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.
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I. SUMMARY OF AUDITOR’S RESULTS

Financial Statements

Type of report the auditor issued on whether the financial statements audited were prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles: **Unmodified**

Internal control over financial reporting:
- Material weaknesses identified? **No**
- Significant deficiencies identified? **Yes**

Noncompliance material to the financial statements noted? **No**

Federal Awards

Internal control over major programs:
- Material weaknesses identified? **No**
- Significant deficiencies identified? **None reported**

Type of auditor’s report issued on compliance for major federal programs: **Unmodified**

Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with 2 CFR 200.516(a)? **No**

The major federal program is:

- Highway Planning and Construction | CFDA No. 20.205

The threshold for distinguishing between Types A and B programs was $750,000.

Martin County qualified as a low-risk auditee? **No**
II. FINDINGS RELATED TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AUDITED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

INTERNAL CONTROL

PREVIOUSLY REPORTED ITEM NOT RESOLVED

Finding 2013-001

Audit Adjustments

Criteria: A deficiency in internal control over financial reporting exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements of the financial statements on a timely basis.

Condition: During our audit, we proposed audit adjustments that resulted in significant changes to Martin County’s financial statements. The adjustments were reviewed and approved by the appropriate staff and are reflected in the financial statements.

Context: The non-detection of misstatements in the financial statements increases the likelihood that the financial statements would not be fairly presented. These adjustments were found in the audit; however, independent external auditors cannot be considered part of the County’s internal control.

Effect: The following significant audit adjustments were necessary to be recorded for December 31, 2015:

- Conservation expenditures and special assessment revenue in the Ditch Special Revenue Fund were increased by $395,855 for an adjustment that was entered backwards.

- Unassigned fund balance of $105,856 in the Human Services Special Revenue Fund was reclassified to committed fund balance.

- Town road allotment expenditures of $418,592 in the Road and Bridge Special Revenue Fund were reclassified from construction and engineering expenditures to intergovernmental expenditures.

- Net investment in capital assets net position was increased by $1,247,594 for the 2015 changes to capital assets.

- Net position restricted for debt service was reduced by $1,688,396 for the unspent bond proceeds at year-end.
Cause: Procedures are not in place to consider the full extent of all entries needed for financial reporting. The County stated it did not have adequate procedures in place which allowed for further review of account balances and supporting documentation.

Recommendation: We recommend the County review internal controls currently in place and design and implement procedures to improve internal controls over financial reporting to ensure the County’s annual financial statements are reported in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Client’s Response:

The County will review procedures related to internal controls over financial reporting to include a review of balances and supporting documentation by another qualified individual to identify potential misstatements.

III. FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS FOR FEDERAL AWARD PROGRAMS

None.

IV. OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. MINNESOTA LEGAL COMPLIANCE

PREVIOUSLY REPORTED ITEM NOT RESOLVED

Finding 2005-003

Individual Ditch System Deficits

Criteria: Drainage system costs are required by Minn. Stat. § 103E.655 to be paid from the ditch system account for which the costs are being incurred. If money is not available in the drainage system account on which the warrant is drawn, this statute allows for loans to be made from ditch systems with surplus funds or from the General Fund to a ditch system with insufficient cash to pay expenditures. Such loans must be paid back with interest.

Additionally, ditch systems should be maintained with a positive individual fund balance to meet financial obligations.

Condition: The County had individual ditch systems with deficit cash balances and deficit fund balances at December 31, 2015.
Context: At December 31, 2015, 41 ditch systems had negative cash balances totaling $2,140,687, and 21 ditch systems had deficit fund balances totaling $1,901,790.

Effect: The County is not in compliance with Minnesota statutes by having ditch systems with negative cash balances. Ditch systems with deficit fund balances indicate that measures have not been taken to ensure that the ditch system can meet financial obligations.

Cause: With regard to the cash deficits, expenditures have been made from ditch systems with insufficient cash to cover the expenditures. Deficit fund balances are, for the most part, a result of significant project costs for which approval of special assessments are pending completion of bonding and petition processes.

Recommendation: We recommend the County eliminate the cash deficits by borrowing from eligible funds with surplus cash balances under Minn. Stat. § 103E.655. Additionally, deficit fund balances should be eliminated as necessary by levying the special assessments whenever practical.

Client’s Response:

The County will continue to review and improve the levying process to better estimate and levy for future repairs and improvements on individual ditch systems.

B. MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

PREVIOUSLY REPORTED ITEM RESOLVED

Human Services Special Revenue Fund Deficit Fund Balance (2013-002)

The Human Services Special Revenue Fund had a deficit fund balance at December 31, 2014, of $224,494.

Resolution

At December 31, 2015, the Human Services Special Revenue Fund reported a positive fund balance of $105,856.
REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING
AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN
AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN
ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

Independent Auditor’s Report

Board of County Commissioners
Martin County
Fairmont, Minnesota

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of Martin County, Minnesota, as of and for the year ended December 31, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the County’s basic financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated July 14, 2016.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered Martin County’s internal control over financial reporting to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the County’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the County’s internal control over financial reporting.

A deficiency in internal control over financial reporting exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the County’s financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A
significant deficiency is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and, therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. Given these limitations, during our audit, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified. We did identify a deficiency in internal control over financial reporting, described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as item 2013-001, that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

**Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether Martin County’s financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

**Minnesota Legal Compliance**

The *Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Counties*, promulgated by the State Auditor pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 6.65, contains seven categories of compliance to be tested in connection with the audit of the County’s financial statements: contracting and bidding, deposits and investments, conflicts of interest, public indebtedness, claims and disbursements, miscellaneous provisions, and tax increment financing. Our audit considered all of the listed categories, except that we did not test for compliance with the provisions for tax increment financing because the County has no tax increment financing.

In connection with our audit, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that Martin County failed to comply with the provisions of the *Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Counties*, except as described in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs as item 2005-003. However, our audit was not directed primarily toward obtaining knowledge of such noncompliance. Accordingly, had we performed additional procedures, other matters may have come to our attention regarding the County’s noncompliance with the above referenced provisions.
Martin County’s Response to Findings

Martin County’s responses to the internal control and legal compliance findings identified in our audit have been included in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs. The County’s responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and, accordingly, we express no opinion on them.

Purpose of This Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting, compliance, and the provisions of the Minnesota Legal Compliance Audit Guide for Counties and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the County’s internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the County’s internal control over financial reporting and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

/s/Rebecca Otto             /s/Greg Hierlinger
REBECCA OTTO                GREG HIERLINGER, CPA
STATE AUDITOR               DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

July 14, 2016
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Independent Auditor’s Report

Board of County Commissioners
Martin County
Fairmont, Minnesota

Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program

We have audited Martin County’s compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Compliance Supplement that could have a direct and material effect on the County’s major federal program for the year ended December 31, 2015. Martin County’s major federal program is identified in the Summary of Auditor’s Results section of the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.

Management’s Responsibility
Management is responsible for compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of its federal awards applicable to its federal programs.

Auditor’s Responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for Martin County’s major federal program based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the audit requirements of Title 2 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance). Those standards and the Uniform Guidance require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred.
An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about Martin County’s compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for the major federal program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the County’s compliance with those requirements.

**Opinion on the Major Federal Program**

In our opinion, Martin County complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program for the year ended December 31, 2015.

**Report on Internal Control Over Compliance**

Management of Martin County is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the County’s internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on the major federal program to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for the major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Uniform Guidance, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the County’s internal control over compliance.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit the attention of those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.
We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of Martin County, Minnesota, as of and for the year ended December 31, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the County’s basic financial statements. We have issued our report thereon dated July 14, 2016, which contained unmodified opinions on those financial statements. Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise Martin County’s basic financial statements. The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) as required by Title 2 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance) is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. The SEFA is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the SEFA is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

Purpose of This Report

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of the Uniform Guidance. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

/s/Rebecca Otto                        /s/Greg Hierlinger

REBECCA OTTO  GREG HIERLINGER, CPA
STATE AUDITOR  DEPUTY STATE AUDITOR

July 14, 2016
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Grantor</th>
<th>Pass-Through Agency</th>
<th>Federal CFDA Grant Number</th>
<th>Pass-Through Grant Numbers</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Commerce</td>
<td>Passed Through Blue Earth County, Minnesota State and Local Implementation Grant Program</td>
<td>11.549</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
<td>Passed Through Minnesota Department ofPublic Safety Juvenile Accountability Block Grants</td>
<td>16.523</td>
<td>F-T2JABG-2015-MARTINCO-4424</td>
<td>$29,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.575</td>
<td>F-CVS-2015-MARTINVS-5323</td>
<td>15,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program</td>
<td>16.738</td>
<td>F-YIP-2014-MARTPROB-5113</td>
<td>38,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$82,924</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Passed Through Minnesota Department of Transportation Highway Planning and Construction</td>
<td>20.205</td>
<td>00046</td>
<td>$1,422,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formula Grants for Rural Areas</td>
<td>20.509</td>
<td>AGR#07193</td>
<td>268,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,691,241</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services</td>
<td>Passed Through Minnesota Department of Education Grants to States</td>
<td>45.310</td>
<td>E3701</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed Through Minnesota Department of Public Safety Emergency Management Performance Grants</td>
<td>97.042</td>
<td>F-EMPG-2015-MARTINCO-1132</td>
<td>22,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed Through Blue Earth County, Minnesota Homeland Security Grant Program (Total Homeland Security Grant Program 97.067 $4,003)</td>
<td>97.067</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passed Through Murray County, Minnesota Homeland Security Grant Program (Total Homeland Security Grant Program 97.067 $4,003)</td>
<td>97.067</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Homeland Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$32,278</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Federal Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,813,378</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The County did not pass any federal awards through to subrecipients during the year ended December 31, 2015.

The notes to the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards are an integral part of this schedule.
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1. Reporting Entity

The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards presents the activities of federal award programs expended by Martin County. The County’s reporting entity is defined in Note 1 to the financial statements.

2. Basis of Presentation

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards includes the federal grant activity of Martin County under programs of the federal government for the year ended December 31, 2015. The information in this schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of Title 2 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance). Because the schedule presents only a selected portion of the operations of Martin County, it is not intended to and does not present the financial position or changes in net position of Martin County.

3. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Expenditures reported on the schedule are reported on the modified accrual basis of accounting. Such expenditures are recognized following, as applicable, either the cost principles contained in OMB Circular A-87, Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments, or the cost principles contained in the Uniform Guidance, wherein certain types of expenditures are not allowable or are limited as to reimbursement. Martin County has elected to not use the 10 percent de minimis indirect cost rate allowed under the Uniform Guidance.

4. Reconciliation to Schedule of Intergovernmental Revenues

Federal grant revenue per Schedule of Intergovernmental Revenues $ 1,811,863
Grants received more than 60 days after year-end, unavailable in 2015
Formula Grants for Rural Areas $ 69,015
Unavailable in 2014, recognized as revenue in 2015
Formula Grants for Rural Areas (44,897)
Emergency Management Performance Grants (22,603)

Expenditures Per Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards $ 1,813,378