

**The City Auditor's Office
City of Gainesville, FL**

PURPOSE: The purpose of this memo is to document the substance of the conversation between the City Auditor, City Attorney, and GRU General Manager about the consideration of a forensic audit of matters surrounding the GREC contract process (Legistar #150562).

PARTICIPANTS:

Carlos I. Holt (CH), 352-393-8629
holtcl@cityofgainesville.org

Nicole Shalley (NS), 352-334-5011
shalleynm@cityofgainesville.org

Ed Bielarski (EB), 352-393-1007
bielarskiej@cityofgainesville.org

Lisa Bennett (LB), 352-393-8735
bennettlc@cityofgainesville.org

DATE OF DISCUSSION:

January 25, 2016 – Monday, 1000 – City Attorney's Small Conference Room

Verbatim Transcript Synopsis Detailed Summarization

RECORD OF DISCUSSION:

CH and NS outlined a brief history of the reason for the meeting and discussion. NS added a good bit of prior information about how the subject of a forensic audit was discussed prior to the creation of the RFP that Navigant bid on and provided a report in April, 2015. EB stated that the Navigant report raised some good topic areas that were not investigated in depth.

NS brought up the idea for starters of reaching out to Navigant to inquire what they would have done differently if the engagement had been a forensic audit rather than an investigative review. EB discussed the possibility of obtaining an external legal opinion of what might be obtained from a forensic audit, what evidence could legally be obtained with no other information that the City already has. LB stated that other firms that were not awarded the investigative review had also done some research into the topic at hand in the preparation of their bids.

The group decided that the initial approach might be for the City Auditor to reach out to all of the bidders on the RFP that was awarded to Navigant, including Navigant, and inquire as to what a forensic audit might look like, what would have been done differently, and would they consider it worthwhile to perform one now.

CH was tasked with obtaining this information from each source and then scheduling another meeting to discuss it further. It was agreed that all options remained on the table. Outside counsel could also be a possibility discussed at the next meeting in order to properly consider whether to move forward with a forensic audit.

End of Discussion

	<p>W/P: Prepared: C. Holt Date: 1/25/2016</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------