BRAINERD, MINNESOTA

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

November 21, 2016

Description of the Office of the State Auditor

The mission of the Office of the State Auditor is to oversee local government finances for Minnesota taxpayers by helping to ensure financial integrity and accountability in local governmental financial activities.

Through financial, compliance, and special audits, the State Auditor oversees and ensures that local government funds are used for the purposes intended by law and that local governments hold themselves to the highest standards of financial accountability.

The State Auditor performs approximately 150 financial and compliance audits per year and has oversight responsibilities for over 3,300 local units of government throughout the state. The office currently maintains five divisions:

Audit Practice - conducts financial and legal compliance audits of local governments;

Government Information - collects and analyzes financial information for cities, towns, counties, and special districts;

Legal/Special Investigations - provides legal analysis and counsel to the Office and responds to outside inquiries about Minnesota local government law; as well as investigates allegations of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in local government;

Pension - monitors investment, financial, and actuarial reporting for approximately 700 public pension funds; and

Tax Increment Financing - promotes compliance and accountability in local governments' use of tax increment financing through financial and compliance audits.

The State Auditor serves on the State Executive Council, State Board of Investment, Land Exchange Board, Public Employees Retirement Association Board, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, and the Rural Finance Authority Board.

Office of the State Auditor
525 Park Street, Suite 500
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55103
(651) 296-2551
state.auditor@osa.state.mn.us
www.auditor.state.mn.us

This document can be made available in alternative formats upon request. Call 651-296-2551 [voice] or 1-800-627-3529 [relay service] for assistance; or visit the Office of the State Auditor's web site: www.auditor.state.mn.us.

**LAKES AREA DRUG INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION
BRAINERD, MINNESOTA**

November 21, 2016



Agreed-Upon Procedures

**Audit Practice Division
Office of the State Auditor
State of Minnesota**

This page was left blank intentionally.



REBECCA OTTO
STATE AUDITOR

STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR

SUITE 500
525 PARK STREET
SAINT PAUL, MN 55103-2139

(651) 296-2551 (Voice)
(651) 296-4755 (Fax)
state.auditor@state.mn.us (E-mail)
1-800-627-3529 (Relay Service)

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Ms. Kristin Lail, Program Administrator
Minnesota Department of Public Safety

Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division
Oversight Committee

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division, solely to assist you in determining that the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division has appropriate practices implemented to ensure assets are adequately safeguarded and controlled and the chain of custody for seized property is documented and provides for adequate security and accountability from intake to disposition. These procedures were applied to the records of the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division originating with confidential/buy fund activity during the 12-month period ending December 31, 2015. The Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division's management is responsible for the records of the Investigative Division. This engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

1. Procedure

Determine that the use of confidential/buy funds is adequately documented on expense reports.

Findings

We obtained a list of all confidential/buy fund transactions for the 12-month period ending December 31, 2015. We selected four transactions, concentrating on funds used for a buy/bust; investigator purchase of illegal drugs, contraband, or other evidence of

criminal activity; and payments made directly to informants for drugs, as these activities would be the most likely to also involve seized property. We reviewed the expense reports for the selected transactions. All items tested were adequately documented.

2. Procedure

Determine that adequate documentation exists to support the chain of custody for seized property, including a detailed inventory of property seized before being secured in storage, proper accounting of currency seized, and clear identification of storage location and inventory number.

Findings

The case files associated with the confidential/buy fund transactions selected for testing were identified. We reviewed all the seized property from the initial buy and any related search warrants associated with each case. This consisted of a total of eight buys and two search warrants. We traced the documentation of the activity for each seized item from the point of seizure to its inventory barcode number to its current location. For one of the four case files tested, a copy of the hand-written evidence receipt was not retained in the case file. Adequate documentation supported the chain of custody for all other seized items tested.

3. Procedure

Determine that controls at property storage locations meet best practice standards.

Findings

We were escorted by the evidence custodian through the Crow Wing County evidence room, which is the only location used by the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division, and reviewed the controls in place considering such things as physical access, controlled security, and property and custody tracking records. We noted the following issues during our review:

- The property room does not have enhanced security storage procedures in place for jewelry, instead it is stored with general evidence;
- When evidence is to be destroyed, the practice is to obtain approval, update the system to note the item as destroyed, and drugs are placed in a barrel for future destruction. However, the documentation process does not identify when the specific item was actually destroyed and by what method; and
- There is no periodic monitoring of the property room and its records by someone other than the custodian of the property room to verify that items are located where they should be or were properly disposed of.

Other controls noted for property storage met best practice standards.

4. Procedure

Determine that property exists in storage or was properly disposed of.

Findings

For all of the seized property items associated with the four cases selected for testing, we verified that the item was located in storage where it was noted in the tracking system, appropriately returned to the owner, or properly disposed of, as applicable. The necessary approvals and documentation were reviewed to verify the proper treatment. No exceptions were noted for the items tested.

5. Procedure

Determine that forfeitures were properly reported to the Office of the State Auditor.

Findings

For the seized property items associated with the four cases selected for testing, we verified that the items were properly determined to be a forfeiture or not by the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division. No forfeiture items were noted in our sample; therefore, there was no information to verify with the Office of the State Auditor's Government Information Division.

* * * * *

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and the Lakes Area Drug Investigative Division and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than those specified parties.

/s/Rebecca Otto

REBECCA OTTO
STATE AUDITOR

/s/Greg Hierlinger

GREG HIERLINGER, CPA
DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

November 21, 2016