



Office of Inspector General

FDLE Armory Audit

Project Number IG-0058

June 2016

Service ★ Integrity ★ Respect ★ Quality



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This review of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) Armory was initiated in accordance with the Office of Inspector General's Fiscal Year 2014–2015 Audit Plan. The purpose of conducting this review was to determine if internal controls over firearms and equipment tracking were adequate and to examine current FDLE policy and procedures to determine what process improvements could be made to ensure the accuracy of agency property records.

This review has identified opportunities to improve accountability, enhance controls, and reduce the potential for theft and misuse of agency assets. Additionally, this review recommends changes to current FDLE policy and procedures that will require statewide implementation and training of Armory personnel and other affected members.

As summarized below, several areas related to the functions of the Armory and Armory personnel need to be addressed:

Finding 1: *FDLE does not have an accurate inventory of armory items.*

Finding 2: *FLAIR property records are not timely updated when a member retires and may include weapons that are no longer FDLE property.*

Finding 3: *Position descriptions of members serving as regional armorers do not list time or responsibilities dedicated to armorer duties and functions.*

Finding 4: *The process for purchasing training and duty ammunition is not documented in agency policy or procedure.*

Finding 5: *Armory inspections are not consistently conducted in accordance with the Regional Armory Inspection Schedule.*

Finding 6: *Weapon inspection forms are not consistently completed or maintained by designated armory personnel.*

Finding 7: *There is no documented accountability of who has access and who enters the off-site warehouse, nor is there any FDLE oversight of who is issued a key to the equipment storage room.*



BACKGROUND

The FDLE Armory Section is responsible for ensuring the efficient distribution and safe operation of FDLE weapons and equipment. Armory personnel review, test, evaluate, and maintain the equipment for all sworn members. Additionally, they coordinate the purchase and inventory of the department's weapons, ammunition, and ballistic vests. All new sworn members receive their initial equipment through the Armory.

Organizational Structure:

The FDLE Armory Section is organizationally situated in the Professionalism Division. Prior to February 2015, the armory was located in the FDLE Investigations & Forensic Science (IFS) Division, Office of Field Services, and Special Agent Training Academy. The armory is one of the three components of the Special Agent Training Academy; the other two components are Special Agent Training Classes and In-service Sworn Training.

Department/Regional Armors:

Per FDLE Policy 4.1 - *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics*, one member in Headquarters is designated the Department Armorer. The Department Armorer reports to the Special Agent Supervisor in the Professionalism Division. Each FDLE regional operations center (ROC) has an Armory and a designated regional armorer who reports to their respective regional Special Agent Supervisor. In addition to their sworn job duties, regional armorers perform many of the duties of the Department Armorer for their fellow ROC members.

Weapons Inventory Process:

Armorers interviewed do not physically conduct inventories of the weapons maintained in their respective armory locations. The armorers rely on their regional property coordinator to access FLAIR¹ to verify their assigned property inventory on an as-needed basis and during the agency's annual physical property inventory.

Pursuant to the FDLE General Services Manual, a physical inventory of all agency property is conducted once each fiscal year. The annual physical inventory is typically performed during the first quarter of the calendar year. The inventory coordinator and inventory delegate in each agency division/region utilize the barcode scanning inventory system to ascertain whether property is located as specified in the FLAIR property records. At the end of the inventory process, the Inventory Results Report is produced and filed with the Commissioner by June 30 of each year.

Training:

FDLE utilizes the Pathlore/Learning Management System (LMS) as a repository for member training records. Training qualification records for sworn members are completed by regional training instructors and entered into Pathlore/LMS database by the regional training instructor or the regional training liaisons. The Pathlore/LMS database is accessible by authorized members statewide, therefore eliminating the need to physically transfer training qualifications records upon a sworn member's transfer.

¹ Florida Accounting Information Resource (FLAIR) Property Subsystem is the primary tool used by State of Florida agencies to generate and maintain detailed property records for the accounting and management of tangible property items.



The Department Armorer completes an annual review of firearm training qualification records in Pathlore/LMS and provides written notification to the Commissioner and management of all members who did not complete department mandated training requirements.



FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1: *FDLE does not have an accurate inventory of armory items.*

The Department Armorer (Armorer), as well as regional armorers, relies on FLAIR to account for the Department's weapon inventory. However, the inventory is not accurate as there is no formalized process for the armorers to notify their property custodian to modify FLAIR records.

At FDLE, FLAIR is maintained by the agency's Property Custodian for the inventory and assignment of agency property. The Property Custodian is responsible for keeping track of assets and ensuring the assets have complete accounting and non-accounting information. FDLE also designates Regional Property Coordinators to perform Department property record maintenance in coordination with the Property Custodian.

Policy 4.1, *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics*, states in part: "The Department Armorer will maintain an inventory listing the type, description, identifying model and serial number of each firearm, as well as the identity of the authorized user."

Current FDLE policy does not identify a procedure for conducting a property inventory specific to the armories. The armorers rely on FLAIR to account for the weapons type, description, and serial number and do not physically conduct inventories of weapons maintained in their respective armory locations. In addition to weapons, the armories are comprised of other items such as: ammunition, holsters, body gear, protective vests, tools and replacement parts needed for weapon repair, which are not tracked or accounted for in FLAIR, nor during the annual Department inventory.

Armorers rely on their regional property coordinators to modify FLAIR records as property items are transferred into and out of their respective armories. The form used to document when a weapon has been issued from or returned to an armory is the FDLE Armory Transaction Form. This one-page form is a three-part carbon document that is completed and signed by the Armorer (or regional armorers). The form is labelled to indicate the white copy is kept in the armory, the yellow copy forwarded to the Property Coordinator, and the pink copy given to the agent (member).

However, interviews with regional armorers revealed not all agency armorers are familiar with this form. The form was not always completed, and record modifications were not always done or were not completed timely. In addition, this form is not referenced in policy or procedure, nor reflected in the FDLE Forms Library.

The OIG conducted on-site physical inventories at several agency armories. In an effort to determine what should be located in the armory, property records were exported from FLAIR via the Open Reports² database based on the region or location. Due to variations in which the property description and assignment was recorded in FLAIR, numerous methods were queried in order to capture the weapons believed to be assigned to a specific armory, (e.g. items assigned to the specific Armory location, items assigned to an armorer by name, armorers' name spelling variations, and items assigned to a former armorer of a specific armory).

² Open Reports is a repository of FDLE property records extracted from FLAIR; with read-only accessibility for authorized members.



A summary of the results of the OIG on-site inventory of weapons at each armory location is reflected below. The table depicts the number of weapons assigned to the specific armory location based on the property record in FLAIR.

Location	Date of Inventory	Weapons Assigned per FLAIR	Weapons Located	Weapons Not Located	Additional Weapons Located*
Pat Thomas Warehouse**	12/1/2014	0	0	0	7
HQ Armory	12/2/2014	578	349	229	19
POS/Capitol	12/3/2014	26	23	3	1
TROC / Special Operations Team North Cage	12/3/2014	35	18	17	22
JROC	12/9/2014	45	30	15	31
PROC	12/18/2014	28	18	10	8
TOTAL:		712	438	274	88

NOTE: * Additional weapons inventoried were identified as agency weapons not assigned to that armory location in FLAIR, as well as members' weapons being stored for safekeeping.

** To date, there is no specific assignment or location designation in FLAIR for the Pat Thomas Warehouse location. The seven weapons inventoried at the Pat Thomas Warehouse were included in the 229 reflected in FLAIR as being assigned to "Armory/Gaynor."

Additionally, due to the manner in which property records were completed in FLAIR, (e.g. assigned to an armorer by name only), some of the weapons referenced above as not accounted for during the on-site inventories were determined to be assigned to and in the possession of the named armorer for job duty.

As a result of the property transfers not being properly documented in FLAIR, records for several weapons identified as being assigned to the armorer/armory were incorrect, (e.g. weapons had been provided to members for current job duty, were still assigned to former members, or were assigned to another armorer). Without an accurate property inventory, the agency cannot account for the location and assignment of weapons at any given time. Also, without consistent use of the FDLE Armory Transaction Form, the agency's Property Custodian cannot keep property records up-to-date.

Recommendations

- 1) We recommend management consider creating or obtaining an electronic inventory system that can be utilized by all agency armorers to accurately and timely document the assignment and location of agency weapons and the other items in their armories.
- 2) If management decides to continue using FLAIR as the database to track armory inventory, we recommended that the armorers conduct periodic inventories of their armories and off-site locations, as the physical accountability of weapons is currently limited to review during the Department's annual property inventory process.



- 3) In order to allow for easier tracking and reporting of weapons, we recommend management ensure that weapon information is consistently entered into the selected inventory tracking database, (e.g. item description, member assignment and regional location).
- 4) We recommend management document the use of the FDLE Armory Transaction Form, the process of property transfers, and the modifications of property records involving the armorer, regional property coordinators and the FDLE Property Custodian in policy or procedure.
- 5) We recommend that armorers utilize the FDLE Armory Transaction Form to document all armory firearm transactions and facilitate the notification of property changes to their appropriate property coordinator. Armorers should also ensure that FLAIR is timely updated to reflect changes to the armory inventory.
- 6) Consideration should also be given to enhancements to the FDLE Armory Transaction Form and integrating the form into an electronic format for accessibility in the FDLE Forms Library.

Finding 2: *FLAIR property records are not timely updated when a member retires and may include weapons that are no longer FDLE property.*

Upon retirement, a sworn member may request to be presented with his/her department-issued handgun and/or credentials. However, there is no documented or consistently followed process of notifying the FDLE Property Custodian of the need to delete the property record from FLAIR. Often, notification of the need to delete a retiree's weapon from FLAIR is discovered during the Department's annual physical inventory.

FDLE Policy 3.13, *Personnel Records*, references the FDLE Member Out-Processing Checklist, (Form OHR-067), which is used to outline the duties of supervisors and the Office of Human Resources (OHR) when a member separates from the agency. The Out-Processing Checklist references FDLE Form OHR-062, the Acknowledgement of Conditions of Receipt for Handgun and/or Credentials Form.

FDLE Form OHR-062 is generated when a sworn member requests to be presented with his/her department-issued handgun and/or credentials upon retirement. The form is routed to the armorer to verify the weapon's FDLE property number, and to OHR for verification of the members' retirement or separation status, prior to being routed to the Commissioner's Office for approval or denial. The completed form is maintained in the member's personnel file in the OHR. There is no documented process for the form to be routed to the FDLE Property Custodian.

Without a formalized process to notify the FDLE Property Custodian of the need to delete agency property records, weapons released to retirees as personal property are technically considered agency property, and property records in FLAIR will be inaccurate until the property record is deleted.



Recommendation

- 1) We recommend management revise Form OHR-062, referenced in Policy 4.1, *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics*, to require the OHR representative to route the approved Form OHR-062 to the FDLE Property Custodian in order to timely delete the weapon property record from FLAIR.

Finding 3: Position descriptions of members serving as regional armorers do not list time or responsibilities dedicated to armorer duties and functions.

In accordance with FDLE Policy 3.3 - *Member Performance and Employment Status*, major duties and responsibilities for a specific position should be documented in a member's position description.

The FDLE Armorer is located in Headquarters. The duties and responsibilities to be performed by the Armorer are located in FDLE Policy 4.1 - *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics*. Those duties and responsibilities are outlined in the Armorer's official position description, and include: inspect and maintain all weapons used by FDLE members, repair agency-owned weapons, order weapons and parts for FDLE, continually test and evaluate weapons, gear and ammunition, and to maintain records on all weapons and Special Agent qualifications.

In addition to the Armorer, each FDLE ROC has designated regional armorers who perform duties and functions comparable to the Armorer. However, the position descriptions of members designated as regional armorers do not include the armorer duties and functions they perform, and there is no centralized oversight for regional armorers.

Without an accurate and official position description, designated regional armorers cannot be held accountable or fairly credited for their job performance. The lack of centralized oversight may result in inconsistencies of records maintenance, safety or liability concerns, best practices in industry standards, and compliance with agency policy.

Recommendation

- 1) We recommend the position description for each designated regional armorer be reviewed and modified to include armorer duties and responsibilities.

Finding 4: The process for purchasing training and duty ammunition is not documented in agency policy or procedure.

Management has not formally documented the needs analysis and ammunition purchase processes for training and duty in a policy or procedure.

Currently a few members assigned to the sworn training/armory function in Headquarters have access to the rudimentary formula and spreadsheets used to calculate the customary amount of ammunition needed for agency-wide training and duty per sworn member, per year.

Policy 4.1, *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics*, states in part that all ammunition used will be factory service or training ammunition purchased from state contract or by purchase



order for specific purposes or assignments. All ammunition purchased will be with approval of the Department Armorer.

Without a documented process for ammunition analysis, ammunition supply could be in excess or depleted if orders are not accurately calculated based on the ongoing needs of the agency. Also, the lack of oversight could result in a risk of theft or misuse of agency property.

Recommendations

- 1) We recommend management review for accuracy the existing document used for the analysis of ammunition needs and purchases.
- 2) We recommend management consider incorporating the agency's needs analysis and the processes for purchasing training and duty ammunition in a formal procedure or policy.

Finding 5: Armory inspections are not consistently conducted in accordance with the Regional Armory Inspection Schedule.

The FDLE IFS, Office of Field Services, Armory Section webpage states the Armory reviews, tests, evaluates and maintains the special agents' equipment. The Regional Armory Inspection Schedule indicates inspections are to occur in Headquarters and in the Orlando, Miami and Tampa Bay Regional Operations Center (ROC) in the even years and at the Capitol Police, Pensacola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville and Fort Myers ROC in the odd years. There is no process that explains how the inspections are to be conducted.

Armorers revealed they do not routinely conduct inspections of armory weapons or their respective armory facility. Based on interviews with Headquarter armory personnel and regional armorers, the last weapon inspections were conducted in 2013; however, no documentation was maintained as to which regional operations centers were visited. Many armorers rely on information regarding weapons to be documented during sworn members' line inspections conducted by supervisory agents, or they assess the needs of their armory facility and armory weapons as needed during their day-to-day duties. Without adherence to the documented schedule of when to conduct inspections, the agency is not in compliance with its own guidance document.

Recommendations

- 1) We recommend management ensure scheduled armory inspections are conducted.
- 2) We recommend management formally document the inspection process in policy or procedure.

Finding 6: Weapon inspection forms are not consistently completed or maintained by designated armory personnel.

The FDLE IFS Division, Office of Field Services, Armory Section webpage provides a link to four weapon inspection forms, (e.g. Glock, Shotgun, AR15/M16 and Heckler & Koch MP5/G3), to be



utilized by agency armory personnel during regional armory inspections, in-service sworn training or as needed to document the condition, functionality and repair of agency-owned weapons.

Policy 4.1 - *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics* states the Department Armorer is responsible for inspecting all approved department-issued firearms through the use of armorer inspection forms that meet manufacturer specifications. Additionally, policy states all repairs will be documented on armory inspection forms and stored by the department armorer.

Based on interviews with armorers in the regions visited, it appears that they do not have a clear understanding of when to use weapon inspection forms. The armorers' understanding of the purpose of weapon inspection forms vary in that some stated inspection forms are not needed for newly purchased weapons being issued for duty, while others stated the form is only generated to document weapon repairs. Other armorers understood the forms were generated during regional inspections of weapons conducted by Armory staff in Headquarters.

This lack of consistency in the process of inspecting and documenting the condition, functionality and repair of agency-owned weapons could result in a liability to the agency.

Recommendation

- 1) We recommend management consider modification to Policy 4.1 to reflect any armory personnel involved in the distribution, collection, inspection or repair of agency-owned weapons and personally-owned weapons be responsible for completing and maintaining weapon inspection forms. This revision would apply to high-liability firearm instructors during in-service sworn training and to members who perform armorer-related duties in the regional operation centers.

Finding 7: *There is no documented accountability of who has access and who enters the off-site warehouse, nor is there FDLE oversight of who is issued a key to the equipment storage room.*

The department utilizes a secured off-site warehouse to store agency-owned weapons, ammunition and duty-related equipment for use by sworn members working in or near the Tallahassee, Florida area, (e.g. members assigned to Headquarters, the Tallahassee Regional Operations Center, Protective Operations Section and the Capitol Police division). This warehouse is located at the Florida Public Safety Institute (also referred to as the Pat Thomas Warehouse/Range).

FDLE Armory personnel have provided the combination to the padlock to numerous members responsible for conducting high-liability training in order to obtain items necessary for training from the warehouse. The warehouse also has a secured room that contains a gun safe, ammunition and duty-related equipment. The gun safe combination is limited to three sworn members who have an authorized, job-specific need to know.

The understanding as to who has access or does not have access to the secured warehouse locations varies. There is no documented accountability of who enters the off-site warehouse, and FDLE has no oversight of who is issued a key to the equipment storage room as the keys are issued by the Florida Public Safety Institute staff. Further, documentation as to who controls



access to keys or the process of returning a key is lacking. Any potential security breach could result in the agency's inventory being damaged, misused or stolen.

Policy 1.4 - *Use of FDLE Resources* states in part that misuse of FDLE resources, including facilities, will subject a member to loss of the resource, disciplinary action and/or criminal prosecution. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring members under their supervision are in compliance with this policy.

Recommendation

- 1) We recommend, in accordance with Policy 1.4, management consider implementing a process to document who should have continued authorized access to the secured off-site storage facility, and to inform the Public Safety Institute staff of needed adjustments accordingly. A periodic review of the access list should also be conducted.



OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the FDLE Armory Audit were to evaluate the adequacy of the internal controls over firearms and equipment tracking and:

- To determine if Department Armory assets are accounted for and properly tracked.
- To determine if agency weapons are obtained, distributed, maintained, and disposed of in accordance with agency policy.
- To determine the accuracy of FDLE's weapons records.
- To identify efficiencies and/or cost savings.

The scope of this audit included examination of agency records for the period of 07/01/2010 through 10/31/2014. In performing this audit, we:

- Interviewed the Department Armorer (Armorer), several designated regional armorers, property coordinators, members of management and the FDLE Property Custodian to gain an understanding of the armory function.
- Reviewed FDLE Policy 4.1 - *Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics* in order to evaluate whether the position description of the Armorer accurately reflected the duties performed by the Armorer, as specified in policy, and to obtain an understanding of:
 - FDLE policies, procedures and controls relevant to the FDLE Armory function and the role of the Armorer,
 - the Armorer's role in maintaining an inventory of the type, description, model, serial number and authorized user of each firearm and Electronic Control Device (ECD),
 - the weapon inspection forms incorporated in policy, and
 - the process of documenting, maintaining or transferring armory and firearm training qualification records when a sworn member transfers from a specific region/division.
- Reviewed FDLE Policy 3.3 - *Member Performance and Employment Status*, and examined position descriptions of designated regional armorers to evaluate whether the position descriptions accurately reflected the armory-related duties they perform.
- Reviewed FDLE Policy 3.13 - *Personnel Records*, to obtain an understanding of procedures regarding issuing Department weapons upon a member's retirement. We also reviewed the following referenced FDLE forms:
 - Form OHR-067, FDLE Member Out-Processing Checklist, which outlines duties of supervisors and the Office of Human Resources (OHR) when members are separating from the agency.
 - Form OHR-062, the Acknowledgement of Conditions of Receipt for Handgun and/or Credentials Form, used for presenting Department issued handgun/credentials upon member retirement.
- Physically observed and tested access to secured facilities at various armory locations to determine if security measures, as referenced in FDLE Policy 1.4 - *Use of FDLE Resources*, are sufficient and regularly evaluated.
- Reviewed the organizational structure of the Investigations & Forensic Science Division, Office of Field Services, Special Agent Training Academy and Armory Section.



- Reviewed the FDLE General Services Manual, Section J. *Property Management* and interviewed the Armorer and members assigned to the armory function to obtain a better understanding of the agency's current business processes in conducting the annual inventory of agency property.
- Queried FLAIR property records using the Open Reports database to obtain an itemized listing of agency property assigned to the FDLE Armory locations selected for an on-site inventory during this audit.
- Conducted an inventory of the firearms and ammunition in the Headquarters Armory; the Tallahassee, Jacksonville, and Pensacola Regional Operations Center armories; the Protective Operations Section; and the Pat Thomas Warehouse off-site location.
- Analyzed and performed reconciliations of inventory findings and compared them against FLAIR property records in the Open Reports database to determine if they were in agreement.
- Analyzed the role of the FDLE Property Custodian and the utilization of FLAIR as it relates to agency property records.
- Evaluated the effectiveness of the FDLE Armory Transaction Form as it relates to agency firearm record keeping.
- Analyzed FLAIR property records in the Open Reports database to evaluate whether property transfers recorded on the FDLE Armory Transaction Forms were accurately reflected in the database.
- Examined spreadsheets provided by Armory Section personnel in an effort to obtain a better understanding of the agency's methodology for purchasing and distributing ammunition.
- Reviewed Policy 3.17 - *Workplace/Domestic Violence*, and requested documentation relating to sworn members involved in incidents of domestic violence, from the Office of Executive Investigations, Professional Standards Unit.
- Examined personnel records for a random sample of members who were hired, transferred or separated from the agency during the period of 07/01/2013 to 10/31/2014 to determine:
 - whether agency property records were modified to reflect weapons assigned from or returned to the Armory and,
 - whether agency property records were modified in FLAIR to reflect weapons removed from the agency's inventory due to being released to the member upon retirement.
- Reviewed and analyzed the process of conducting regional armory inspections as indicated by the FDLE Investigations & Forensic Science Division, Office of Field Services - Armory Section webpage.



- Surveyed comparable law enforcement agencies to gather information regarding their armory processes and evaluated FDLE's business practices against existing industry standards.
- Explored options to utilize technology currently available to the agency to track armory inventory.
- Evaluated the useful lifespan of agency owned weapons and weapons accessories, pursuant to the guidelines referenced in the FDLE General Services Manual, to determine the reasonable value of items that could be traded, credited or repurposed.



DISTRIBUTION, STATEMENT OF ACCORDANCE, AND PROJECT TEAM

Distribution

Richard L. Swearingen, Commissioner
Dean Register, Director, Professionalism Division
Michelle Pyle, Director, Business Support Division
Sherry Gomez, Chief, Investigations and Forensic Science Division, Office of Policy Development & Planning

Statement of Accordance

This audit was conducted pursuant to Section 20.055, Florida Statutes, and in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards as published by the United States Government Accountability Office. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Copies of this audit report will be made available for public inspection.

Project Team

Engagement conducted by:
Adrienne Trykowski, Senior Management Analyst II

Quality Assurance provided by:
Susan Cureton, Director of Auditing

Under the supervision of:
Lourdes Howell-Thomas, Inspector General

Approved by:

Lourdes Howell-Thomas, Inspector General

Date

Management Response

Finding 1: *FDLE does not have an accurate inventory of armory items.*

- 1) *We recommend management consider creating or obtaining an electronic inventory system that can be utilized by all agency armorers to accurately and timely document the assignment and location of agency weapons and the other items in their armories.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Members of sworn training, ITS and IFS researched several systems in the spring of 2015. Networking of commercial off-the-shelf systems between all regions and users was found to be problematic.

In June of 2015, ITS, working in conjunction with IFS, provided a proposal to create another module similar to vehicle log within AIMS. This new module would function very similar to the vehicle log module but would be specific to weapon tracking and accountability. The decision to proceed with this proposal was placed on hold pending the release of the OIG audit regarding the Armory. In May of 2016, sworn training asked that ITS re-engage the project of proposing an AIM module specific to weapon tracking and accountability. Additionally, it should be noted that since the initial release of the OIG report in November of 2015, all weapons have been accounted for through the annual property inventory process.

Implementation date: Estimated six months after management decision to proceed.

- 2) *If management decides to continue using FLAIR as the database to track armory inventory, we recommended that the armorers conduct periodic inventories of their armories and off-site locations as the physical accountability of weapons is currently limited to review during the Department's annual property inventory process.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Members of sworn training will assess the need to amend current practice regarding inventory and inspections of armories and off-site storage locations regardless of what tracking system is utilized.

Implementation date: September 1, 2016

- 3) *In order to allow for easier tracking and reporting of weapons, we recommend management ensure that weapon information is consistently entered into the selected inventory tracking database, (e.g. item description, member assignment and regional location).*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. The utilization of AIMS will allow much closer monitoring and internal auditing to ensure that weapon information is consistently entered into the system. Regardless of what tracking system is ultimately utilized, sworn training staff is currently formalizing

naming conventions for all authorized firearms. The formalized naming conventions will be supported by documented operational procedures.

Implementation date: August 1, 2016

- 4) *We recommend management document the use of the FDLE Armory Transaction Form, the process of property transfers, and the modifications of property records involving the armorer, regional property coordinators and the FDLE Property Custodian in policy or procedure.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. A move to tracking weapons in AIMS is anticipated to limit the number of hard copy forms and records. Once a new process is established, accompanying procedures and forms, if needed, will be implemented.

Implementation date: Upon implementation of recommendation number one.

- 5) *We recommend that armorers utilize the FDLE Armory Transaction Form to document all armory firearm transactions and facilitate the notification of property changes to their appropriate property coordinator. Armorers should also ensure that FLAIR is timely updated to reflect changes to the armory inventory.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. A move to tracking weapons in AIMS is anticipated to limit the number of hard copy forms and records. Once a new process is established, accompanying procedures and forms, if needed, will be implemented.

Implementation date: Upon implementation of recommendation number one.

- 6) *Consideration should also be given to enhancements to the FDLE Armory Transaction Form and integrating the form into an electronic format for accessibility in the FDLE Forms Library.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. A move to tracking weapons in AIMS is anticipated to limit the number of hard copy forms and records. Once a new process is established, accompanying procedures and forms, if needed, will be implemented.

Implementation date: Upon implementation of recommendation number one.

Finding 2: FLAIR property records are not timely updated when a member retires and may include weapons that are no longer FDLE property.

- 1) *We recommend management revise Form OHR-062, referenced in Policy 4.1, Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics, to require the OHR representative to route the approved Form OHR-062 to the FDLE Property Custodian in order to timely delete the weapon property record from FLAIR.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. However this recommendation should be addressed by the Business Support Program (BSP), Office of General Services.

Implementation date: Defer to BSP

Finding 3: *Position descriptions of members serving as regional armorers do not list time or responsibilities dedicated to armorer duties and functions.*

- 1) *We recommend the position description for each designated regional armorer be reviewed and modified to include armorer duties and responsibilities.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. However this recommendation should be addressed by the Investigations and Forensic Science Program (IFS).

Implementation date: Defer to IFS

Finding 4: *The process for purchasing training and duty ammunition is not documented in agency policy or procedure.*

- 1) *We recommend management review for accuracy the existing document used for the analysis of ammunition needs and purchases.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. The existing document was created prior to the sworn training function being transferred to the Professionalism Division. SAS Dan Augustyniak has reviewed the document for accuracy and revisions have been made.

Implementation date: April 1, 2016

- 2) *We recommend management consider incorporating the agency's needs analysis and the processes for purchasing training and duty ammunition in a formal procedure or policy.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Disagree. The needs associated with training and duty ammunition, by nature is a fluid process that requires constant evaluation. Needs change drastically based on the number of Special Agent Training Academies coordinated during the year or the type of scenario based training coordinated in a particular year. Sworn training staff regularly polls Regions and evaluates their own supply prior to ordering ammunition. A formal procedure or policy relating to ordering ammunition is not believed to be warranted, nor is it believed that such a formal procedure or policy will create efficiency.

Implementation date: N/A

Finding 5: *Armory inspections are not consistently conducted in accordance with the Regional Armory Inspection Schedule.*

- 1) *We recommend management ensure scheduled armory inspections are conducted.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Armory inspections have not been conducted in strict accordance with the former IFS, Office of Field Services, Armory Section webpage. Sworn training staff explains that armory inspections were suspended due to our transition to all 9mm weapons in 2013 and 2014. This transition required HQ armory staff to coordinate the inspection and issuance of new handguns (handguns account for the majority of our weapons stock) to the majority of our sworn members during 2013 and 2014.

Sworn training staff will evaluate past practices regarding armory inspections and make recommendations for future armory inspections. Once recommendations are approved the practices will be adopted and detailed in operational procedures or department policy.

Implementation date: September 1, 2016

- 2) *We recommend management formally document the inspection process in policy or procedure.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Sworn training staff will evaluate past practices regarding armory inspections and make recommendations for future armory inspections. Once recommendations are approved the practices will be adopted and detailed in operational procedures or department policy.

Implementation date: September 1, 2016

Finding 6: *Weapon inspection forms are not consistently completed or maintained by designated armory personnel.*

- 1) *We recommend management consider modification to Policy 4.1 to reflect any armory personnel involved in the distribution, collection, inspection or repair of agency-owned weapons and personally-owned weapons be responsible for completing and maintaining weapon inspection forms. This revision would apply to high-liability firearm instructors during in-service sworn training and to members who perform armorer-related duties in the regional operation centers.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Sworn training staff will evaluate past practices regarding the use of and maintenance of weapons inspection forms. Once recommendations are approved, the practices will be adopted and detailed in operational procedures or department policy.

Implementation date: September 1, 2016

Finding 7: *There is no documented accountability of who has access and who enters the off-site warehouse, nor is there any FDLE oversight of who is issued a key to the equipment storage room.*

- 1) *We recommend, in accordance with Policy 1.4, management consider implementing a process to document who should have continued authorized access to the secured off-site storage facility, and to inform the Public Safety Institute staff of needed adjustments accordingly. A periodic review of the access list should also be conducted.*

Agree/Disagree. Management Response:

Agree. Sworn training staff has coordinated the installation of a new lock on the secure room within the warehouse. Selected members have been issued keys to this room. A list of those members possessing the interior key is maintained by the SAS of Sworn Training. Additionally, the combination to the exterior lock has been changed. FDLE High-liability instructors have been provided the new combination.

Implementation date: June 15, 2016



Florida Department of
Law Enforcement

Richard L. Swearingen
Commissioner

Business Support
Post Office Box 1489
Tallahassee, Florida 32302-1489
(850) 410-7000
www.fdle.state.fl.us

Rick Scott, *Governor*
Pam Bondi, *Attorney General*
Jeff Atwater, *Chief Financial Officer*
Adam Putnam, *Commissioner of Agriculture*

January 19, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Office of Inspector General

FROM: Michelle Pyle, Director
Business Support Program

SUBJECT: FDLE Armory Audit, Project Number IG-0058, Finding 2

Below is the Business Support Program response to Finding 2 in the FDLE Armory Audit #IG-0058.

Finding 2: FLAIR property records are not timely updated when a member retires and may include weapons that are no longer FDLE property.

Recommendation: We recommend management revise Form OHR-062, referenced in Policy 4.1, Use of Force, Weapons & Defensive Tactics, to require the Office of Human Resources (OHR) representative to route the approved Form OHR-062 to the FDLE Property Custodian in order to timely delete the weapon property record from FLAIR.

Management Response: Agree. OHR will begin routing the completed Form OHR-062 to the appropriate FDLE Property Custodian so the FLAIR property records can be updated. Form OHR-062 has been revised to include a space for OHR to document the name of the FDLE Property Custodian and the date the form is routed.

Implementation Date: December 30, 2015.



Florida Department of
Law Enforcement

Richard L. Swearingen
Commissioner

Criminal Investigations and Forensic Science Services
Post Office Box 1489
Tallahassee, FL 32303-1489
(850) 410-8300
www.fdle.state.fl.us

Rick Scott, *Governor*
Pam Bondi, *Attorney General*
Jeff Atwater, *Chief Financial Officer*
Adam Putnam, *Commissioner of Agriculture*

January 15, 2016

Memorandum

TO: Office of Inspector General

FROM: Investigations and Forensic Sciences Division
Assistant Commissioner Don Ladner

SUBJECT: FDLE Armory Audit, Report No. IG-0058 -
Finding 3: Position descriptions of members serving as regional armorers do not list time or responsibilities dedicated to armorer duties and functions.

Recommendation: We recommend the position description for each designated regional armorer be reviewed and modified to include armorer duties and responsibilities.

Management's Response:

Agree. The following standard language has been added to the position descriptions of all regional armorers:

Responsible for intake, assignment and maintenance of department issued firearms and related high liability equipment

Responsible for storage and security of unissued firearms and related equipment

Responsible for receiving and maintaining appropriate armorer certifications

The percentage of time devoted to armorer duties varies regionally (between 10% and 25%) based upon the needs of the region and agreement between armorer and regional management team.

Implementation Date: Amended position descriptions were submitted to Office of Human Resources for publication in FDLE's electronic library on January 14, 2016.