

# CITY OF LAWRENCE

## Rapid Assessment



May 2017

# Project Overview

- RSM was tasked to perform a Rapid Assessment of the Miscellaneous Billing and related Cash Application process.
  - The assessment included an evaluation of documentation and on-site interviews with departmental employees.
  - The goal of the assessment was to document procedural gaps, risks and control weaknesses.
  - To attempt to determine the root cause of the missed Riverfront billings.
  - And to quickly determine through data analysis and trending the possibility of other missed billings and/or inconsistencies in the data.
  - The City would then determine if a deeper analysis is required.

# Executive Summary

Based on the data trends, the interviews and the available documentation the errors center around the following issues:

- **Data Conversion:** It appears many of the issues occurred when converting from the old application to Innoprise. Billings that were not consistent each month were not necessarily added to the system. Additionally, prior to the current Finance Director payments were often made “Over the Counter”, therefore not applied to the customer’s account. For example, a Franchise payment based on 5% of revenue arrived, rather than applying to XYZ Company, it was batch processed. The only way to trace this receipt is to manually “look through the boxes” of checks/counter slips.
- **Lack of Communication:** The Billing team is not necessarily aware of when or what they should be billing. The City Attorney provided a lease extract during the visit, it was the first the biller had seen it. It is a great starting point to reconcile billing. When notified of one-off bills they are often emailed directly to people in lieu of a generic email, when jobs are transferred the emails may be lost.
- **Lack of Training:** Users are not aware of ways to set-up non-cycle bills in the system, or to create needed control reporting.
- **Lack of Controls:** Currently, an Administrative Support II associate is solely responsible for the miscellaneous billing. He allocates 1 day a week to this task, operates in a largely manual environment with little oversight, few controls and no written procedures.
- **Lack of Tools:** Today off-cycle billings are largely tracked in individual’s Outlook calendar when jobs are transferred the “billing schedule” is not necessarily forwarded. The system has limitations, lack of workflow, controls and reporting that create workarounds.



# Recommendations Summary

We grouped opportunities that are smaller in scope and address tactical issues into “Quick Wins”. Transitional and strategic recommendations should also be addressed in the coming months.

Phase	Low	Medium	High
<b>Quick Wins</b> (0-90-days)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide further training to the billing team regarding the treatment of unique / off-cycle billing items</li> <li>• Continue to emphasize online portal via statement pamphlets</li> <li>• Contact Dev. Services to provide single file containing all permits</li> <li>• Continue to encourage electronic statement delivery</li> <li>• Implement Dual Control in all cash handling (PO Boxes &amp; Drop Boxes)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an accounts receivable monthly reconciliation process</li> <li>• Develop procedures implementing double checks on manually keyed entries</li> <li>• Change Innoprise system settings to stop running \$0.00 invoices for clients who are paid in full</li> <li>• Create a checklist for the cycle 96 leases</li> <li>• Establish generic email address / online form to request bill creation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a comprehensive list of leases and franchise agreements</li> <li>• Determine current accounts receivable balances by customer and tie to the general ledger</li> <li>• Determine an overall control point where all agreements must be approved and then added to the master list for the billing team to administer</li> <li>• Review the identified lease variances (see appendix A &amp; C)</li> </ul>
<b>Transitional Initiatives</b> (90-180-days)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formalize billing policies and procedures.</li> <li>• Determine and implement a clear responsibilities matrix for the billing team.</li> <li>• Develop and implement a lease renewal policy and procedures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the sales tax calculations for city provided services</li> <li>• Evaluate city-county cost sharing agreements and execution of said agreements</li> <li>• Replace Outlook as the billing schedule / reminder system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document and standardize lease/franchise agreement workflow and administration.</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Initiatives</b> (Future or longer term projects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the potential efficiencies created by implementing Remote Deposit Capture</li> <li>• Evaluate Lockboxes in lieu of PO Boxes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Billing system upgrade</li> <li>• Implement monthly Balance Sheet reconciliation process</li> </ul>	

# DATA REVIEW



# Lease Extracts Overview

- Utilizing the below process the following leases appear to require further review:
  - Utilizing the lease extract from the City Attorney's office as the comprehensive listing
  - Extracted Miscellaneous Billing and Payment data from "HTE " and Innoprise for the periods of January 2000 – April 2017
  - In the cases in which the balances do not match, a summary is provided for review.
    - This excludes items where specific payments likely have been taken "over the counter" and the system shows the customer is in good standing
    - A sample of an Over the Counter payment is included for review
  - Additionally, "other items" mentioned in the course of our interviews that do not appear in the system or provided listing are included.

# Leases to Review

- Leases without billings or payments
  - CIP II/BCL
  - LDCBA
  - LWC Partners \$10,585/Year
  - University of Kansas Athletics, Inc. \$1/Year
  - Shelter, Inc \$100/Month
  - AT&T
  - New Cingular Wireless, LLC
  - Sprint
  - T-Mobile
  - Verizon
- Follow-up
  - Hetrick Aircraft, Inc. – confirm value not on lease
  - Kitsmiller – billed for 40 & 56 acres only 56 acres on attorney extract listing
  - Lawrence Arts Center - repayment
  - Dailey Angus Farms LLP – verify corn vs soy beans to confirm billing
  - Nunemaker-Ross, Inc.- confirm \$100 lease is billed, \$65/32 acres, appears in 2012-2016 billing \$65/96 acres and \$65/20 acres in 2013-2016
- Other Items
  - Revenue based agreements are not billed due to lack of data, verify payments are received
  - City & County Cost Share Agreement
  - Here Apartments \$100k
  - 7 – Grey Hound Bus Parking Spaces

# Trending Data Overview

- As we were unable to obtain a full listing of the City's anticipated miscellaneous billings an analysis of the data was performed
- The intent is to identify customers that have unusual billing/payment patterns based on trending data to narrow the scope of contract review
  - *Example: XYZ Co. Received an annual bill 2010-2013, then no further billing. Maybe they dropped their lease or left the city which is fine, maybe we quit billing them. This customer would be flagged for review.*
- Process
  - Extracted Miscellaneous Billing and Payment data from “HTE “ and Innoprise for the periods of January 2000 – April 2017
  - Excluded bills related to Sanitation, Permits, Taxes
  - Retained bills related to Leases, Land and Franchises (Codes: F4, BLDG, BUILD, LAND, LANDL, LEASE, LND, LSE, PL, PK, RW, R40, R4, R51)
  - Trending data was reviewed for:
    - Large changes in balances month to month, year to year
    - Billing or Payment Stop/Starts
  - The attached file includes those variances for further review
- Including for review does not necessarily indicate there is an issue



Microsoft Excel  
Worksheet





# Next Steps

To calculate the unbilled receivables we suggest the following multi-pronged approach:

- **Survey: Verify all City properties are billed appropriately**
  - Develop a short survey to be sent to the Department/Division Directors and/or their designate to identify any properties they are responsible for leasing/franchising
  - Send Survey and request response within 5-7 days
  - Follow-up with any missing Department/Divisions
  - Accumulate the data and send to the City Manager, City Attorney and Directors for their review to confirm completeness
  - As surveys are returned, review billings/payments for completeness, update variance summary and “City Property” list, as appropriate
- **Review: Assessments lease/data trend questions**
  - Review the leases that appear to vary from the City Attorney’s extract, determine the correct value to be billed and summarize the variances, update the “City Property” list, as appropriate
  - Review the revenue based agreements for payments, if not as expected, work with City Attorney to contact the customers, to determine the outstanding balance
  - Due to the historic practice of applying checks in batch, pulling paper records will most likely be required, alternatively customers could be contacted to confirm payments on a limited basis
  - Review the trending data to confirm if appropriate; summarize the variances and update the “City Property” list, as appropriate

THANK YOU FOR  
YOUR TIME AND  
ATTENTION



**RSM US LLP**

**+1 800 274 3978**  
**[www.rsmus.com](http://www.rsmus.com)**

This document contains general information, may be based on authorities that are subject to change, and is not a substitute for professional advice or services. This document does not constitute audit, tax, consulting, business, financial, investment, legal or other professional advice, and you should consult a qualified professional advisor before taking any action based on the information herein. RSM US LLP, its affiliates and related entities are not responsible for any loss resulting from or relating to reliance on this document by any person.

RSM US LLP is a limited liability partnership and the U.S. member firm of RSM International, a global network of independent audit, tax and consulting firms. The member firms of RSM International collaborate to provide services to global clients, but are separate and distinct legal entities that cannot obligate each other. Each member firm is responsible only for its own acts and omissions, and not those of any other party. Visit [rsmus.com/aboutus](http://rsmus.com/aboutus) for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International.

RSM® and the RSM logo are registered trademarks of RSM International Association. The power of being understood® is a registered trademark of RSM US LLP.

© 2017 RSM US LLP. All Rights Reserved.