Office of
Multnomah County Auditor

Steve March
County Auditor

501 SE Hawthorne Room 601
Portland, Oregon 97214
Phone: (503) 988-3320

Fran Davison
Judith DeVilliers
Joanna Hixson
Craig Hunt
Sarah Landis
Shea Marshman
Mark Ulanowicz

Date: November 30, 2009

To: Ted Wheeler, Multnomah County Chair
Deborah Kafoury, Commissioner, District 1
Jeff Cogen, Commissioner, District 2
Judith Shiprack, Commissioner, District 3
Diane McKeel, Commissioner, District 4
Mindy Harris, Department of County Management Interim Director

From: Steve March, Auditor
Fran Davison, Senior Auditor
Mark Ulanowicz, Principal Auditor

Subject: Report to Management, Central Stores: External Sales

The attached report to management covers our recent performance review of *Central Stores: External Sales*. Central Stores is responsible for providing purchasing and warehouse services for Multnomah County internal customers and more than 70 external customers, including agencies in all 36 Oregon counties. The objective of our review was to determine whether or not the county is covering its costs in providing purchasing services to external customers of Central Stores.

We found that revenue from external customers covers the variable costs associated with making the sales. However, it is less clear that the external sales program covers its share of the total cost of the Central Stores operation which also includes warehouse and other fixed costs as well as county overhead costs. We would hope that management consider the information in the report as part of the continuing dialog over internal service charges.

We extend our thanks to the Central Stores staff and department representatives for their cooperation and assistance throughout the review and commend them for their attention to the important issue of inventory management.

cc: Jana McLellan
Rich Swift
Garret R. Vanderzanden

Steve March
Multnomah County Auditor
501 SE Hawthorne, Room 601
Portland, Oregon 97214
503-988-3320
www.co.multnomah.or.us/auditor

Audit Staff
Fran Davison
Mark Ulanowicz

Central Stores: External Sales Report to Management

November 2009

Summary

The objective of our review was to determine whether or not the county is covering its costs in providing purchasing services to external customers of Central Stores. We analyzed customer data to better understand how internal and external customers compare on several factors and whether the fee paid by external customers covers the costs associated with fulfilling their orders. We determined that the revenue brought in by external sales covers the variable cost (personnel costs) associated with making the sales. However, it is less clear that the external sales program covers its share of the total cost of Central Stores' operations, which also includes warehouse and other fixed costs as well as county overhead costs. Our analysis showed profit margins ranging from negative 5 percent to positive 5 percent, depending on how we allocated the fixed and overhead costs.

Background

Central Stores is part of the Multnomah County Materiel Management section of the Department of County Management. Central Stores provides goods and supplies to county departments and other agencies throughout Oregon. In Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) customers made more than $6 million in purchases from Central Stores (CS): $3,766,000 by Multnomah County internal customers and $2,295,000 by external customers.

CS has more than 70 external customers, including agencies in all 36 Oregon counties. The majority of these are family planning clinics managed by other counties and not-for-profit organizations eligible for federal family planning funding. CS is able to purchase contraceptive drugs and supplies at a discount by taking advantage of consortium contracts and volume purchases. For more than 20 years, CS has provided buying services, centralized receiving, inventory stocking and distribution and has managed returns for these external agencies.

Multnomah County CS charges its external customers a 10 percent fee for providing this service, with a slightly higher fee for certain low-cost materials. This fee was set by Multnomah County resolution and is subject to change by the Board of County Commissioners.

Sales to external customers accounted for approximately 38 percent of the dollar amount of purchases from CS in FY08. The high dollar amount of external purchases resulted from the relatively high cost of the items purchased rather than the number of orders or items: external customers accounted for about 14 percent of total items sold and only 10 percent of orders. Fees charged to external customers totaled approximately $250,000 and accounted for about 23 percent of CS's $1.1 million FY08 operating expenses. [1]

Exhibit 1: Comparison of Internal and External Customers

Customers	Sales	%	Materials Sold	%	Orders Filled	%	Average Sale per Order
Internal	$3,765,887	62%	47,506	86%	13,310	90%	$ 283
External	$2,295,050	38%	7,736	14%	1,494	10%	$1,536
Total	$6,060,937	100%	55,242	100%	14,804	100%	

Source: Purchase data from SAP download of reservations for FY08

Allocating Costs

CS provides purchasing and warehouse services to both internal and external customers. Because the external sales program does not use dedicated staff or resources, we can only estimate the cost of selling material to external customers. For this estimate, we considered the variable costs to be the personnel costs – salary and benefits – needed to process external sales because these resources could be most easily used for other activities. The remaining costs, such as those related to fixed warehouse expenses and county overhead, are included in the calculation of total costs.

Using payroll data and FY08 actual CS expenditures, we developed four cost allocation models to estimate the operation's costs. We based three of our allocation models on proxies for sales activity – or the amount of resources necessary to support sales – and one on self-reported measures of staff time devoted to external sales. The dollar amount of sales, the number of unique items sold in each order, and the number of orders filled all served as our proxies for sales activity.

Staff expenses include personnel costs[2] for CS staff who service external customers. Warehouse expenses include county indirect expenses, building expenses, telephone services, county IT and data processing, and other miscellaneous expenses. Exhibit 2 below shows the results for each model based on variable costs and total costs.

[1] Budget estimate may include some expenses associated with the Fleet or Road Warehous

[2] The amount of cost allocated for individual personnel was different for some staff members, depending on duties and responsibilities

Exhibit 2: Cost Allocation Models and Resulting Net Income - External Customers

	A Sales Dollar Amount (38%)	B Materials Sold (14%)	C Orders Filled (10%)	D Staff Reported (various)	E Average of Methods
Purchasing and Handling Fees (estimated) [3]	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**
Variable Costs (personnel)	**188,238**	**97,018**	**80,244**	**113,017**	**119,629**
Fees Less Variable Costs	**61,762**	**152,982**	**169,756**	**136,983**	**130,371**
Fixed and Overhead Costs	**184,913**	**68,126**	**48,661**	**24,331**	**81,508**
Net Income	**(123,150)**	**84,856**	**121,095**	**112,652**	**48,863**
Profit Margin	**-5%**	**4%**	**5%**	**5%**	**2%**

A. Allocation Based on Percent of Sales Dollar Amount

Allocating the cost of the external sales business on the basis of dollar amount of sales is consistent with how CS allocates costs for internal customers. External customers account for 38 percent of the sales activity of CS. If assessed on sales activity, allocated costs would total $373,150, yielding a net loss of about 5 percent of total sales. See Exhibit 2, Column A above.

B. and C. Allocation Based on Sales and Warehouse Activity

Allocating costs on the basis of materials sold and orders processed assigns costs based on the time it takes CS staff to support the external sales business. Sales to external customers generate 14 percent of the total material line items sold and 10 percent of orders filled (reservations). In each case, the business is profitable, with a profit margin of 4 percent for the materials allocation and 5 percent when we allocated costs by orders. See Exhibit 2, Columns B and C above.

D. Allocation Based on Staff-Reported Time

In calculating our Staff-Reported allocation, we used staff estimates of hours worked on external sales and estimated 5 percent of warehouse costs to account for use of warehouse space and other resources. If costs were assessed on resources used, the cost would be $137,348 with a net income of $112,652 and profit margin of 5 percent. See Exhibit 2, Column D above.

---

[3] Purchasing and Handling Fees (revenue) includes the 10% fee plus some additional fees collected from external customers

Managing Revenue and Expenses

It is difficult to manage potentially unpredictable revenue from external customers with expenses that are essentially fixed in the short-term. A number of factors contribute to the instability of external revenues. For example, many external customers are eligible to purchase materials using the same multi-state or consortium contracts CS uses and could do so without paying CS's 10 percent handling fee. In those instances where CS does get a volume discount not available to its customers, the discount is usually less than the 10 percent fee. Moreover, CS does not have any minimum purchase or other purchase commitment requirement for its external customers, giving the customers the freedom to choose whatever supplier they wish without risk of penalty.

The convenience of purchasing through CS is a compelling reason for customers not to leave, but as resources get tighter, losing customers is a real possibility if these customers believe they can cut costs by making their own purchases. For example, the Multnomah County Health Department reduced its purchases of supplies through CS and chose to absorb the administrative cost of making these purchases directly from suppliers rather than pay CS for the service. At the time, the CS internal service charge was nearly twice the handling fee paid by external customers for the same materials. The Health Department pharmacy now purchases about $250,000 worth of family planning supplies directly per year rather than going through CS.

The loss of the convenience of purchasing through CS constitutes a switching cost for external customers. However, for larger customers that are likely to already have purchasing operations, this cost may not be as high. Large customers may even be able to take advantage of some of the same volume discounts available to CS and the Health Department. Even if the customers did not leave CS completely, they could purchase the few expensive items they need directly, saving the handling fee, and continue to buy lower cost items through CS. These less expensive items disproportionately affect CS fee revenue.

Exhibit 3: Top Five External Customers by Sales Amount

Customer Name	Sales	Percent of Total Sales
Washington County Family Planning	$302,257	13%
Douglas County Family Planning	$192,837	8%
Deschutes County Family Planning	$128,599	6%
Jackson County Family Planning	$119,036	5%
Linn County Family Planning	$114,455	5%
Total	$857,184	38%

While customers and the external sales revenue could be lost with little or no warning at any time, the costs associated with providing the external sales service are more difficult to reduce quickly. Finance, purchasing, and warehouse activities associated with external sales are completely integrated into the overall CS operation. For example, the steep drop in internal sales from FY07 to FY08 did not result in a corresponding decrease in expenses.

Assuming that CS will continue to exist with or without an external sales operation and that the purchasing and handling fees from these sales more than cover the variable cost of providing that service, these sales help to reduce costs for internal county customers. For example, without the FY08 external sales revenue, charges to departments could have increased another 4 percentage points to cover expenses. However, any evaluation of the CS operation as a whole should consider the fact that the fees charged for external sales may not cover the total cost of providing the service in the future.

Scope and Methodology

During this review, we interviewed staff responsible for several facets of the entire CS operation as well as the larger FREDS Division and the Health Department. We also interviewed officials from other jurisdictions, including the State of Oregon Department of Human Services. We collected and analyzed internal and external sales data for the period between July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 and payroll data for CS staff. We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. 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.

Recommendations

1. In the near-term, consider creating incentives, such as volume purchase discounts or discounts for purchase commitments, to reduce the likelihood of external customers leaving the program.

2. Any significant changes in the external sales operations – such as investment or expansion – should consider the total costs of the operation.

3. Management should evaluate the potential disincentives created by its rate structure – specifically in areas where CS charges internal customers roughly twice the rate it charges external customers for the same products and services.

Response to the Report

Department of County Management

MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

Fleet, Records, Electronic, & Distribution Services Division (FREDS)
700 NE 55th Ave
Portland, Oregon 97213
(503) 988-5299 phone
(503) 988-6265 fax

To: Steve March, County Auditor

From: Garret Vanderzanden, Materiel Manager

Date: November 23rd, 2009

RE: Central Stores: External Sales Report to Management

The Department of County Management and FREDS appreciate the work the County Auditor's completed in evaluating our External Sales business and whether or not we are recovering our costs in providing these services. We recognize the value the recommendations bring to the program. We will be working with both our internal and external customers on how these can strengthen both business relationships. We wanted to also take this opportunity to speak to some of the specifics in the report and the work currently being done.

Central Stores agrees that there is risk involved in external customers leaving the program and recognizes the need to mitigate that risk. We are working with our partners at the State who manage the Family Programming, the large majority of our external customers, to identify improvements to the systems currently in place. These include but are not limited to:

- Moving to an electronic payment processing protocol to streamline accounts receivable.
- Improvement in invoicing processes by implementing SAP Sales Module.
- Roll out of online ordering tool in calendar year 2010. This will be done by leveraging Shopping Cart functionality implemented in FY10 for internal customers.

Each of these will gain efficiencies for our customers in their business interactions with Central Stores. The business relationships we have with our external clients are currently very strong due to the accuracy, efficiency, expertise and professionalism delivered daily. These changes will serve to further strengthen those relationships. While we currently do not have any plans in place related specifically to creating discount incentives for our external customers, we recognize the value this may bring and will be evaluating it as a retention strategy.

The auditor's report also recommended evaluation of potential disincentives created by the current Central Stores rate structure. Central Stores is evaluating the Allocation Methodology, the basis for the rate structure for internal customers, on an ongoing basis to improve the model. The intent is to achieve a fair and equitable rate for each of our customers based on the work done on their behalf. It is recognized that the current model, solely based on total dollars purchased, does not adequately capture nor describe the complexity of the work performed. This is demonstrated by the Cost Allocation models contained in the auditor's report and the wide disparity when looking at a Sales Dollar amount methodology vs. a Work Performed methodology.

We acknowledge that improvements to the current rate structure are needed. However, the assertion that the current model provides a disincentive to purchase commodities from Central Stores is an area we feel warrants further exploration. The report notes a single example within the County as the basis for this assertion, but the comparisons made between purchasing the supplies through Central Stores vs. purchasing outside appear to include different elements to arrive at the total cost. For example, the cost of purchasing supplies through Central Stores includes certain fixed and administrative costs, yet the example used for purchasing supplies directly from vendors appears to include only the purchase price of the item itself. By using a single example the report missed those programs that Central Stores has worked with to improve their commodity management:

- Weatherization – moved procurement and warehousing of commonly used products to Central Stores in January 2007 to ensure more accurate tracking of funds and availability of commodities.
- IT – moved procurement and warehousing of Asset Replacement program to Central Stores in October 2005 to ensure more accurate tracking of inventory and centralization of commodities.

These programs are not inclusive of all programs we partner with but are a good representation of those for whom our business model is an incentive rather than a disincentive. Central Stores will continue working to address the current rate structure with the objective of achieving the lowest overall cost of doing business to the County in its entirety.

Again, we appreciate the recommendations made to improve our business relationships with both our internal and external customers. We will be looking at ways to implement those recommendations, as well as continuing to work on the efforts already in place that are complementary.

Cc: Rich Swift
Jana McLellan
Mindy Harris