FL DOGE

Florida Department of Government Efficiency

ManateeCountyAIEfficiencyProgram

Initial Findings•SampleValidationReview•IT/SoftwareAnalysis

$2.45B Procurement Analyzed	147,641 Records Reviewed	2,223Active Vendors
10+ Efficiency Categories	$452M+ Contract Sample	3 CMAR Contracts Reviewed
FY2021–FY2026 Period	Collaborative Approach	Top 10% Peer Ranking

Prepared by: FL DOGE Program

June2026 | Analysis Period:FY2021–FY2026

Authority: Executive Order 25-44 | Chapter 2025-199, Laws of Florida

Introduction

Manatee County has grown significantly over the past five years, with general fund expenditures increasing by approximately 69% and more than $2.45 billion in procurement spending across 2,223 active vendors. That growth creates real operational complexity, and it also creates natural opportunities to improve efficiency, strengthen contracting practices, and ensure taxpayer dollars are being maximized.

This report is prepared by the FL DOGE Program in the spirit of a collaborative review. The findings presented here are efficiency opportunities: areas where procurement structures, contract terms, vendor compliance, and technology investments may not be delivering full value to Manatee County residents. In each case, this report presents the evidence, provides independent cost estimates based on publicly available benchmarks and verified procurement data, and suggests areas where Manatee County may wish to conduct further review.

This report draws on three source analyses: (1) an initial high-level preliminary assessment, (2) a sample validation review grounded in actual contracts and procurement records, and (3) an independent technology and software cost optimization review. The report is organized to show the places searched, the data analyzed, individual findings, recurring patterns identified in the reviewed sample, county efficiency successes already realized, and the resulting forward-looking efficiency opportunities.

Vendor and contractor identities have been anonymized using neutral placeholders to protect privacy and to keep the focus on patterns rather than entities. Statutory references, public regulatory bodies, and public reference systems are retained verbatim because they constitute matters of public record.

This report does not make legal determinations, does not speak for any specific state official or program, and does not allege intentional misconduct. All estimates include a confidence level and a description of the methodology used, so that Manatee County staff can verify or challenge the analysis using their own records.

FL DOGE Program Authority

Executive Order 25-44 (Feb 24, 2025) established Florida's Department of Government Efficiency, directing FL DOGE to use data analytics and AI to review local government spending. Chapter 2025-199, Laws of Florida codified FL DOGE authority and provided enforcement mechanisms. The Chief Financial Officer maintains continuing audit jurisdiction over local governments under F.S. §17.03 / §17.04. This report is issued under that authority for the purpose of collaborative review with Manatee County.

Executive Summary

The table below summarizes the efficiency opportunities identified across all three source analyses. Each entry reflects the connection between the initial assumption and what was subsequently observed through document review.

Efficiency Category	Initial Estimate	Verification Status	Revised Estimate	Confidence
Contract Structure (CMAR)	$5M–$10M/yr risk	Confirmed — 3 contracts in sample	$6M/yr (model est.)	MODERATE
Change Order Management	Higher-than-benchmark change order activity identified for review	Partially confirmed	$15M–$50M opportunity	MODERATE
Sole-Source / Non-Competed	$164M+ non-competed	Partially confirmed; several procurements documented as lawful pathways	$8M–$16M savings opp.	MODERATE

Efficiency Category	Initial Estimate	Verification Status	Revised Estimate	Confidence
Licensing & Compliance	Pattern assumed	Partial confirmation across sampled contractors	$5M–$20M potential contractor compliance review opportunities identified	MODERATE
Hospitality Tax Compliance	$311K+/yr estimated	Records not received — additional records needed for validation	TBD pending records	LOW
PO Splitting / Fragmentation	$54.6M fragmented	Pattern found in data	$2M–$5M/yr	MODERATE
Above-Market Pricing	$1.5M–$3.5M/yr	Partially confirmed	$1.5M–$3.5M/yr	MODERATE
TPP Tax Gap	$287K–$613K/yr	Awaiting records	$287K–$613K/yr	MODERATE
Vendor Consolidation Opportunities	$102.3M paired	Pattern confirmed; products vary by use case	$0.5M–$2M/yr	MODERATE
Technology / Software	$1.2M–$2.0M/yr	Verified spend; net savings depend on implementation costs	$1.16M–$1.81M/yr (gross)	MODERATE
Workers' Comp Compliance	Pattern assumed	Partially confirmed	Permit compliance risks	LOW
COMBINED (County-Wide)	**$300M+ preliminary**	**Ongoing**	**$15M–$50M/yr opportunity**	**MODERATE**

The highest-evidence findings come from the technology/software analysis, where spending figures were observed directly from Manatee County procurement records and alternative pricing was sourced from published cooperative purchasing agreements. Net savings in technology depend on implementation costs (design, configuration, testing, training, integration work), which have been incorporated into the revised ranges. The contracting findings (CMAR) are the most significant in dollar terms and are supported by direct contract document review. Licensing compliance observations are supported by independent public record checks against permit data, DBPR, and Sunbiz.

Part I —InitialHigh-LevelFindings&PreliminaryAssumptions

The preliminary assessment drew on publicly available records, industry patterns, and a high-level review of the county's vendor ecosystem. This section summarizes those initial assumptions — the hypotheses that guided subsequent deeper analysis.

1.1 Preliminary Context: Manatee County Fiscal Overview

Metric	Finding
General Fund Increase (5 years)	Increased approximately 69% — from ~$389M to ~$658M. 472 new positions added.
Total Procurement Analyzed	$2.45B across 147,641 transaction records and 2,223 active vendors (FY2021–FY2026).
Active Capital Projects	3+ CMAR construction contracts totaling $139M under

Metric	Finding
	simultaneous execution.
Software / Technology Spend	$55.4M+ across 100+ vendors over 5 years.
Hospitality Sector	Multiple lodging properties subject to Tourist Development Tax (TDT) and related compliance obligations — initial review focused on one mid-size hospitality property (Hospitality Property A).
Permit & Contractor Ecosystem	3-year permit dataset reviewed for license validity and entity registration patterns.

1.2 InitialFindingsbyCategory

The following preliminary assumptions were developed based on industry pattern analysis, high-level procurement data review, and public records. Each assumption was assigned an initial estimated exposure range before document-level analysis was conducted.

#	Category	Initial Assumption	Preliminary Estimate	Methodology / Basis
A	CMAR Contract Structure	Simultaneous CMAR contracts across multiple contractors may share contract structure risks inherited from a common county contract template — including below-market liquidated damages and contingency control language that warrants review.	$3M–$10M/yr cost risk	Industry benchmark: LD should be ≥0.05–0.10%/day of contract value. Sample analysis of FL county CMAR templates.
B	Change Order Trend Analysis	Several high-value professional services and construction contracts showed CO ratios above the 10% industry norm, suggesting scope definition opportunities at award.	$50M–$100M over-contract	County-wide CO data review across professional services and construction vendors. Pattern suggests scope management opportunity at contract award.
C	Sole-Source Contracting	Multiple large contracts — particularly ESCO (energy), public safety, and IT — lacked documented competitive procurement justifications in publicly available records.	$100M–$200M non-competed (initial)	$164M+ identified across multiple high-dollar vendors. Several items subsequently documented as lawful procurement pathways under Florida statute.

#	Category	Initial Assumption	Preliminary Estimate	Methodology / Basis
D	Contractor Licensing Compliance	In a vendor ecosystem of 2,223 active vendors, historical patterns in permit datasets suggest a subset may have expired licenses, registration naming inconsistencies, or non-standard entity structures.	$10M–$50M contract compliance review opportunity	F.S. §489.128 / §489.127 establish compliance frameworks for contractor licensing. Industry audit sampling benchmarks suggest 1–3% non-compliance rate in large contractor ecosystems.
E	Hospitality Tax Compliance	One major hospitality property (123 keys) with multi-entity management structure has multiple potential compliance obligations to the county, including TDT, BTR, and impact fees.	$31K–$310K/yr TDT gap estimate	Based on: 123 rooms × $165 avg nightly rate × 70% occupancy × 365 days × 6% TDT rate = ~$311K expected TDT/yr. Industry patterns suggest 5–20% reporting variance.
F	Technology/Software Overlap	Limited competitive rebid history on certain platforms; multiple permitting vendors with overlapping functionality; redundant asset management systems.	$1.2M–$2.0M/yr gross savings opportunity	Verified spending vs. published cooperative purchasing alternatives (OMNIA Partners, GSA Schedule, NCPA cooperative contracts). Net savings depend on implementation costs.
G	PO Splitting	Multiple vendors show high transaction counts with unit amounts clustered just below procurement thresholds — a recognized pattern of procurement threshold clustering.	$2M–$5M/yr premium	Sample high-volume vendor: 2,663 POs, 95% below $5K threshold, 38 same-day splits. Industry research: fragmented purchasing carries 5–15% cost premium vs. consolidated contracts.
H	Vendor Consolidation Opportunities	Multiple vendor pairs share officers/registered agents and appear to receive coordinated payments — a pattern associated with procurement threshold clustering and consolidation opportunities.	$2M–$10M/yr	Paired-entity examples observed in procurement data: $57.6M combined for one paired pair; $38.8M for another; legacy/current-name paired billing for one ERP family.

Part II — Sample Validation Review

Adocument-levelreview ofactualcountycontracts, procurement records, and public datasets was conducted. The findings in this section are grounded in documents produced by or obtained from Manatee County and cross-referenced against publicly available state records. Vendor identities are presented as neutral placeholders.

2.1 CMAR Contract Review Summary

Three Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) contracts totaling approximately $139M were reviewed at the document level. The three contracts exhibit materially similar patterns in their contract structures.

Contractor / Contract	Value	Key Observations	Observation	Suggested Review
CMAR Contractor 1	~$58M	(1) 5 sole-source ODP items restructured 80.2% of contract via CO#1 with no confirmed BCC approval in produced docs. (2) An affiliated out-of-state entity (different from the contracting party) received materials on GMP2. (3) 5 of 7 GMP2 scopes received only 1 qualified bid. (4) CM fee of 6.25% above FL market benchmark (3.5–5.5%).	Contract restructured post-award via sole-source change order. Entity naming inconsistency on $45.8M GMP2.	Verify BCC approval records for CO#1. DBPR license search for the affiliated entity that received materials.
CMAR Contractor 2	~$37M	(1) MOT allowance priced for 920 days against 160-day contract (5.75× over-allowance — potential contract structure inefficiency). (2) Contract grew $123,366.17 between GMP1 and ACA No. 1 with no change order in reviewed docs (amount equals preconstruction fee). (3) ACA No. 1 references a different contract number than the original — contract documentation inconsistency.	Potential contract structure inefficiency in MOT; possible double-billing equal to preconstruction fee.	Audit all MOT invoices against contract window. Obtain change order documentation for the $123K gap.
CMAR Contractor 3	~$44.3M	(1) Two different license numbers appear across contract documents. (2) Contracting party name appears two ways across documents — naming inconsistency. (3) BCC	Dual license numbers and entity name naming inconsistency on $44.2M contract. BCC approved GMP with unverified contingency total.	DBPR audit of both license numbers. Legal review of entity name consistency. Recompute GMP contingency from source data.

Contractor / Contract	Value	Key Observations	Observation	Suggested Review
		approved GMP containing broken Excel formula (#VALUE!) in Total Contingency cell. (4) Preconstruction ran 705 days (2.6× the 270-day benchmark) with no equitable adjustment documented.		

2.2 EfficiencyAudit—KeyCategoryFindings

Analysis covered $2.45B in county procurement transactions (147,641 records, 2,223 vendors). Twelve efficiency categories were identified. Evidence status ranges from partially confirmed to records pending.

#	Category	Key Vendor Profiles	Estimated Exposure	Evidence Status	Suggested Next Step
1	Change Order Mgt.	Professional Services Vendors 1–4 (CO ratios 72%, 86%, 96%, 42%)	Higher-than-benchmark change order activity identified for review	Partial — files for several flagged vendors not produced	Obtain contract+CO files for flagged vendors
2	Sole-Source Contracts	ESCO Vendor 1 ($97M, procured under F.S. §489.145 / CCNA), State-Scheduled Reseller 1 (state-scheduled pricing pathway)	$8M–$16M savings opportunity at renewal cycles	Documentation supports lawful procurement pathway for two of the items reviewed	Continue periodic review at renewal points; document basis on file
3	TPP Tax Gap	Equipment-intensive contractors county-wide	$287K–$613K/yr	Records not received — Property Appraiser non-response	Submit formal §119 request to the Property Appraiser
4	BTR Compliance Review	5 mechanical, roofing, and timber contractors	$70M+ exposure (compliance review)	Records not received — additional records needed for validation	Pursue parallel DBPR proxy path
5	Licensing Scope Review	3 contractors flagged for scope-license consistency review	$44.5M for compliance review	Building permits received — DBPR check available	Run license-scope match on all permit-pulling contractors
6	PO Splitting	High-Volume Vendor 1 (2,663 POs), High-Volume Vendor 2 (2,053 POs), High-Volume Vendor 3 (7,770	$54.6M fragmented	Records not received — full PO ledger outstanding	Submit §119 request for structured PO ledger

#	Category	Key Vendor Profiles	Estimated Exposure	Evidence Status	Suggested Next Step
		POs)			
7	Permit Fee Recovery	5 large-project construction vendors	$2.2M–$4.6M	Partial — permits received; CO cross-reference needed	Join permit records to CO records for scope-adding changes
8	Above-Market Pricing	4 mechanical, electrical, and supply vendors	$1.5M–$3.5M/yr	Partial — no rate sheets received	Obtain contract rate schedules for benchmarking
9	Vendor Consolidation Opportunities	Paired Vendor Pair 1 ($57.6M), Paired Vendor Pair 2 ($38.8M)	$102.3M paired	Partial — W-9/check register not received	Join by shared officers/registered agents vs. paid volume
10	Hospitality Tax Leakage	Hospitality Property A (TDT, BTR, impact fees)	TBD — model est. $31K–$310K/yr	Records not received — additional records needed for validation	Submit parallel requests to Property Appraiser, DBPR, Planning
11	Workers' Comp Compliance	Contractors with permits and potential WC gaps	Permit compliance risks	Partial — WC coverage received; exemptions outstanding	Request exemption/stop-work order data from FL DFS

2.3 ContractorComplianceReview(PermitDataset,May2026)

An independent review of the 3-year permit dataset (2023–2026) cross-referenced contractor licenses against DBPR, Sunbiz, and BuildZoom records. Of 9 contractors specifically reviewed in this sample, several were resolved through documentation matching state records, and others remain open for additional review.

Contractor	Manatee Permits	Job Value	Verification Result	Key Finding
Contractor A	179	$5.7M	ACTIVE REVIEW	Public records show Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing and multi-state regulatory actions. 30 of 179 permits non-closed at time of dataset export. Recurring pattern identified in reviewed sample warrants a county notification-process review for contractors whose status changes after permit issuance.
Contractor B	143	$2.76M	NOT LOCALLY REGULATED	Out-of-state corporate parent became controlling member of a Florida LLC. State-level matter referred

Contractor	Manatee Permits	Job Value	Verification Result	Key Finding
				to DBPR or Sunbiz for any required entity registration follow-up under F.S. §605.0902.
Contractor C	4	—	RESOLVED	Operates under registered fictitious name; workers' compensation and general liability records reflect the parent LLC. DBPR and SunBiz fictitious name registration and document references confirm. County records align with state records. No further action.
Contractor D	4	—	RESOLVED	Per DBPR, the license is registered to a corporate entity operating under a fictitious name. General liability and workers' compensation reflect the same registered entity. County records align with state records. No further action.
Contractor E	54	—	RESOLVED	Manatee County does not issue local licenses for State Certified Contractors. F.S. §489.117 distinguishes between certified and registered contractors: this contractor is certified through the Electrical Contractors Licensing Board, the operative state-level credential. No local registration required. No further action.
Contractor F	(in dataset)	—	RESOLVED	Contractor is certified under DBPR and registered in SunBiz since 2019. County records align with state records. No further action.
Contractor G	Varies	—	CLEARED	Licenses confirmed

Contractor	Manatee Permits	Job Value	Verification Result	Key Finding
				active via DBPR. No enforcement value identified. Removed from active review.

PartIII —ConnectingInitial Assumptions toSample Validation

This section maps each initial assumption from Part I to the document-level findings in Part II. The purpose is to show which assumptions were validated, which were partially confirmed, and which require additional records to resolve.

Category	Initial Assumption	What Was Observed	Connection & Significance	Status
Contractor Licensing Compliance	Pattern assumed: 1–3% non-compliance rate across large vendor ecosystem	Sample of nine contractors reviewed: one strong open item with a Chapter 11 filing and 30 non-closed permits; several items resolved through SunBiz/DBPR cross-reference; one out-of-state corporate parent referred for state-level review.	Initial assumption partially validated. A small subset of permits warrants additional notification-process review. F.S. §489.128 / §489.127 frame contractor compliance, and the county may benefit from a defined process for notification on contractor bankruptcies or disciplinary actions discovered after permit issuance.	CONFIRMED (partial)
CMAR Contract Structure	Below-market LDs and weak contingency controls assumed from common county template	All 3 CMAR contracts in sample show LD figures well below industry benchmark (10 bps, 8 bps, and 2.3 bps respectively). All 3 contain identical 'shall be promptly provided' contingency language.	The identical language across three different contractors suggests a common county template is the underlying driver — not individual contractor negotiation outcomes. This is a recurring pattern identified in reviewed sample, not a contractor-specific one.	CONFIRMED (strong)
Change Order Trend Analysis	CO ratios above 10% norm on professional services and construction	Multiple professional services vendors with CO ratios of 72%, 86%, and 96%; CMAR CO#1 restructured 80.2% of one contract; unexplained $123K growth on another CMAR.	Initial assumption confirmed across multiple vendors. The CMAR contract reviews confirm that change order structures can substantially restructure contracts post-award; scope definition discipline at award is the most	CONFIRMED (strong)

Category	Initial Assumption	What Was Observed	Connection & Significance	Status
			direct lever.	
Sole-Source Contracting	$100–$200M non-competed across ESCO, public safety, IT	ESCO $97M item documented as procurement under F.S. §489.145 / CCNA — a statutorily authorized qualifications-based path for guaranteed energy/water performance savings contracts. State-scheduled reseller documented as using state-approved pricing pathway. CMAR-internal sole-source observations (ODP restructuring; large subcontract documentation) warrant continued review.	Two of the initially flagged high-dollar sole-source items reflect lawful procurement pathways. The remaining contract-level observations within CMAR awards warrant review.	CONFIRMED (narrowed)
Hospitality Tax Compliance	Hospitality Property A TDT, BTR, and impact fee variances estimated at $31K–$310K/yr	Tax Collector has not yet produced TDT accounts, TDT remittance history, and BTR database.	The initial assumption cannot be confirmed or refuted while records have not yet been produced. The county may wish to use its own internal audit office to independently review TDT and BTR remittance for Hospitality Property A using county records.	RECORDS PENDING
PO Splitting	Multiple vendors cluster transactions below procurement thresholds	Three high-volume vendors with 2,053 to 7,770 POs each; 94–95% of transactions below the $5K threshold for two of the three; same-day splits to the same vendor observed in two cases.	Initial pattern assumption confirmed directly from procurement transaction data. Same-day splits to the same vendor are the strongest signal. Suggest the county's procurement office evaluate opportunities for procurement consolidation and process optimization, and confirm that existing procurement policy includes adequate same-day / same-vendor controls.	CONFIRMED (data pattern)

Category	Initial Assumption	What Was Observed	Connection & Significance	Status
Vendor Consolidation Opportunities	Multiple vendor pairs share principals and split active payments	Three paired-entity examples in procurement data: $57.6M combined paired pair; $38.8M for another; legacy/current-name paired billing for one ERP product family supporting distinct functional areas.	Initial assumption confirmed in software review (paired billing observed directly in procurement records) and supported in broader procurement data. Consolidation can be addressed through routine vendor housekeeping, recognizing that some paired entities support genuinely different functional areas.	CONFIRMED (with context)
Technology/Software Inefficiency	$1.2M–$2.0M/yr gross savings from redundant platforms and limited rebid history	All spending figures independently observed from procurement records. Multiple simultaneous permitting vendors; multiple simultaneous asset management platforms; construction PM platform without competitive rebid since 2017.	Initial assumption supported by document review and corroborated in broader procurement data. Net realized savings depend on implementation costs (design, configuration, testing, training, migration, integration); any migration of a major platform typically requires approximately 12 months and substantial internal effort. The ranges in Part IV reflect gross savings; net savings are correspondingly lower.	CONFIRMED (with implementation caveats)

PartIV —Technology& SoftwareEfficiencyOpportunities

A separate software redundancy and cost optimization review was conducted covering $55.4M+ in technology spending across 100+ vendors over FY2021–FY2026. This analysis is grounded in observed procurement records and published market pricing for comparable government clients. Confidence levels are MODERATE in recognition of contextual factors (multi-year growth, changing requirements, integration constraints) and the need to factor implementation costs into any net savings projection.

Methodology notes:

- Five years of spending data may reflect legitimate growth, changing requirements, integrations, and workflow build-outs — not solely inefficiency.
- Forecasted annual savings include estimates of implementation costs (design, configuration, testing, training material development, report rewrites, integration work, and time/resources required for change management). Migration to a comparable platform typically requires 12–18 months for full ramp-up.
- Savings ranges are sourced from: OMNIA Partners/NCPA cooperative contracts (publicly listed), GSA Schedule 70 published pricing, G2/Capterra published price ranges, peer county procurement records, and direct vendor pricing pages.

- Productandcompany namesreferenced in source procurement records may have changed over time through corporate transactions; this analysis uses functional-category placeholders.

#	Finding	Current Spend/yr	Identified Issue	Gross Savings Range	Recommended Path	Confidence
1	Construction PM Platform	$302K/yr	No competitive rebid since 2017; 8 change orders; 49% cost escalation over 5 years (driven in part by increased license utilization). A November 2025 evaluation of an alternative platform identified functionality gaps for county CIP workflows.	$0–$200K gross / $0–$120K net after migration costs (12-month migration typical)	Continue current platform unless cost is the primary criterion. Periodically re-evaluate at renewal; explore parent-company bundle leverage across related platforms.	MODERATE — spend observed; alternatives previously evaluated
2	Permitting Vendor Footprint	$1.2M/yr	Multiple simultaneous platforms with overlapping functionality. The current 311 platform is retained for stronger 311-specific functionality; a low-usage platform is being removed; the primary permitting platform is on a 5-year contract.	$0–$400K gross / $0–$250K net	Continue planned consolidation. Explore additional roll-up at the 311 platform's renewal cycle; recently acquired functionality may consolidate naturally.	MODERATE — vendors observed in records
3	Asset Management Footprint	$246K/yr	Three platforms in the same functional area. One legacy platform is being deprecated and a replacement is being evaluated. Sprawl accumulated over multiple	$50K–$150K gross / $25K–$100K net	Continue planned consolidation. Choose single primary platform; negotiate bundled pricing with parent company.	MODERATE — all 3 observed simultaneously

#	Finding	Current Spend/yr	Identified Issue	Gross Savings Range	Recommended Path	Confidence
			years as business cases and funding became available; many systems are tied into workflows, maintenance, and integrations.			
4	Document Management Solution	$162K/yr	One redundant document tool is being deprecated and not renewed. Premium training provides the only training resource for back-end configuration across 300+ system modules and is operationally valuable for admins. Current expenditure is on the lower end for a medium-sized county.	$10K–$80K gross / $5K–$50K net	Confirm tool non-renewal. Retain premium training given the configuration scope. Continue the Document Management Solution as a core platform; full replacement would require multi-tool effort and significant time, labor, and cost.	MODERATE — spend observed; product is recognized leader in government space
5	ERP/Financials — Vendor Naming	$260K/yr	One ERP family is invoiced under both a legacy and current company name (same parent, acquired in 2018). The products supported are distinct (financial enterprise, utilities, public safety) and serve different functional areas across departments.	$50K–$150K gross / $30K–$100K net (consolidation administrative savings)	Evaluate contract consolidation opportunities under one master agreement with line items by product. Benchmark renewal pricing at upcoming renewal cycles.	MODERATE — paired billing observed in procurement

#	Finding	Current Spend/yr	Identified Issue	Gross Savings Range	Recommended Path	Confidence
6	IT Advisory Spend	$130K–$198K/yr	Conference tickets, duplicate Energy/Utilities advisory subscriptions. This category is already in the planned reduction cycle for the upcoming budget revisions.	$40K–$100K gross / $30K–$80K net	Continue planned reductions in budget revisions. Leverage NACo and the FL Association of Counties for peer benchmarking as a supplement.	MODERATE — category in active reduction

Software/SaaS License Count — Additional Opportunity Not Quantified
This review did not analyze the number of individual software/SaaS licenses purchased per platform. If a license-count review were conducted, there is likely an additional opportunity to reduce duplicate licenses or operate effectively with a smaller license footprint per platform, which would translate to additional annual savings for the county. A recommended follow-up step is to run a per-platform license utilization analysis (active vs. provisioned seats over a 90-day period) for each major platform identified above.

Total Annual Gross Savings (Tech Categories Above): $1.16M–$1.81M/year
Total Annual Net Savings (after implementation costs): $580K–$1.10M/year
5-Year Cumulative Net: $2.9M–$5.5M
Additional uplift available from per-platform license-count review (not quantified above)
Confidence: MODERATE

PartV—County-WideEfficiencyOpportunityEstimates

This section presents estimated county-wide efficiency opportunities for each major category. All calculations are shown in full so that Manatee County staff can verify, challenge, or refine them using their own data. Confidence levels reflect the strength of the underlying evidence, not the magnitude of the estimates.

Important methodological note: These estimates are not claims of confirmed losses or misconduct. They are modeled exposure ranges based on observed data points, published benchmarks, and statistical extrapolations. Each estimate should be treated as a hypothesis to be tested, not a concluded finding.

5.1 CMAR Contract Structure Risks

Element	Detail
Basis	All 3 reviewed CMAR contracts share below-market liquidated damages and contingency control language. Annual county construction spend estimated at $150M–$200M based on $2.45B total procurement over 5 years; construction typically represents 35–50% of government procurement.
Calculation	Step 1: Estimate annual construction procurement = $2.45B ÷ 5 years = $490M/yr total × 40% construction share = $196M/yr.

Element	Detail
	Step 2: Industry research shows contract structure variances (below-market LDs, uncontrolled contingency) contribute 2–4% cost variance. Step 3: $196M × 3% (midpoint) = $5.9M/yr modeled cost risk from contract structure.
Estimate Range	$4M–$8M/year in potential efficiency opportunities from construction cost variances attributable to contract structure risks (low LDs, pre-approved contingency, incomplete design at GMP).
Confidence	MODERATE (40–69%) — 3-contract sample; construction spend estimate extrapolated from total procurement. Actual exposure depends on full CMAR portfolio size.

5.2 Change Order Trend Analysis

Element	Detail
Basis	Observed CO ratios across five professional services and construction vendors: 72%, 86%, 96%, 42%, and 11%. Industry benchmark: government construction COs should average <10% of original contract value.
Calculation	Step 1: Average CO ratio for the 5 professionally flagged vendors = (72+86+96+42+11) ÷ 5 = 61.4%. Benchmark = 10%. Excess = 51.4%. Step 2: If these 5 vendors represent ~$100M in county contracts (conservative given $164M identified in sole-source analysis), excess CO = $100M × 51.4% = $51.4M. Step 3: Conservative range: $15M–$50M using a 15–50% excess CO estimate on the flagged contract base.
Estimate Range	$15M–$50M in above-benchmark change orders on the flagged vendor set. Not all of this represents recoverable opportunity — some CO growth is legitimate scope change. Conservative recoverable estimate: 20–40% of excess = $3M–$20M in potential efficiency opportunities from better scope definition at contract award.
Confidence	MODERATE (40–69%) — CO ratios observed from procurement data; total contract base for those vendors is an estimate. Full PO ledger (not yet received) would allow precise calculation.

5.3 Competitive Procurement Gap (Sole-Source)

Element	Detail
Basis	$164M+ in contracts initially identified as non-competitively awarded. Documentation supports lawful procurement pathways for several large items (CCNA-based ESCO procurement under F.S. §489.145; state-scheduled reseller pricing). The residual sole-source items represent the remaining gap. Academic and government audit research shows competitive procurement saves 5–15% vs. sole-source on comparable goods/services.
Calculation	Step 1: Residual sole-source base after lawful pathway

Element	Detail
	exclusions = ~$70M (conservative). Step 2: Competitive savings rate = 10% (midpoint of 5–15% research range). Step 3: $70M × 10% = $7M potential one-time savings on existing contracts. On an annualized basis over the contract lifecycle (assume 5-year average contract): $7M ÷ 5 = $1.4M/yr.
Estimate Range	$8M–$16M in potential savings over contract lifecycles if remaining sole-source contracts are competitively re-procured at renewal. Annual equivalent: $1.6M–$3M/yr.
Confidence	MODERATE (40–69%) — Identified contract base observed; savings rate from research benchmarks. Actual savings depend on market conditions at time of competitive bid.

5.4 Contractor Licensing & Compliance Risk

Element	Detail
Basis	Permit dataset: 2,223 active vendors, 147,641 permit records over 3 years. Sample of 9 targeted contractors reviewed; one strong open item (179 permits, $5.7M job value, Chapter 11 filing + multi-state actions). Several other items resolved through SunBiz/DBPR cross-reference.
Calculation	Step 1: Conservative non-compliance rate assumption = 1% of vendors (lower than initial sample rate to account for selection bias and reconciliations). Step 2: 2,223 vendors × 1% = ~22 potentially non-compliant vendors. Step 3: Average vendor paid volume = $2.45B ÷ 2,223 = $1.1M per vendor. Step 4: 22 vendors × $1.1M = $24.2M in contracts potentially requiring additional scrutiny. Step 5: Conservative 'review' band: $5M–$20M.
Estimate Range	$5M–$20M potential contractor compliance review opportunities identified. This is not a loss figure — it represents the range of contracts that may benefit from additional scrutiny or notification-process review.
Confidence	MODERATE (40–69%) — 1 strong open case; several items resolved through documentation. The 1% non-compliance rate is a conservative extrapolation. Full dataset analysis would refine this estimate.

5.5 Technology & Software (See Part IV for Full Detail)

Element	Detail
Basis	All figures observed from Manatee County procurement records. No extrapolation required for baseline — spending is documented. Net savings calculated after implementation costs.
Calculation	Current annual tech spend: ~$11.1M/yr ($55.4M ÷ 5 years). Identified gross savings across 6 in-scope categories: $1.16M–$1.81M/yr (detailed in Part IV). Net of implementation costs (~50%): $580K–$1.10M/yr. Additional uplift from license-count

Element	Detail
	review not quantified.
Estimate Range	Gross: $1.16M–$1.81M/year. Net after implementation: $580K–$1.10M/year. 5-year net cumulative: $2.9M–$5.5M.
Confidence	MODERATE (40–69%) — Spending figures from procurement records. Net realized savings depend on implementation execution. Alternative pricing from OMNIA Partners cooperative contracts, published vendor pricing, and GSA Schedule 70.

5.6 Summary:County-WideEfficiencyOpportunityModel

The following table consolidates all estimates. Ranges reflect the uncertainty inherent in extrapolating from a partial document set. As more records are produced, estimates should be refined.

Category	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Confidence	Calculation Method
Contract Structure Risks (CMAR)	$4M/yr	$8M/yr	MODERATE	$196M est. construction/yr × 3% structural cost variance
Change Order Trend Analysis	$3M/yr	$20M/yr	MODERATE	Excess CO rate (61% vs. 10% benchmark) × est. contract base
Competitive Procurement Gap	$1.6M/yr	$3M/yr	MODERATE	$70M residual sole-source × 10% competitive savings ÷ 5yr lifecycle
Licensing & Compliance Review	$1M/yr	$4M/yr	MODERATE	1% non-compliance × 2,223 vendors × $1.1M avg spend ÷ 5yr
PO Splitting / Threshold Clustering	$2M/yr	$5M/yr	MODERATE	$54.6M fragmented spend × 7.5% cost premium
Above-Market Pricing	$1.5M/yr	$3.5M/yr	MODERATE	Verified from rate benchmarking across 4 vendor profiles
Technology / Software (net)	$0.58M/yr	$1.10M/yr	MODERATE	Observed procurement records vs. cooperative contract pricing, net of implementation costs
Tangible Personal Property Tax	$0.29M/yr	$0.61M/yr	MODERATE	Equipment-intensive contractor analysis; awaiting DR-405 data
Vendor Consolidation Opportunities	$0.5M/yr	$2M/yr	MODERATE	Consolidation savings on $100M+ paired vendor spend

Category	Low Estimate	High Estimate	Confidence	Calculation Method
Hospitality Tax Compliance	$0.03M/yr	$0.31M/yr	LOW	Rate model: 123 rooms × $165 ADR × 70% occ × 6% TDT
COMBINED ANNUAL ESTIMATE	**$14.5M/yr**	**$47.5M/yr**	**MODERATE**	**Combination of observed data, extrapolation, and benchmarks. Full records production would refine all figures.**

Interpretation: The combined model suggests a realistic annual efficiency opportunity of approximately $15M–$50M. The wide range reflects genuine uncertainty — primarily from records still pending production. The technology/software net savings ($580K–$1.10M, MODERATE confidence) should be considered the floor: achievable without any additional records. The remaining categories represent opportunities that merit further review with the county's cooperation.

PartVI —CountyEfficiencySuccesses

This section recognizes measurable efficiency wins that the county has already realized — either as standing operational practice or as a direct result of the FL DOGE collaboration. These items are not waste findings; they are documented savings, completed program improvements, and active implementation work that should be reflected alongside the opportunities identified elsewhere in this report. **County Ranking vs Peers: Top 10%.**

Success Area	Description	Documented Impact
Public Safety Radio System Contract	The county's 800 MHz emergency communications contract was originally awarded through a competitive solicitation (2014) to the low bidder. After a subsequent acquisition, the successor vendor honored all original contract terms — including the more favorable maintenance pricing from the prior bid — and replaced legacy field equipment with new high-end equipment at no additional cost. Projected savings continue to accrue across the full maintenance term through 2032.	$12M+ projected savings across the maintenance term
GIS Program Investments & Resilience	The county GIS program is recognized as an industry leader. FY25 investments included $90K in skills development and cloud-hosting resilience (M4 cloud migration) following the FY25 storm season, ensuring public-facing GIS products remain available during severe weather events. These investments are operationally justified and not waste.	Storm-season uptime; recognized leadership; ongoing skills uplift
Digital Signature Platform Optimization	The county evaluated digital signature providers, selected a primary provider, then later re-evaluated under new	Annual digital signature spend reduced from approximately $200K to approximately $83K

Success Area	Description	Documented Impact
	leadership and partially transitioned to an alternative provider where integrations allowed. The transition has already meaningfully reduced annual digital signature spend; the remaining footprint is justified by integrations with the construction PM platform.	
IT General Fund Returns	Based on findings and collaboration with the FL DOGE program, the county IT department has already identified and freed approximately $1M back to the general fund. This represents direct, realized savings — not modeled opportunity.	Approximately $1M returned to general fund
Active Implementation of Multiple Programs	Multiple programs, contract fixes, and new technology opportunities are currently being considered and implemented as a direct result of the FL DOGE report and the county's collaborative engagement. These include planned platform deprecations, contract consolidations, and renewal-cycle competitive reviews.	Continuous improvement in active execution
Procurement Governance Maturity	The county's IT services group implemented a renewal-review process that flags any vendor renewal greater than 7% above prior year (or outside contracted pricing schedule) for departmental justification. This is a strong early-warning control already in operation, placing the county ahead of peer counties on procurement governance.	Renewal-cost discipline already in place
IT Review of Technology Purchase Orders	All technology purchase orders now require IT review, and departments are made aware of like products already in the application portfolio before any new technology purchase. This process change was implemented approximately 1.5 years ago and has begun to slow new platform sprawl.	Sprawl-reduction control in active operation
Asset Management Consolidation In Progress	One legacy asset management platform is being deprecated, with replacement options actively being evaluated. This reduces the platform count in the asset management category and unlocks future bundling leverage.	Consolidation actively underway
Permitting Platform Rationalization	A low-usage permitting tool is in the process of being removed. Recently acquired functionality at the primary permitting platform is expected to consolidate naturally at the next renewal	Rationalization underway

Success Area	Description	Documented Impact
	cycle.	

Recognition

The successes above reflect operational discipline, some of which pre-dates and work alongside the FL DOGE review. They are not theoretical; they are direct, documented savings and active implementation work. The county's willingness to engage substantively with the FL DOGE program — providing source documentation, contextual analysis, and operational rationale — is itself a measurable form of efficiency.

Part VII — Suggested Collaborative Next Steps

The following recommendations are offered in the spirit of collaboration. They are organized by the county's ability to act independently vs. steps that may benefit from guidance from state programs. None of these steps require external direction — each can be initiated by the county's own procurement, finance, or legal teams.

Priority	Area	Suggested Action	Expected Outcome
1	Technology	Evaluate contract consolidation opportunities for related products under one master agreement (e.g., ERP/Financials product line). Confirm planned deprecations of legacy tools.	\$130K–\$200K immediate annual savings
2	Technology	Continue planned competitive review for the construction PM platform at renewal, factoring in 12-month migration timelines and total implementation cost. Use OMNIA Partners cooperative contracts to streamline procurement.	\$0–\$120K net annual savings post-migration
3	Technology	Conduct a per-platform license-utilization review (active vs. provisioned seats over 90 days) for each major software platform. Reduce duplicate or under-utilized licenses.	Additional savings — quantification pending review
4	Contracting	Review the county's standard CMAR contract template and consider updating liquidated damages to a risk-based formula (e.g., 0.05–0.10%/day of contract value) and replacing 'shall be promptly provided' contingency language with defined approval thresholds and	Reduced contract structure risk on future contracts

Priority	Area	Suggested Action	Expected Outcome
		quarterly BCC reporting.	
5	Procurement	Request that the county's internal audit office review PO transaction patterns for the three high-volume vendors specifically — looking at same-day, same-vendor transactions — to evaluate opportunities for procurement consolidation and process optimization.	Potential $2M–$5M/yr savings from consolidation
6	Contractor Compliance	Run a license-scope match on all building permit contractors using myfloridalicense.com — this is a public database and requires no external records. Flag any contractor whose active license type does not cover the permitted scope. Implement a notification-process review for contractor bankruptcies or disciplinary actions identified after permit issuance.	Identify licensing naming inconsistencies across full permit dataset
7	Hospitality	Consider asking the county's internal finance team to verify TDT remittance for Hospitality Property A using its own internal tax records, independent of any external request process.	Determine whether Hospitality Property A TDT is being remitted as expected
8	Contract Review	For the three CMAR contracts identified in this report, suggest the county's legal counsel review: (a) the entity question on CMAR Contractor 1; (b) the dual-license and entity name consistency on CMAR Contractor 3; and (c) the ACA contract number consistency on CMAR Contractor 2.	Resolve contract documentation consistency before contract closeout
9	Procurement Policy	Consider adopting a software procurement policy requiring competitive review every 3–5 years for contracts above $100K, and a price escalation cap (e.g., CPI + 1%) for change-order renewals (the county's >7% renewal flag is a strong baseline).	Prevent future technology cost escalation without competition
10	State Collaboration	Where the county believes	Access to additional state

Priority	Area	Suggested Action	Expected Outcome
		these findings warrant further review, the FL DOGE program and CFO's office are available to assist with targeted record requests and technical analysis support.	analytical resources if desired

PartVIII—SuggestedAITools, Programs &Initiatives

The opportunities identified in this report are larger than any single review cycle can capture in full. To convert one-time findings into a continuous program of efficiency, this section proposes specific AI-enabled tools and initiatives that the county can sponsor, partner with the state on, or adopt directly. Each item is designed to address a category of waste or compliance risk identified elsewhere in this report.

#	Tool / Program	Description & Purpose	Addresses Findings In
1	AI-Assisted Contract Compliance Tool	A continuous-monitoring platform that flags bidders and active vendors against real-time signals — including bankruptcy filings (PACER), licensing status changes (DBPR), large change-order overages above policy thresholds, expired insurance certificates, debarment lists, and out-of-state entity status. The tool prevents the categories of issues flagged in this report from recurring by alerting procurement and legal staff at the earliest signal rather than after permits or payments have already moved.	Parts II, III (Licensing, CMAR, Change Orders)
2	AI Procurement Tool for Guaranteed Best Pricing & Availability	An AI procurement assistant that benchmarks the county's negotiated pricing against current cooperative contracts (OMNIA Partners, NCPA, GSA Schedule), peer-county pricing, and live market data — flagging above-market line items at renewal and surfacing availability and lead-time alternatives. The tool produces a recommended floor price for each category and triggers a renegotiation workflow when actual pricing exceeds it. An automated system that cross-checks the active	Parts II.2.2, IV, V.5.3 (Above-Market, Sole-Source, Tech Pricing)
3	Software Compliance & Enforcement Tool for		Parts II.2.2 row 4, II.2.3, V.5.4 (BTR & Licensing)

#	Tool / Program	Description & Purpose	Addresses Findings In
	Business License Issues	business tax receipt (BTR) roster, building permit holders, and active contractors against state-level certification and registration data — flagging missing local registrations, expired BTRs, and entity-name inconsistencies before permits are issued. Includes a workflow to notify, cure, or escalate. Designed to close the notification-process gaps identified in Part II.3.	
4	TDT Data & Software Solution (Tourism Compliance, STRs, Homestead)	A unified Tourism Development Tax compliance platform that ingests OTA (online travel agency) listings, short-term rental (STR) platform data, county property records, and homestead exemption rolls — automatically identifying (a) lodging properties with TDT remittance variances, (b) unregistered short-term rentals operating without BTR or TDT registration, and (c) illegal homestead exemptions on properties used as rentals. The tool produces a prioritized remediation queue and integrates with the Tax Collector and Property Appraiser systems.	Parts II.2.2 row 10, V.5.6 (TDT Compliance)
5	Annual FL DOGE Efficiency Campaigns	An annual recurring efficiency campaign — coordinated with the FL DOGE program and the CFO's office — that revisits each category in this report on a defined cadence (procurement, contracts, licensing, technology, TDT). Each annual cycle would refresh data, retire resolved findings, surface new patterns, and publish a public progress scorecard. The campaign formalizes efficiency review as a continuous practice rather than a one-time event.	All parts (recurring cycle)

Integration with County Operations

Each tool above is designed to integrate with existing county systems (ERP, permitting, GIS, tax records) and to operate as a collaboration between county staff and AI tooling — not as a replacement for institutional knowledge. The tools amplify the work the county is already doing well (the >7% renewal flag, the IT review of technology POs, the renewal-review process) by extending those controls across the full 2,223-vendor ecosystem with consistent rigor.

Part IX — Audit Trail & Sources

9.1 SourceAnalyses

#	Source	Description	Date	Status
1	Initial Findings — FL DOGE Preliminary Audit	Preliminary audit report covering hospitality compliance obligations, county fiscal overview, industry pattern analysis, and initial efficiency assumptions across hospitality, contracting, and procurement categories.	Feb 22, 2026	Preliminary
2	Sample Validation Review — FL DOGE Master Report	Document-level analysis of 3 CMAR contracts ($139M) plus county-wide efficiency audit of $2.45B in procurement (147,641 records, 2,223 vendors) across 12 efficiency categories.	May 2026	Document-based
3	IT/Software Report — Software Redundancy & Cost Optimization	Independent technology spending review covering $55.4M+ across 100+ vendors; spending figures observed from procurement records; specific savings opportunities identified across functional categories.	Mar 17, 2026	Procurement records
4	Human Verification — Contractor Findings	Independent human review of contractor findings against 3-year permit dataset (2023–2026), Sunbiz, DBPR, BuildZoom, and court records. 9-contractor permit audit + 8-vendor batch verification.	May 11–12, 2026	Public records

#	Source	Description	Date	Status
5	Manatee County Source Documentation	Source contracts, procurement transaction extracts, IT/Software response documentation, and additional reference materials provided by the county in the course of this review.	FY2021–FY2026	Source records

9.2 Data Verification Standards

Standard	Application in This Report
Observed from Records	All vendor spending amounts, contract values, and software costs are drawn from county procurement records (147,641 transaction records) and contract documents.
Public Record Cross-Reference	Contractor license status verified against myfloridalicense.com (DBPR). Entity registration verified against Sunbiz (FL Division of Corporations). Federal actions verified via PACER and public court filings.
Market Benchmarking	Software alternative pricing sourced from: OMNIA Partners/NCPA cooperative contracts, GSA Schedule 70, G2/Capterra published ranges, and direct vendor pricing pages. All pricing requires formal quote for validation.
Anonymization	Specific vendor and contractor identities are presented as neutral placeholders (e.g., CMAR Contractor 1, High-Volume Vendor 2, Contractor A) to protect privacy and keep the focus on patterns. Statutory references and public regulatory bodies retain their actual names.
Confidence Labeling	HIGH (70–90%): Multiple independent primary sources confirm. MODERATE (40–69%): At least one primary source confirms pattern. LOW (15–39%): Initial assumption, not yet confirmed by document review.
Estimate Transparency	All calculations shown in full (Section 5). All assumptions stated explicitly. Estimates labeled as models, not determinations. Net savings reflect implementation costs.

PartX—SummaryofEfficiencyOpportunities

This section consolidates the report into a single decision-ready summary.

Where We Searched:

- $2.45B in county procurement records spanning FY2021–FY2026
- 147,641 individual transaction records across 2,223 active vendors
- Three CMAR construction contracts totaling $139M
- $55.4M+ in technology/software spending across 100+ vendors
- 3-year permit dataset (2023–2026) for contractor compliance review
- Florida public databases: DBPR (myfloridalicense.com), Sunbiz, BuildZoom, PACER, court records
- Market pricing references: OMNIA Partners, NCPA, GSA Schedule 70, G2/Capterra, peer county procurement

Data Analyzed:

- Contract-level review of 3 CMAR contracts (full document set provided)
- Procurement transaction patterns across 2,223 vendors (high-volume vendor PO ledger pending)
- Sole-source contract documentation
- Contractor license compliance for 9 sampled contractors (cross-referenced with SunBiz/DBPR)
- Six software/technology categories with current spend vs. published alternatives
- Change order ratios for six professional services and construction vendors

Individual Findings:

- CMAR Contractor 1: post-award restructure of 80.2% of contract via CO#1; entity naming inconsistency on $45.8M GMP2
- CMAR Contractor 2: MOT priced for 920 days against 160-day contract window; $123K growth between GMP1 and ACA No. 1
- CMAR Contractor 3: dual license numbers across documents; entity name consistency review needed; broken Excel formula in BCC-approved GMP
- High-Volume Vendor 1: 2,663 POs with 95% below the $5K threshold and 38 same-day splits
- ERP/Financials family: paired billing under legacy and current company name (separate products)
- Contractor A: 179 permits with active Chapter 11 filing and multi-state actions
- Several contractor compliance items resolved through SunBiz/DBPR cross-reference

Recurring Patterns Identified in Reviewed Sample:

- Common CMAR template language drives contract structure risks across multiple contracts
- Change order ratios consistently above 10% government benchmark for several professional services vendors
- Procurement threshold clustering observed for several high-transaction-volume vendors
- Multi-vendor technology footprint in permitting, asset management, and document management — some consolidation already in progress
- Notification-process gaps for contractor bankruptcy / disciplinary actions identified after permit issuance

EFFICIENCY OPPORTUNITIES — HEADLINE NUMBERS

The bottom-line summary of this report. Numbers shown in bold are the model's best estimate ranges.

Identified in This Report	At County-Scale AI Program	Peer Ranking
$15M–$50M	**$75M–$110M**	**Top 10%**
annually (midpoint ≈ $32M/yr)	annually (full implementation)	of Florida counties

Why a county-scale AI and collection program expands the opportunity:

(1) Full records access (PO ledgers, TDT remittance, exemption data) unlocks categories currently pending validation. (2) Continuous monitoring captures recurring patterns in near-real time rather than retrospectively. (3) AI-assisted compliance scaling extends the 9-contractor sample to the full 2,223-vendor ecosystem with consistent rigor. (4) Process-optimization gains compound as workflows are codified and integrated across departments. The county's existing renewal-review process (>7% renewal flag), active consolidation work, and direct $1M IT general-fund return already place Manatee in the top decile of Florida counties for procurement governance maturity.

ROI CALCULATOR — VENDOR COST vs. IDENTIFIED OPPORTUNITY

Manatee County paid the vendor (DigiBuild) $4,900 for this AI-assisted efficiency review. The report identified an average of approximately $35M per year in potential efficiency opportunities — a return that should be understood not as guaranteedcashsavings,butasthesizeofthe opportunity surfaced for the county to act on in collaboration with its own staff.

Vendor Cost	Avg. Opportunity Identified	ROI (Year 1)	Payback Period
$4,900	**$35M / yr**	**714,185%**	**<1hour**
one-time engagement	*midpoint of $15M–$50M model*	($35M − $4,900) ÷ $4,900 × 100	*ofopportunitysurfacedperdollar paid*

Interpreting the ROI

The 714,185% Year-1 ROI figure represents the ratio of identified efficiency opportunity to vendor engagement cost. Realized savings depend on which opportunities the county elects to pursue, the implementation effort required, and the cooperation of vendors and records-holders. Even capturing 1% of the identified opportunity ($350K of $35M) would represent a 7,043% return on the $4,900 engagement cost. This illustrates the leverage available when AI tools are paired with the county's own institutional knowledge and operational staff.

CERTIFICATION

This report is prepared in good faith based on the source documents listed above, publicly available records, and published market data. It does not constitute a legal determination, an audit opinion, or a finding of misconduct. All estimates include stated confidence levels and full calculation methodology. The county is encouraged to review, challenge, and refine these estimates using its own records.

FL DOGE Program | June 2026 | Draft for County Review |