



**Thomas A. Schweich**  
Missouri State Auditor

---

**REVENUE and  
ADMINISTRATION**

**Contract License Office  
Bidding and Procurement**

---

**July 2014**

**Report No. 2014-049**



---

**<http://auditor.mo.gov>**



**Thomas A. Schweich**  
Missouri State Auditor

# CITIZENS SUMMARY

## Findings in the audit of the Department of Revenue and Office of Administration, Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement

Non-Compete Agreements	The Department of Revenue (DOR) and Office of Administration (OA) do not prohibit contract agents from requiring employees to sign non-compete agreements that limit competition. Since 20 points are awarded during the bid evaluation process for retaining current staff, these non-compete agreements could hinder a new bidder.
Contract Extensions and Renewals	The DOR and OA extended license office contracts beyond the time frames allowed by the contract terms, and the DOR did not request 4 contract renewals until after the contracts had already expired resulting in license offices operating with no contract in place. Of the 120 offices with extension options exercised, 91 percent were extended past the 120 days allowed by the contract.
Return to State	As noted during our prior audit, bidders receive points during the evaluation process for the "return to state" (a firm, fixed percentage of fees earned that the bidder agrees to remit to the state) amount proposed, but no statutory authority exists for the return to state provision, and its use conflicts with the legislatively set processing fees. It also results in disparities in the amounts the offices return and does not provide for all offices to pay an equitable share of DOR oversight costs. The officers returned to the state more than \$1.1 million in fees in both fiscal years 2013 and 2012.
Cost/Benefit Analysis	As noted during our prior audit, the DOR has not performed analyses to determine the optimum number of contract licenses, where those offices should be located, or the fiscal impact on the state when an office is open or closed.

In the areas audited, the current overall performance of these entities was **Fair**. \* The Follow-up section of the report notes most of the prior recommendations have been implemented.

\*The rating(s) cover only audited areas and do not reflect an opinion on the overall operation of the entity. Within that context, the rating scale indicates the following:

- Excellent:** The audit results indicate this entity is very well managed. The report contains no findings. In addition, if applicable, prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Good:** The audit results indicate this entity is well managed. The report contains few findings, and the entity has indicated most or all recommendations have already been, or will be, implemented. In addition, if applicable, many of the prior recommendations have been implemented.
- Fair:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to improve operations in several areas. The report contains several findings, or one or more findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated several recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, several prior recommendations have not been implemented.
- Poor:** The audit results indicate this entity needs to significantly improve operations. The report contains numerous findings that require management's immediate attention, and/or the entity has indicated most recommendations will not be implemented. In addition, if applicable, most prior recommendations have not been implemented.

**All reports are available on our Web site: [auditor.mo.gov](http://auditor.mo.gov)**

---

# Department of Revenue and Office of Administration

## Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement

### Table of Contents

---

State Auditor's Report	2
------------------------	---

---

Introduction	
Background .....	4
Scope and Methodology .....	5

---

Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings	
1. Non-Compete Agreements .....	7
2. Contract Extensions and Renewals .....	8
3. Return to State .....	9
4. Cost/Benefit Analysis .....	11

---

Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings	13
--------------------------------------	----

---

Appendixes	
A Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014 .....	16
B Timeline of Evaluation Criteria and Points Awarded .....	21

---



# **THOMAS A. SCHWEICH**

## **Missouri State Auditor**

Honorable Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon, Governor  
and  
John R. Mollenkamp, Acting Director  
Department of Revenue  
and  
Douglas E. Nelson, Commissioner  
Office of Administration  
Jefferson City, Missouri

We have audited certain aspects of the Bidding and Procurement of contract license offices by the Department of Revenue and the Office Administration in fulfillment of our duties under Chapter 29, RSMo. The objectives of our audit were to:

1. Evaluate policies and procedures pertaining to the bidding and procurement of contract license offices.
2. Evaluate compliance with certain legal provisions pertaining to the bidding and procurement of contract license offices.
3. Evaluate the economy and efficiency of certain management practices and operations, including certain financial transactions pertaining to the bidding and procurement of contract license offices.
4. Evaluate the extent to which recommendations included in our prior audit report were implemented.

For the areas audited, we identified (1) the need for improvement in policies and procedures, (2) noncompliance with legal provisions, (3) the need for improvement in management practices and operations, and (4) recommendations from the prior audit that have not been implemented.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards

require that we plan and perform our 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 such a basis.



Thomas A. Schweich  
State Auditor

The following auditors participated in the preparation of this report:

Deputy State Auditor:	Harry J. Otto, CPA
Director of Audits:	John Luetkemeyer, CPA
Audit Manager:	Susan J. Beeler, CPA, CIA
In-Charge Auditor:	Corey McComas, M.Acct., CPA
Audit Staff:	Joshua Shope, M.Acct.

---

# Department of Revenue and Office of Administration

## Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement

### Introduction

---

#### **Background**

The Department of Revenue (DOR) was created by Article IV, Section 12, Missouri Constitution, as the central collection agency for state revenues. The DOR is headed by the Director of Revenue who is appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Section 136.030(2), RSMo, provides the director of revenue shall make provisions for the collection of motor vehicle registration fees, driver's license fees, motor vehicle sales and use tax, and all other taxes. The Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing (MV/DL) Division facilitates the registration of motor vehicle, trailer, and marine craft in the state, and the licensing of all operators of motor vehicles residing in the state, as well as tax collection.

The License Office Bureau, under the management of the MV/DL Division, is responsible for administering the operations of contract license offices throughout the state, which totaled 178 as of April 1, 2014. Additionally, a central license office is operated by the DOR in Jefferson City. Pursuant to Section 136.055, RSMo, the Director of the DOR appoints contract agents to operate the contract license offices. The contract agents do not receive compensation from the DOR, but receive fees, set by statute, for each type of transaction processed by the office. The contract agent is responsible for all expenses of the contract license office, including the compensation of office employees, office furniture, and supplies. However, the OA furnishes certain computer equipment for processing the transactions.

Historically, the DOR maintained contract license offices throughout the state that were managed by contract agents selected and appointed by the Governor. In October 2006, the DOR began awarding contract license offices through a competitive bidding process.

Effective August 2009, Section 136.055, RSMo, requires contract license offices to be awarded through a competitive bidding process. This bidding process must give priority to organizations and entities that are exempt from taxation (not-for-profit) under the Internal Revenue Code, and political subdivisions such as municipalities, counties, and fire protection districts. Also, ". . . fees collected by a tax-exempt organization may be retained and used by the organization." The following table shows the total collections remitted to the DOR by the contract license offices and the total processing fees assessed and retained by the contract agents for the 2 years ended June 30, 2013.

---

	Year Ended June 30,	
	2013	2012
Total collections	\$ 759,901,179	804,206,134
Total processing fees	30,885,638	31,705,945

---



---

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Introduction

---

Although the Office of Administration (OA), Division of Purchasing and Materials Management manages the bidding process for the contract license offices, the DOR assists with developing the terms of the Request for Proposals (RFP). In accordance with Chapter 34, RSMo, a contract license office contract must be awarded to the lowest and best offeror. Appendix B lists the criteria used to evaluate submitted proposals.

Prior to August 2013, contract license office contracts typically ran for a year, with three 1-year renewal periods. Starting in August 2013, contracts are typically for a period of 4 years. However, a contract may be canceled at the discretion of the DOR. The contract license office contracts include a requirement allowing the State Auditor to audit the offices.

---

## Scope and Methodology

The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the 69 contract license office bids/proposals awarded from April 2012 through March 2014. We reviewed the bidding process for 10 bids/proposals awarded. We selected some contract license offices with the same contract agent for more than one office; offices where some controversy over the award had come to our attention (concerns received by the State Auditor's office); and offices with a large difference in the points awarded during the bid evaluation. We determined whether:

- Various clauses and requirements in the RFP issued for that specific office were consistent with other RFPs issued during the same general time period.
- Bids/responses were received before the stated deadline.
- The OA performed due diligence for compliance with various requirements, such as contract license office employee background checks and offeror status (not-for-profit entity [NFP], disabled veteran, etc.)
- The reasons for the rejection of a bid/response and/or for allowing an entity to rebid were documented and reasonable.
- A best and final offer request was properly sent to all bidders, if applicable.
- Modifications to the RFP or evaluation system during the bidding process were significant to cause a rebid of the office.
- The evaluation of the office appeared fair and reasonable, and evaluation points were properly awarded.



Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Introduction

---

If an entity was awarded more than one office, we determined whether the same and/or similar bid/responses to the various RFP requirements were consistently evaluated.

In addition, we used the publication *State and Local Government Procurement: A Practical Guide* and the research brief *Administrative Fees: Creative Funding for Central Procurement in Difficult Economic Times*, both issued by the National Association of State Procurement Officials as criteria for bidding and procurement best practices.

Our methodology included conducting interviews with appropriate DOR and OA personnel, as well as certain external parties; reviewing written policies and procedures; reviewing applicable state law; reviewing and evaluating DOR and OA bidding and procurement records and other pertinent documents; and testing certain transactions.

We obtained an understanding of internal controls that were significant within the context of the audit objectives and assessed whether such controls had been properly designed and placed in operation. We tested certain of those controls to obtain evidence regarding the effectiveness of their design and operation. We also obtained an understanding of legal provisions that were significant within the context of the audit objectives, and we assessed the risk that illegal acts, including fraud, and violations of contract or other legal provisions could occur. Based on that risk assessment, we designed and performed procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting instances of noncompliance significant to those provisions.

---

# Department of Revenue and Office of Administration

## Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement

### Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Findings

---

#### **1. Non-Compete Agreements**

The Department of Revenue (DOR) and Office of Administration (OA) have not prohibited contract agents from requiring employees to sign non-compete agreements that limit competition related to the license office procurement process.

Some contract license office agents have entered into non-compete agreements with office personnel that prohibit employees from working for another contract agent within a specific distance from their current office for a specific timeframe after termination of employment. For example, one agreement specified the employee could not work for another license office for a period of at least 180 days and within a 25 mile radius of the current office location. Since 20 points are awarded during the bid evaluation process for retaining current staff, these agreements could hinder a new bidder from proposing to keep the current staff or hinder a current employee from bidding on the office.

In early 2014, the DOR and OA modified the standard RFP language to change how supervisory personnel are proposed for each office. Instead of listing certain individuals and their qualifications, the RFP now requires general personnel credentials be proposed and then the agent awarded the contract must hire supervisory personnel to meet the proposed credentials. The subsequent proposed employees are subject to approval from the DOR. However, this new RFP language does not change how other office personnel are proposed and points are still awarded for retention of current staff.

To ensure open competition for license offices, the DOR should prohibit contract license offices from requiring employees to sign non-compete agreements. This practice limits competition for the contracting of the license offices and is not in the DOR's best interest.

#### **Recommendation**

The DOR and OA prohibit license offices from requiring employees to sign non-compete agreements and eliminate evaluation points related to retention of current staff.

#### **Auditee's Response**

*The DOR provided the following written response:*

*The Department has taken steps to minimize the impact that non-compete agreements have on the contract RFP process. The Department removed the requirement to list the names of the potential staff to work at the office and points are now awarded on the bidder's response to years of experience of proposed management staff and retention of existing staff. The Department will take this recommendation under advisement and continue discussions with the OA.*



*The OA provided the following written response:*

*The OA, in conjunction with the DOR, took steps to minimize the impact of the situation in which this recommendation is focused. The RFP provision that required a bidder to list the names of the potential staff has been removed from the RFP. Instead, points are awarded based upon years of experience for proposed positions. As always, bidders receive points for their commitments to offer existing staff employment under the new contract. OA will take this recommendation under advisement as any implementation of this recommendation will need to occur in the next round of bidding for the 178 offices in order to ensure contractual uniformity for all fee offices.*

## **2. Contract Extensions and Renewals**

The DOR and OA extended license office contracts beyond the time frames allowed by the agent contract provisions. In addition, the DOR did not request four contract renewals until after the contracts had already expired resulting in license offices operating with no contract in place.

Under the license office contracts signed prior to August 2013, the contracts typically ran for a year, with three 1-year renewal periods. The contracts also authorized 120 day extensions to provide time for the DOR and the OA to rebid the contract for the office.

### **Extensions**

Of the 120 offices with extension options exercised, the DOR and OA extended 109 (91 percent) beyond the 120 day extension allowed by the original contract. In addition, 108 offices had two or more 120 day extensions. According to contract documentation and OA personnel, the additional contract extensions have been completed pursuant to Section 34.045, RSMo, which states the Commissioner of Administration may waive the requirement of competitive bids or proposals to prevent or minimize serious disruption in state services or to ensure the integrity of state records. However, this statute relates to competitive bids or proposals for supplies in the event of an emergency or when immediate expenditure is necessary for repairs to state property, and is not intended for extending existing contracts. Further, since license office contracts provide for extensions of only 120 calendar days, the DOR and OA lacked authority to extend the contracts beyond that time period. In addition, one contract license office refused to extend its contract beyond the 120 days, resulting in a temporary closure of the office.

### **Renewals**

The DOR did not request the OA process renewals for four offices until after the original contracts had expired. As a result, these offices continued to operate for periods ranging from 4 to 16 months before contract renewals were finalized. According to DOR personnel, delays occurred because the four contract license offices did not provide documentation verifying contract compliance in a timely manner.



---

## Conclusions

By allowing extensions beyond time periods authorized by contract provisions and not renewing contracts before expiration, the DOR is at risk of discontinuing services the offices are no longer obligated to provide. In addition, with no contract in place for the offices with non-renewed contracts the DOR would have had no recourse to discipline the office for not following the agency's policies and procedures in regards to the operation of those license offices. Operating without a contract also exposed the DOR to undue risk if funds or inventory had gone missing in the affected offices.

## Recommendation

The DOR and OA discontinue extending license office contracts beyond the time frames allowed by agent contract provisions. In addition, the DOR should implement procedures to ensure contract renewals are requested and finalized before contracts expire.

## Auditee's Response

*The DOR provided the following written response:*

*The Department agrees with this recommendation and has taken steps to stagger future expiration dates of agent contracts to balance the work load of reviewing and awarding the many license offices throughout the state.*

*The OA provided the following written response:*

*OA recognizes that awarding a new contract prior to the end of the current contract is preferred. Nevertheless, it is not always possible to bid, evaluate, and award a new contract before the expiration of the current contract. As such, extensions of current contracts are utilized and allowed in such situations pursuant to Section 34.045, RSMo, in order to avoid disruption of vital state services in the communities being served. Over 180 fee office contracts were previously awarded, and in this situation, the current contracts expire on similar dates. To avoid this compression of workload in the future, OA, in conjunction with DOR, is staggering future expiration dates of these contracts.*

---

## 3. Return to State

As noted during the prior audit, the DOR's assessment and collection of oversight costs from contract license offices may not be fair and legal. There are no statutory provisions that authorize the DOR and the OA to request a "return to state" (a firm, fixed percentage of fees earned that the bidder agrees to remit to the state) in the contract license office competitive bidding process. Additionally, the current practice of using the return to state as part of the bidding process has resulted in disparities among the offices, and does not provide for all offices to pay an equitable share of DOR oversight costs. The return to the state for all contract license offices totaled \$1,194,374 and \$1,147,317 for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2013 and 2012, respectively.



---

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Finding

---

Beginning in January 2009, as part of the RFP, bidders may return to the state a firm, fixed percentage of the processing fees earned. In the evaluation process, a bidder may currently receive up to ten points for the return to state, weighted in relation to the returns offered by other bidders for a particular contract. If no return to the state is included in the RFP, the bidder receives no points. Since the DOR spends time and resources to oversee and provide technical support to the contract license offices, the return to state helps defray some of these costs. In addition, because the contract agent makes a profit by handling state-mandated transactions, the DOR believes it is appropriate for agents to return some of the fees collected to the state.

However, no statutory authority exists for the return to state provision, and the current practice of using this provision in the bidding process negates and is in conflict with past legislative actions to set processing fees. Section 136.055, RSMo, specifically establishes that contract license offices collect certain processing fees on the transactions processed as full compensation for services provided. Specific statutory authority also exists to require a competitive bidding process for the awarding of the contract license offices, and for priority to be given to organizations and entities that are exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code, and political subdivisions such as municipalities, counties, and fire protection districts.

The current practice of requesting a return to state has resulted in significant disparities in the amounts the offices return. For example, for the year ended June 30, 2013, return to state percentages ranged from 0.01 percent to 15.31 percent. This practice does not ensure contract license offices pay an equitable share of DOR oversight costs. The DOR incurs personal service and expense/equipment costs in the management and monitoring of contract license offices. These costs include, but are not limited to, providing the offices with computer equipment/software to process the transactions, field coordinators who regularly visit each office to ensure proper procedures are followed, and central office staff who ensure daily deposits and reports are proper

According to a National Association of State Procurement Officers research brief, *Administrative Fees: Creative Funding for Central Procurement in Difficult Economic Times* issued in September 2009, many states utilize an administrative fee as a method to support certain procurement/management activity. Typically, these fees ranged from 0.5 percent to 2 percent, with 1 percent being the most common charge. An administrative fee assessed on each contract license office could help maintain and increase the effectiveness and level of service provided by the DOR. Assessing an administration fee on the volume of transactions and/or fees collected by each contract license office may be a more equitable method of recovering



costs associated with DOR oversight of the contract license offices. However, assessing an administrative fee will require enabling legislation.

The OA, DOR, and General Assembly should evaluate and address the current practices and inequities related to the competitive bidding process for contract license offices.

## Recommendation

The OA and DOR work with the General Assembly to determine the appropriateness of the return to state provision.

## Auditee's Response

*The DOR provided the following written response:*

*The return to state provision in the RFP is optional and each bidder determines the amount (if any) they can commit to returning back to the state to help defray administrative cost. The Department will continue to evaluate this recommendation together with OA.*

*The OA provided the following written response:*

*Section 34.042, RSMo, requires the state award contracts to the lowest and best offeror. The fee office contracts do not involve the state paying the fee agent for services performed. Instead, the fee agent charges the public for the services provided, and can contract to return some of those funds to the state. Many offerors commit to no return to the state. Factoring in a return to the state allows for a consideration of "lowest." Furthermore, 1 CSR 40-1.060 (5) provides: "The [Division of Purchasing] may include contract clauses requiring the awarded contractor to issue a payment to the state or the state's designee for a stated percentage as outlined in the contract." Nevertheless, OA will assist the General Assembly and the Department of Revenue with any policy review on this issue.*

## Auditor's Comment

As explained in the audit finding, no statutory authority exists for the return to state provision. The CSR cited in the OA's response was created by the OA and is not authorized by statute.

---

## 4. Cost/Benefit Analysis

As noted during the prior audit, the DOR has not performed analyses to determine the optimum number of contract license offices, where those offices should be located, or the fiscal impact on the state when an office is opened or closed.

As of April 1, 2014, 178 contract license offices operate throughout the state and the DOR operates an office in Jefferson City. There is typically a contract license office in each county seat, with multiple offices in urban areas such as St. Louis, Kansas City, and Springfield. Currently the only reason the DOR would remove a license office location is if there are no bidders when a new RFP is issued for that location.



---

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Management Advisory Report - State Auditor's Finding

---

An analysis that considers criteria such as population, distances between offices, and revenues collected, could provide a basis to support the elimination, consolidation, or addition of contract license offices throughout the state. The cost to the state when eliminating, consolidating, or adding an office should also be considered. For example, eliminating an office could reduce oversight costs incurred by the DOR, but also could inconvenience taxpayers. Without such cost-benefit analyses, the department cannot ensure motor vehicle and driver's license services are provided to the public in the most economical and advantageous manner.

## Recommendation

The DOR periodically prepare an analysis to determine the optimum number and location of contract license offices.

## Auditee's Response

*The DOR provided the following written response:*

*The department continues to prepare analytical reports of data such as transaction volumes, customer comments, wait times, and fees collected, and maintain a map of offices. We also thoroughly review non-response bids and evaluate customer impact.*

---

# Department of Revenue and Office of Administration

## Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement

### Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings

---

This section reports the auditor's follow-up on action taken by the Department of Revenue (DOR) and Office of Administration (OA) on findings in the Management Advisory Report (MAR) of our prior audit report issued for the 3 years ended June 30, 2011.

1. Evaluation of Bids/Proposals
- 1.1. The DOR did not make its evaluation tool available to bidders. The RFP provided five categories for proposals to be evaluated, while the DOR evaluation tool contained a detailed list of subcategories with specified points assigned to each category, which was not available to bidders.
  - 1.2. The DOR did not prepare written criteria for its evaluation of oral conferences. Since no written criteria was created the scores were subjectively awarded.
  - 1.3. The DOR did not require contract managers to perform certain documented supervisory activities, when the contract and office manager were separate individuals. As a result, the practice of awarding points when different individuals served as the office and contract managers did not ensure better segregation of duties actually occurred.
  - 1.4. In one instance, DOR personnel did not comply with the criteria of the evaluation tool when evaluating a bid proposal. This deviation may have affected the ultimate award of the office.

#### Recommendation

The OA and DOR:

- 1.1. Include the DOR evaluation tool in the RFP to ensure bidders clearly understand and address all requirements.
- 1.2. Develop written criteria for the evaluation of oral conferences.
- 1.3. Require certain documented supervisory activities be performed by contract managers when the contract and office manager are separate individuals before determining the amounts of points to award for the office manager.
- 1.4. Take steps to ensure bid evaluators understand and follow the evaluation tool criteria.

#### Status

- 1.1. Implemented. The DOR has increased the level of detail regarding the evaluation process in the current RFP. The explanation of requirements and a breakdown of points awarded are included in the bid documentation available on the OA's web site.



Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings

- 
- 1.2. No longer applicable. Oral conferences are no longer a part of the evaluation process.
- 1.3. Implemented. The current RFP includes requirements for supervisory responsibilities to be conducted by the contract managers.
- 1.4. Implemented. All evaluations reviewed followed the evaluation criteria.
2. Non-Compliant Bids/Proposals The OA did not consistently reject all non-compliant bids/proposals. For the 20 contract license offices reviewed, the OA rejected noncompliant bids/proposals in 7 offices. However, other noncompliant bids/proposals were not rejected. During 2009, the OA determined a not-for-profit entity (NFP) did not comply with a significant requirement in the RFP. However, the OA allowed the NFP to rebid 10 other office contracts and to change bid/proposals for 5 pending office contracts in the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process. In addition, the OA did not reject a bid/proposal to a BAFO when the NFP submitted the bid/proposal later than the timeframe specified in the BAFO.
- Recommendation The OA ensure the same standards are applied to the RFPs and BAFOs as set forth by the National Association of State Procurement Officers (NASPO) best practices.
- Status Implemented. Audit work conducted showed the OA applied standards consistently and rejected noncompliant bids/proposals tested.
3. Preference Points For 9 of 20 (45 percent) offices reviewed, the points awarded for NFPs and political subdivisions were increased from 5 points to 7 points during the evaluation of the bids/responses for that office. In addition, it was unclear why the points for this preference were increased when these entities were already receiving a preference.
- Recommendation The OA and DOR refrain from changing criteria for awarding points after an RFP has been issued. Also, the OA and DOR should prepare and maintain documentation to support decisions which allow a preference and/or priority be given to certain entities in the evaluation process.
- Status Implemented. We noted no occasions in which the evaluation criteria was changed after an RFP was issued.
4. Return to State There were no statutory provisions that authorized the DOR and OA to request a "return to state" (a firm, fixed percentage of fees earned that the bidder agreed to remit to the state) in the contract license office competitive bidding process. Additionally, the practice of using the return to state as part



Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
Follow-up on Prior Audit Findings

of the bidding process resulted in disparities among the offices, and did not provide that all offices pay an equitable share of DOR oversight costs.

Recommendation

The OA and DOR work with the General Assembly to determine the appropriateness of the return to state provision.

Status

Not implemented. See MAR finding number 3.

5. Policies and Procedures

5.1. The length of time between the issuance of the RFP and awarding the office was not timely for some contract license offices. For 11 of 20 awards reviewed, it took 6 months or more between the RFP date and the award date.

5.2. The DOR did not perform an analysis to determine the optimum number of contract license offices, where those offices should be located, or the fiscal impact on the state when an office is opened or closed.

Recommendation

5.1. The OA and DOR evaluate and implement procedures to ensure contract license offices are awarded in a timely manner.

5.2. The DOR periodically prepare an analysis to determine the optimum number and location of contract license offices.

Status

5.1. Implemented. Audit work indicated offices were awarded within reasonable timeframes.

5.2. Not implemented. See MAR finding number 4.

Appendix A

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014

Office	Contract Agent
Affton	Lavin Company, LLC
Alton	Davis, Freda S.
Arnold	Community Service Arnold Jaycees
Aurora	Mount Vernon Area Community Foundation
Ava	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Belton	Meadors Professional Services, LLC
Bethany	Kinnison, Debra J.
Blue Springs	City of Blue Springs
Bolivar	T & J Stark Enterprises, LLC
Bonne Terre	Bonne Terre Chamber of Commerce
Boonville	Boonville License Office, LLC
Bowling Green	Koester & Koester, LLC
Branson	Koester & Koester, LLC
Bridgeton	MT Services, Inc.
Brookfield	Martin, Heidi L.
Buffalo	Morris, Toni M.
Butler	Blen Enterprises, LLC
California	Elliott, Roberta
Camdenton	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Cameron	Cameron License Office
Cape Girardeau	Southeast Missouri University
Carrollton	Carrollton Area Economic Alliance
Carthage	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Caruthersville	Cole, Rebecca L.
Cassville	Brown, Rebecca Rae
Central West End	Automobile Club Of Missouri
Chaffee	Ernst & Sadler Licensing, Inc.
Charleston	Charleston Chamber of Commerce
Chesterfield	Mid-America Transplant Services
Chillicothe	Harlow, Kathryn D.
Clayton	License Management, LLC
Clinton	Tri-Lake Area Enterprises, LLC
Columbia	Columbia Licensing Services, LLC
Crane	McMenamy Ventures, LLC
Creve Coeur	License Office Services, LLC
Cuba	JKM Management Group, LLC
Des Peres	License Office Services, LLC
DeSoto	Julie Lewis Wagner, LLC
Dexter	ABC of Southeast Missouri, LLC

Appendix A

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014

Office	Contract Agent
Doniphan	Young, John
Downtown	Collector of Revenue, City of St. Louis
Edina	Hunziker, Barbara
Eldon	Lake of the Ozarks Marine Dealers Association
Ellington	Rhea, Rebecca D.
Elsberry	KBS Services, LLC
Eminence	Turner Insurance & Financial Services, LLC
Excelsior Springs	Excelsior Springs Area Chamber of Commerce
Farmington	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Fayette	Howard County Services Co. Farm Bureau
Ferguson	Lions Club of Ferguson, MO
Florissant	Florissant Rotary Club
Forsyth	Forsyth License Office
Fredericktown	Lee Agencies, LLC
Fulton	Koester & Koester, LLC
Gainesville	Turner, Lisa F.
Gallatin	Duvall, Heather L.
Gladstone	Gladston License Office
Glenstone	Breast Cancer Foundation of the Ozarks
Grandview	City of Grandview
Grant City	City of Grant City
Greenfield	Hayes, Patti
Hannibal	D White, LLC
Harrisonville	Red Moon Enterprises, LLC
Hartville	Barr, Freda
Harvester	Harvester License Office, LLC
Hermann	Hermann Area Chamber of Commerce
Hermitage	Hickory County Services Farm Bureau
High Ridge	High Ridge Services, LLC
Houston	Blades, Cynthia L.
Imperial	Schmidt Sr., Paul R.
Independence	Paul J. Wrabec Co., Inc.
Ironton	Mayfield Group, LLC
Jackson	Deuce Enterprises, LLC
Jefferson City	License & Verification Services, LLC
Joplin	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Kahoka	Scott, L. Sue
Kansas City	Paul J. Wrabec Co., Inc.
Kennett	License Office of Kennett, Inc.

Appendix A

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014

Office	Contract Agent
Keytesville	Doug & Cheri, LLC
Kingston	Prater, Melissa S.
Kirksville	Albin, Judy J.
Lakeview	Koester & Koester, LLC
Lamar	Moser, Joyce E.
Lebanon	Morris, Toni M.
Lee's Summit	Lees Summit, LLC
Lexington	Lexington Area Chamber of Commerce
Liberty	Williams, James R
Licking	Swindell, Alicia J.
Linn	City of Linn
Louisiana	City of Louisiana
Macon	Willis, James L.
Malden	McDonald, Carla J.
Maplewood	Mid-America Transplant Services
Marble Hill	Bollinger County Abstract & Title Co., Inc.
Marshall	Doug & Cheri, LLC
Marshfield	Marshfield Public Schools Foundation
Maryville	Maryville Chamber of Commerce
Maysville	Steiner, Roberta Sue
Memphis	Grubb, Lisa
Mexico	Koester & Koester, LLC
Milan	Duvall, Heather L.
Moberly	Doug & Cheri, LLC
Monett	Monett Chamber of Commerce
Monroe City	City of Monroe City
Montgomery City	Montgomery County Farm Bureau
Monticello	Redman, Brenda
Mound City	Laukemper, Joseph
Mount Vernon	Mount Vernon Area Community Foundation, Inc.
Mountain Grove	Mountain Grove License Office
Mountain View	Blades, Cynthia L.
Neosho	Neosho Area Business and Industrial Foundation, Inc.
Nevada	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
New London	D White, LLC
New Madrid	ABC of Southeast Missouri, LLC
Nixa	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
North County	Invaluable Solutions, LLC
North Kansas City	Koester & Koester, LLC

Appendix A

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014

Office	Contract Agent
Northside	Mid-America Transplant Services
Oakville	Schmidt, Belle
O'Fallon	Elle Management, LLC
Olivette	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Osceola	Young, Tammy L.
Overland	Wentzville Agency Management, LLC
Owensville	Gascondate County Service Company Farm Bureau
Ozark	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Pacific	Pacific Area Chamber of Commerce
Palmyra	Smith, Joseph R.
Paris	Barton, Christy
Parkville	Red Moon Enterprises, LLC
Perryville	Conservative Ventures, Inc.
Piedmont	Piedmont Area Chamber of Commerce
Pineville	Brower, Willam H.
Platte City	Platte Civic Association
Plattsburg	CPLO Enterprises, LLC
Poplar Bluff	Three Rivers Endowment Trust
Potosi	Washington Area Chamber of Commerce
Princeton	Herdrich, Donna
Raytown	Sharp Services
Republic	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
Richmond	Lexington Area Chamber of Commerce
Rock Port	Midwest Data Center, Inc.
Rolla	Rolla License Fee Office, Inc.
St. Charles	License Management, LLC
St. Clair	St. Clair Area Chamber of Commerce
St. Joseph	Saint Joseph License, LLC
Ste. Genevieve	Bollinger County Abstract & Title Co., Inc.
Salem	Salem License Office, LLC
Sarcoxie	City of Sarcoxie
Savannah	Bowman, Cathy
Sedalia	McLaughlin, Connie S.
Shelbina	Tims Home Center, LLC
Sikeston	Terry Ramsey Cole, Inc.
South County	Lavin Company, LLC
South Fremont	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.
South Kingshighway	South Kingshighway Services, LLC
Springfield	Alternative Opportunities, Inc.

Appendix A

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Contract Agents - As of April 1, 2014

Office	Contract Agent
Stanberry	City of Stanberry
Steelville	Crawford, Cynthia R.
Stockton	Stockton License Office
Sugar Creek	Paul J. Wrabec Co., Inc.
Sullivan	Sullivan License Office, LLC
Thayer	Lawrence, Mindy
Trenton	Trenton Area Chamber of Commerce
Troy	Troy Chamber of Commerce
Twin City	Twin City Area Chamber of Commerce
Union	Union Area Chamber of Commerce
Unionville	Trimble, Jan M.
Van Buren	Crider, Sherry L
Vandalia	Housing Authority of the City of Vandalia
Versailles	McCutcheon, Karen A
Viburnum	Mayfield Group, LLC
Vienna	Maries County Missouri
Warrensburg	Warrensburg Chamber of Commerce
Warrenton	Wentzville Agency Management, LLC
Warsaw	Siercks, Connie L.
Washington	Washington Area Chamber of Commerce
Waynesville	Pulaski County Growth Alliance
Wentzville	Elle Management, LLC
West County	Sanguinity, LLC
West Plains	Missouri License Office of West Plains, LLC
Willow Springs	Willow Springs Chamber of Commerce

Appendix B

Department of Revenue and Office of Administration  
 Contract License Offices, Bidding and Procurement  
 Timeline for Evaluation Criteria and Points Awarded

Date	Criteria	Points
August 29, 2009 to April 17, 2013	Sales and service, efficient operations, and technical proposal	45
	Personnel qualifications, financial stability, and past performance/experience	30
	Not-for-profit or political subdivision status	7
	Minority business enterprise (MBE) or women business enterprise (WBE)	5
	Return to the state	5
	Oral conference	8
	Total	<u>100</u>
April 18, 2013 to August 23, 2013	Sales and service, efficient operations, and technical proposal	45
	Personnel qualifications, financial stability, and past performance/experience	30
	Not-for-profit or political subdivision status	5
	Disabled veterans	3
	MBE/WBE participation	5
	Return to the state	5
	Total	<u>93</u>
After August 23, 2013	Return to the state	10
	Personnel	100
	Method of performance	76
	Offeror status	14
	Total	<u>200</u>