

## History of Revenue Audit Procurement

### **RFP No. 13-500274 for Revenue Improvement Assessment for Water and Sewer Services**

1. P&C worked with Edmond Richardson on the RFP beginning in 2013.
2. The County was seeking proposals from firms with experience in utility revenue management to provide a revenue improvement assessment for water and sewer services.
3. The main objectives of the RFP were:
  - a. Increase revenue by recovering lost funds;
  - b. Identify billing system problems resulting in loss of revenue;
  - c. Identify new revenue opportunities delivering ongoing increased revenue; and
  - d. Improve “rate payer” equity among all customers.
4. The main tasks were:
  - a. Conduct a data assessment and modeling;
  - b. Review system interoperability; and
  - c. Provide a final report containing Improved Revenue Opportunities, Potential Revenue Gains, and cost savings.
5. This RFP was never advertised and the project was abandoned in July of 2013.

### **RFP No. 14-500299 for Revenue Audit of Commercial Sanitation and Water/Sewer Services in DeKalb County, GA**

1. P&C worked with Edmond Richardson on the RFP beginning in 2013.
2. The County was seeking proposals from firms with experience in revenue auditing services for local governments to provide a commercial sanitation and water/sewer revenue audit.
3. The main objectives of the RFP were:
  - a. Discover billing issues and field conditions that result in inappropriately reduced or inflated billings.
  - b. Increase revenue by recovering funds lost due to unpaid invoices.
  - c. Identify billing system problems which result in a loss of revenue.
  - d. Identify new revenue opportunities which will deliver ongoing increased revenue.
  - e. Improve billing equity among all customers.
4. The main tasks were:
  - a. Completion of a data assessment and provision of a data model.
  - b. Review system interoperability.
  - c. Review of customer service standards and develop performance standards.
  - d. Provision of final reports.
5. Two vendors submitted proposals:
  - a. Utility Revenue Management (Score of 467.5)
  - b. Wilson Lewis (Score of 323.75)
6. URM was the recommended awardee. The awardee was to receive 48% of increased revenue for a period of 48 months.
7. The agenda item was never awarded by the BOC.

### **RFP No. 16-500411 Revenue Audit of Commercial Water/Sewer Services**

1. P&C worked with the CEO’s Office on this effort in 2016.
2. The County was seeking revenue auditing services for local governments to provide a commercial water/sewer revenue audit.
3. The RFP was an updated version of RFP No. 14-500299.

4. The main objectives of the RFP were:
  - f. Discover billing issues and field conditions that result in inappropriately reduced or inflated billings.
  - g. Increase revenue by recovering funds lost due to unpaid invoices.
  - h. Identify billing system problems which result in a loss of revenue.
  - i. Identify new revenue opportunities which will deliver ongoing increased revenue.
  - j. Improve billing equity among all customers.
5. The main tasks were:
  - a. Completion of a data assessment and provision of a data model.
  - b. Review system interoperability.
  - c. Review of customer service standards and develop performance standards.
  - d. Provision of final reports.
6. One vendor submitted a Proposal – Utility Revenue Management.
7. The evaluation committee did meet but a recommendation of award was never made.
8. The market survey indicates that the vendor pool for the services was limited and most wanted an opportunity to subcontract.
9. The RFP was cancelled.

**Contract No. 1216193 Cooperative Purchase off Augusta, Georgia Utilities Department Contract No. 17-167**

1. P&C worked with the CEO's Office, Finance and UCO.
2. A decision was made to pursue a piggyback off the competitively let Contract from the City of Augusta. This contract was executed in 2017.
3. Utility Revenue Management Company was the awardee. (Same awardee in the County's RFP No. 14-500299)
4. This was to be a pilot program to determine if the services could actually increase revenue.
5. The main objectives of the RFP were:
  - a. Discover billing issues and field conditions that result in inappropriately reduced or inflated billings.
  - b. Increase revenue by recovering funds lost due to unpaid invoices.
  - c. Identify billing system problems which result in a loss of revenue.
  - d. Identify new revenue opportunities which will deliver ongoing increased revenue.
  - e. Improve billing equity among all customers.
6. The main objectives of the RFP were:
  - a. Review of records and field reviews to provide enhancements to its water and /or wastewater billing and records systems that result in identifying lost, unbilled or under-recovered revenue.
  - b. Repair/Replacement of faulty water meters.
  - c. Provision of periodic reports to document findings.
7. The County specifically deleted the following from the Augusta contract in the piggyback:
  - a. Water meter replacement.
  - b. Provision of replacement water meters.
  - c. Payment of out-of-pocket expenses.
8. In accordance with the Augusta contract, URM was to receive 50% of increased revenue for a period of 48 months.
9. Reports are being evaluated and no money has been paid to date. Note that the first invoice for \$61,000 has been approved and is currently in the payment process.