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“If you do what you have always done, you will get what you’ve always got.”
—Jack Osterholt, former Broward County Administrator

“Are we gladiators or bridge builders, hired guns or helpers?”
—FMMCA Institute Participant

“Is it a marbled or layered cake? Governing bodies have different views of their roles. We need to more clearly define the roles.”
—FMMCA Institute Participant

The Florida City/County Managers Association focused its Winter Institute in 2002 on intergovernmental problem-solving and dispute resolution and co-sponsored subsequent sessions on the topic with elected officials at the 2002 annual meetings of the Florida Association of Counties and the Florida League of Cities. The Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium, along with the Florida Institute of Government, designed and facilitated the program for the 2002 FCCMA Winter Institute and for the subsequent workshops. These sessions sought to:

- Identify successful intergovernmental collaboration and problem-solving initiatives;
- Distill the ingredients and roles played by managers and elected officials that led to these solutions; and
- Seek to apply them to some of the most challenging current intergovernmental issues.

I. Intergovernmental Successes—Lessons Learned

At the Florida City/County Managers Winter Institute, the Florida Association of Counties Annual Meeting panel on June 26, 2002, and the Florida League of Cities, Annual Meeting Pre-Conference Session on August 15, 2002, elected officials and managers identified a over 200 successful intergovernmental efforts at the local level dealing with a range of issues and projects including:

- Annexation;
- Building inspection services;
- Economic development;
- Environmental initiatives;
• Fire/Rescue and Emergency Management services;
• Library services;
• Growth management;
• Information technology;
• Parks and recreation;
• Recreation;
• Redevelopment;
• Revenue and tax sharing;
• School board and local governments;
• Transportation;
• Waste water and waste management;
• Water resources.

Key Ingredients for Intergovernmental Success. County and municipal elected officials and managers identified the following key ingredients present in the successful intergovernmental efforts they identified:

• Leaders recognize that common and mutual benefits and shared goals are present (i.e., there is potential for enlarging the “pie”);
• The timing is right and motivation and the political will to cooperate is present;
• Effective leadership by elected officials;
• City and County officials willing to sit down and work together for the good of all (“Egos check in at the door”);
• Effective and open communication among elected officials and managers;
• Willingness to compromise;
• An opportunity for additional revenues as a result of the intergovernmental cooperation exists;
• General cooperative leadership;
• Effective public involvement and education;
• Good planning and preparation has been jointly undertaken;
• Agreement has been reached on groundrules for negotiations and consensus building and facilitation assistance has been utilized as needed;
• Professional, constructive relationship between City and County managers have been cultivated.

Applying Key Ingredients to Intergovernmental Challenges. At the three sessions, the following intergovernmental challenges were identified and prioritized. Participants then discussed the processes needed to bring about solutions for:

• Revenue and Tax Sharing—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses;
• Annexation—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses;
• Regional Services/Urban Consolidation—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses;
• School Siting/Planning—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses;
• Economic Development—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses;
• Land use Issues—Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses.

Other intergovernmental challenges identified by participants included:
emergency management/disaster response/security; new revenue sources; mass
transit; judicial system; law enforcement; school siting and resource allocation;
relationship among constitutional officers; relationships among and between local
elected City and County officials and between elected official and managers on
dealing with intergovernmental cooperation; concurrency; law enforcement;
environmental land acquisition; economic development; environmental
management including waste management e.g., land fills and land acquisition;
health and social services; governance—home rule, charters; relations among and
between local elected City and County officials and between elected official and
managers on dealing with intergovernmental cooperation; transportation funding
DOT/City/County; traffic signalization; parks and recreation; water
supply/quality issues; health care and social services; property value assessments.

II. Intergovernmental Challenges and Responses

In each of the three sessions, participants used the following set of
questions to frame their discussions and suggestions for intergovernmental
collaboration on key intergovernmental issues identified in each session:

1. What is the context for the topic/challenge?

2. What does the current process for addressing the topic/challenge look
like and what are the problems with it?

3. What would a better process that addresses this topic/challenge while
improving coordination and decision making look like?

4. How do we get a better process?

5. How Do We Get Cities and Counties to Push for a More Thoughtful
Process?

A. Revenue and Tax Sharing

1. Context and Challenges

Discussion groups reviewed the context for taxation and revenue
sharing at the local level, the current decision process and the
problems associated with it. It was noted that the legislature in 2001
addressed CRA issues. It was agreed that local governing bodies
often have different views of their roles (“Is the intergovernmental
context a marbled or layered cake?”). The groups agreed that
revenue issues related to double taxation and the fact that some
services are user-funded presents challenges for collaboration.
Participants also suggested that a lack of an intergovernmental
forum for discussion and negotiation on this issue inhibits
collaboration.
More generally, it was suggested that there needed to be additional formal points for negotiation and dispute resolution, as early as possible in the process. There was a suggestion for an early "neutral" assessment to determine if a negotiated approach could work to solve the problem. In addition to traditional roles of managers meeting to work on the problem and informal negotiations, it was suggested that mediation could be offered at an early point. The new process can be adopted by an inter-local agreement without the need for legislative approval. It was suggested that mediation requests should be approved by the elected body, and if mediation is requested, parties to the inter-local agreement will participate.

It was agreed that CRAs vary widely across the state in terms of purpose, representation on the board, etc. The issue of "donor" communities and their fair share regarding taxes is often a matter of dispute. It was agreed that a positive focus should be on how to "share the wealth." "If we choose to work together we can create added revenue and joint benefits." The current CRA process has few incentives for City/County engagement and encouragement of partnership and this has lead to a "poisoned well" for intergovernmental relations in some jurisdictions. CRAs may be initiated by cities or counties. They often argue over the tax consequences without consideration of the spin-off joint benefits that may be generated. It was also suggested that CRAs are being over-utilized as a funding tool while other funding tools are being under-utilized. It was suggested that CRAs unfortunately represent more a "layered" not "marbled" intergovernmental approach. It was suggested that City and County elected officials need more information on revenue sharing tools in general. It was noted that Cities, Counties and redevelopment agencies are not in agreement on definition of "blight."

2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

Intergovernmental CRA issues are joined in the: formation of CRAs; the authorization of CRAs; and the expansion and continuation of CRAs. Ideas offered for improvement of the CRA decision process in bringing forth solutions included:

- **Support Intergovernmental Leadership.** Leadership relations among City and County are a key part of success or failure of CRAs to be a positive part of intergovernmental issues.
- Try doing a "a day in the shoes of...." Swap managers. Have City Budget officers go to the County Budget office on a temporary swap. Get the FGFOA to address this education issue among their City and County members.
- Encourage more one-on-one staff more interactions to try to sort out issues. Before it gets into public forum with elected officials.
• Clarify the leadership roles of the managers and elected officials on these issues. This should be actively undertaken and not assumed.

**Support for Intergovernmental Forums for Dialogue.** Since this continuing challenge encourage participation in organizations with City and County representation such as regional planning councils, etc. Look to models such as the FLC//FAC/FSB partnership with Leadership Florida for training and education.

• More creativity is needed in convening problem-solving and educational forums at the local and regional levels.

• Look for the possibility of inserting joint City/County meetings earlier on in the CRA formation process.

• **Engage in Constructive Dialogue.** Look for win/win on these issues—i.e., press for a "marbled" approach through joint education of elected officials and emphasize that the solution is more important than claiming the credit.

• Look for creative joint incentives to bring City and County to the table.

• Joint development of options by impacted local governments is needed not just responding to options presented by the County.

• At the table, direct the dialogue towards opportunities for win-win (e.g., Palm Beach and West Palm Beach CRC negotiation where City provided County with a parking structure with CRA funds. E.g., Del Ray’s experience with a CRA and building a court house).

• Look for “cooling off” periods, “going to the balcony” when things get personal.

• **Representation Issues.** To enhance early dialogue on CRAs, suggest that Counties (other than the 16 Charter) have some representation on the CRA boards to bring that perspective into the CRA formation discussion.

• **Inform Elected Officials and Managers on Funding Tools.** Develop a model that could be used by elected and others that included a funding matrix and clearer explanation of funding tools and when/how they can be used.

B. Annexation

1. **The Context and Challenges**

The participants in the three sessions reviewed the historical and statutory context and agreed that the current annexation process was developed in another era and is both power and rights oriented promoting intergovernmental competition while discouraging cooperation. This creates inefficiencies, inequalities and outcomes such as:
• Different City and County land use standards make for more intergovernmental conflicts which are costly and time consuming legal battles.
• Developers sometimes use annexation to avoid planning provisions and standards.
• Unincorporated areas often don’t feel cities have anything to offer. Many times it is less expensive to live in unincorporated areas. Sometimes there are lifestyle differences between residents in cities and those in unincorporated areas of counties.
• Lack of incentives for a City to annex areas that drain resources, even if they really should be in the City or need the City. Nobody wants the poorer areas. There is an issue of social equity. Wealthier unincorporated areas are reluctant to annex into higher-tax cities. Double taxation provides a disincentive for areas to come into the City.
• "Us Against Them" tone of annexation is inappropriate when there should be collaboration to work together to provide services to citizens. Process ignores inter-dependency between cities and counties. Cities rely on a host of services from the County. Lack of clarity about who should provide services: regional or local services; urban or rural services.
• “Cherrypicking” by local governments and enclaves present problems. Annexation of revenue positive areas by cities and bypassing revenue poor areas (“pick-up” annexations, “hopscotching” annexations). Multiple jurisdictions competing for desirable areas.
• Use of CRA’s beyond the original redevelopment purpose (i.e., developer driven annexation).
• Lack of adequate provisions for revenue distribution and compensation as urban service areas build up.
• Counties losing revenue sources but having to maintain service levels.
• Competing interests—developer, homeowner, etc.—drive annexations, rather than a broader concern for the community interest.

2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

The participants at these sessions offered suggestions on what a better process that could improve annexation coordination and decision making would look like and require, including:

• **Encourage Joint Annexation Planning.** Find ways to work together rather than fight over turf. Early and regular communication between City and County manager as soon as an area expresses interest in annexation. This provides an opportunity to talk about what it makes sense to annex and what it does not make sense to annex.
• As part of joint annexation planning, parties need to talk about:
  - How to organize and fund efficient services.
  - Who provides the services?
- Who pays for the services?
- What is the impact on revenues?
- What needs to be negotiated to phase out of services?
- Agree on an objective source of information regarding annexation impacts early on in the process (as in incorporation).
- Development of annexation zones during the planning process. These need to be inclusive and address the needs of small cities as well as those of large cities and the County. (An example is the Pinellas County arrangement based on service provision areas.)

- **Develop Annexation Processes Sensitive to Urban and Rural Contexts.** Provide different and tailored processes for urban and rural counties that recognize their different needs.

- **Focus on Services.** Define who should be responsible for certain urban services. Then agree that if a City provides those services to an area, it should annex that area.
- It is critical that both Cities and Counties jointly and accurately establish the cost of municipal services and identify base line to see which can provide the most cost effective services for citizens.
- The political leadership should maintain the integrity of the distinction between City and County services or levels of service. (An example is the Lee County core County services concept.)
- Appointed officials also need to provide leadership in this regard. We need to be able to stand up and tell our elected officials when a proposal violates this policy.
- News media should play a more constructive role.

- **Enlist Leadership from Elected Officials and Managers.** Start with the FCCMA composed of City and County managers. Build consensus there, and then bring this to elected officials through the Association of Counties and League of Cities and the legislature.
- Hold a joint Florida League of Cities and Florida Association of Counties conference on this topic.
- This FCCMA Winter Institute could serve as a road map for individual County discussions. The individual County discussions could then focus on joint planning areas, service area-based agreements, or whatever else makes sense for that County. These discussions could occur simultaneously and might be facilitated by the FCCMA.
- Elected officials need to participate and buy into the idea as well. One way to involve elected in discussion of this issue is at board goal-setting workshops. We need to create some sense of awareness among elected officials (at the state and local levels) that this issue is important in the long run.
- Look for willing leadership among municipal and County elected officials to keep it moving.
• Convene annexation solutions summits in Counties involving all jurisdictions to identify problems and possible strategies.
• Better define roles of those involved in the intergovernmental process.
• Start with easy annexation issues and build relationship then tackle hot issues.

**Facilitate Intergovernmental Dialogue.** You may need neutral, impartial facilitation and professional facilitators to overcome some of the distrust and personal dynamics.
• We also need to somehow involve the citizens affected by annexations. That is an element missing from our discussions.
• Focus the dialogue on joint planning committees to develop interlocal agreements (JPAs) and mediation established by interlocal agreement to resolve intergovernmental disputes.
• There are some counties where City and County managers can come together on their own. For those areas where this will not happen (or where they may be reluctant to do so), the state may have a role. A mandate from the state may be helpful indicating that something has to be done on the local level. This could help bring people together. The mandate would not say how it needs to be done—only that cities within each County must come together with the County and work out an arrangement. Examples include the recent requirement for a County/City/school board interlocal agreement, and the requirement for the adoption of local comprehensive plans (although the new mandate should not be as detailed as this one).

• **Seek Intergovernmental Agreement on Needed Change to the Annexation Law.** Change statute to prohibit cherry picking.

C. Regional Services and Intergovernmental Relations

1. **The Context and Challenges**

The Regional Services discussion groups at the Winter Institute and at the Florida League of Cities session reviewed the context for regional services related to water services, parks, recreation and transportation in Florida’s local governments. The challenge presented where there are overlapping services is that of getting City to City and City to County agreements for service provision. It was also acknowledged that regional services are a key part of both the annexation and the CRA discussions and as in those discussions, the importance of clarifying and negotiating the respective roles of County and City governments was felt to be a key activity. Some of the problems and opportunities identified included:

• Political lobbying with the legislature;
• Duplication of services and issues of double taxation;
• Loss of tax base and the protection of service revenue and the role of annexation;
• Transportation planning and funding and the perception of MPOs being weighted towards counties or larger cities;
• The push by the state for “regional utilities” and what this will mean to municipal governments that have traditionally developed revenue;
• Problems of developments approved by counties or cities without sufficient consultation with other affected local governments in terms of infrastructure, etc.

A discussion group at the FCCMA Winter Institute focused especially on the context and challenges for water services. The current water supply process involves competing uses and needs and consumptive use permits issued and overseen by the water management districts. There is a need to better identify the sources—wells, groundwater, saltwater reclamation, reuse/reclamation, and the water supply users: agriculture, urban, industrial needs. Many interests, jurisdictions and agencies are involved in water supply issues including: water management districts; Cities and Counties; state regulatory authorities—DEP; Public Service Commission, water wholesalers; private utilities; private wells—agriculture; industrial users; and developers. The current process requires the balancing of economics and politics, conservation and education programs/efforts and growth related issues/impacts. The challenges identified included:

• Cost of meeting demand and shoring up infrastructure;
• Quantity and quality of supply, pollution;
• Determining sources;
• Saltwater intrusion near coast—lack of regulation;
• Aquifer draw down—over consumption;
• Demand and capacity;
• Reclaimed water;
• Use of available resources/allocation;
• Numerous governmental units at different levels involved;
• Governing boards;
• Turf/Power and competing interests between developers, agriculture, rural, and urban;
• Lack of conservation efforts/education;
• Turf wars, fighting over control;
• State policy on recharge areas and storage;
• District policy on draw downs;
• Funding for infrastructure;
• Siting and energy costs;
• Growth management/land use issues—lack of land use coordination with water resources;
• Regulation and priority rights issues;
• Differences between systems—inefficiencies;
• Economic vs. Environmental issues.
2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

The Florida League of Cities discussion group offered the following suggestions on regional services:

- **Use Joint Planning and Interlocal Agreements.** Develop joint planning agreement between City/County that is effective and enforceable.
- Require interlocal agreements that ensure better coordination/cooperation—identify as early as possible policy initiatives that require interlocal cooperation.
- Address up front the question of representation in the dialogue on regional services.
- Clearly explain the needs and goals that regional service policy decisions and strategies are directed towards.
- Seek to jointly develop with both managers and elected officials a common set of measurable goals for County and Cities in the planning effort.
- Policy makers should strive to give a true assessment of all possible impacts of their policies and incorporate effective public input.

- **Improve Intergovernmental Communication and Coordination.** Consider increasing the number of regular joint City/County meetings on policy issues.
- Council of mayors should consider working with County.
- Communication channels should be instituted, utilized and understood.

- **Support Early Public Input and Effective Conflict Resolution.** Initiate early public involvement and input in order to better inform the City/County discussions of regional services. Hold public meetings when people can attend.
- Conflict resolution procedures should be defined, developed, supported and utilized.

- **Seek Legislative Changes that Enhance Capacity for Problem-solving.** Explore changes to the local election process to better match representation with revenue.

The FCCMA discussion group offered the following suggestions to better address these water supply problems and produce solutions.

*Water Supply Substantive Suggestions*

- Keep saltwater intrusion from getting worse.
- Try to develop more unified statewide regulations.
- Designate statewide water resources for protection. Identify and permanently preserve areas of the state needed to protect water recharge areas.
- Develop additional water sources.
- Require new development to use more reuse water.
• Provide greater incentives for public and private users for infrastructure investment and construction and conservation. Provide grants to invest in infrastructure development/improvements—state and federal sources.
• Over time, users should pay closer to actual costs for water.
• Get funding from state and federal governments for desalination plants as an alternative to aquifer/groundwater sources and surface water sources.
• Provide adequate storage sources/technologies for water storage.
• Regional authority for siting, rates, land use development review, reclamation.

Water Supply Process Suggestions
• Develop alternative dispute resolution provisions and processes for resolving water conflicts.
• Develop a statewide consensus building approach to address water holistically from each region—but remember one size does not fit all and that solutions need to be regionally focused.
• Clarify local government’s role in providing water supply and maintaining and enhancing infrastructure. Clarify the role of local government consumptive use permit holders and other local governments.
• Create mechanism/process to coordinate/resolve urban and rural interests.

D. Economic Development

At the League of Cities session, a small group addressed economic development as a priority intergovernmental issue.

1. The Context and Challenge

• Too much weighting for County on ED board.
• The County is trying to take away control from the City.
• Board is looking at rural and suburban sites for ED rather than urban.
• Getting existing land owners to but into redevelopment.
• Need for infrastructure to attract ED.
• County is not promoting or funding ED.
• Too much dependency on tourism.
• Developers aren’t interested in ED.
• Affordable housing inhibits ED.
• Short-term approach rather than long-term. Building anything now rather than something better later.
• Ineffective mass transit inhibits ED.

2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

The group discussed some of the practical approaches that have been successfully used by local government including:
• Created an ED coordinator and expanding its economic development department;
• Developing public/private partnerships;
• Providing funds to business to improve downtown facades;
• Participated in representative private and public/private boards;
• Conducted a visioning process—County and Cities;
• Used festivals to attract people from other areas—with the City and County cooperatively funding advertising;
• Channel grants in a way to foster certain kinds of development.

It then suggested ways to bring forth intergovernmental solutions on economic development including:

• **Connect with Affordable Housing Goals.** Frame economic development in ways to address lack of affordable housing and support increased densities in the downtown and in new developments.

• **Share Resources and Expertise.** Large cities with economic development resources can contract with small cities to help them with their economic development efforts.
• Develop a consortium of smaller cites to work together and hire a coordinator to share or acquire grants-writers and lobbyists.

• **Develop a Shared Vision.** Identify common interests and develop a shared vision within the local government that is consistent and oriented towards the long-term.
• Seek to engage and develop a shared vision with other local governments, the public and business sector within the County.
• Foster good relations between top level administrators.

### E. Land use Issues

#### 1. The Context and Challenge

At the League of Cities session, a small group addressed land use disputes as a priority intergovernmental issue. The challenges in land use include:

• Contending and responding to growth and shifts in political power;
• Grappling with promoting economic development in the face of the rising cost of property;
• Transportation concurrency and impact fees having a large effect on the nature and look of land uses;
• Affordable housing policies and redevelopment issues related to density and height;
• Flood plains;
• Bert Harris Act—Private Rights vs. Public Rights;
• Urban sprawl vs. Urban infill;
• Impact of tourism—both positive and negative;
• Water waste and the siting of facilities and plants;
• Poor intergovernmental relationships and turf protection.

The current land use and development process is complex and confusing for many. There is generally a lack of a clear and effective process to address an intergovernmental land use issue and the current future planning process is not very effective. Local governments often display a lack of understanding about impact of their decisions on each other.

2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

• **Open Communication.** Open, honest communication at both policy level and in the implementation process is critical to successful land use programs.
• Develop mutual understanding of land use goals of various local governments in a proactive manner.
• May need for process to be initiated at staff level and rise up—avoids public posturing to overwhelm process.

• **Regular Review in Light of Changing Circumstances.** Establish as a matter of course regular review of previous development agreements to reevaluate changing circumstances.

• **Establish multi-stakeholder commissions to establish and implement plan.** Consider creating at the County level with cities a growth management commission to better address these policies and programs.

F. School Planning and Siting

1. The Context and Challenge

At the League of Cities session, a small group addressed school planning and siting disputes as a priority intergovernmental issue. The challenges included:

• New mandate from state for inter-local agreements on planning and location of schools—choice means everyone goes everywhere;
• Often there isn’t agreement on present and future numbers
• Impact on immediate community;
• Un-funded mandates—no funds for improving "D & F" schools;
• Schools are often not built with concern for infrastructure—transportation, etc.;
• No effective process is in place now;
• Disjointed impact—powerful commissioners get the goodies;
• People who come to public meetings on schools are often outraged at the lack of planning and coordination;
• State funding formulas limit where funding goes;
• Impacts such as those on teen pregnancy and other social issues are often not considered;
• Schools will often go where the developer provides site which may not be the best land use or location for that land.

2. How to Bring Forth Intergovernmental Solutions

The discussion group participants then identified some strategies for bringing forth solutions on school planning and siting issues.

• Require direct school board participation in the development and implementation of the interlocal agreement.
• Require school board to go through the site planning process like other developments (but with no fee).
• Provide effective citizen input in school siting.
• Establish a citizen school siting advisory committee.
• Establish criteria for siting (infrastructure, population, opportunities for shared facilities.
• Do more joint long-range planning together with school board counties and cities officials and staff.
• School board, cities and counties should meet to agree on what the needs are and on the interlocal agreement process.
• Establish work group with City, County, school board. Local City and County manager police chief, planners, teachers, parents, social service agencies (geographical representation) (set time) child care associations.
• Hire a neutral facilitator to help the parties develop consensus on an acceptable intergovernmental agreement. Provide for the provision of facilitation in the agreement when a school siting is contemplated.

III. Conclusions and Implications

At the conclusion of the FCCMA Winter Institute a panel of City and County managers focused on how they and FCCMA could build an agenda to improve intergovernmental problem-solving. They identified some paradoxes that managers struggle with.

• The annexation system is broken. However service provision works reasonably well. The system keeps afloat through professional ingenuity and creativity.
• Whose job is intergovernmental problem-solving? It calls for both professional as well as political decision making.
• More communication is not enough. It must be productive, strategic and structured to produce solutions.
• Pick your fights and pick your opportunities for collaboration carefully.

Local government managers and leaders must deal with both the long- and short-term issues to be successful. Participants identified four themes emerging from the Institute including:
• The need to educate each other;
• Support folks trying to do this at local level;
• Begin identifying ways we begin to build bridges between FLC and FAC;
• Explore potential legislative path.

The leadership of the FCCMA agreed to bring this issue forward to the annual meeting and to work beyond that in building the basis for intergovernmental cooperation.
Top Ranked Intergovernmental Collaboration Challenges

Florida City County Managers Association

1. Revenue and Tax Sharing (e.g., CRA’s, gas tax, dual taxation, sales tax, distribution formulas)
2. Annexation
3. Regional Services (water, parks, transportation, recreation)
4. Control (or loss of) of land use, water/sewer and electric utilities
5. Consolidation of services
6. County/City service responsibilities for urban, urbanizing and rural areas

Florida League of Cities

1. Revenue and Tax Sharing
2. Annexation
3. Regional Services/Urban Consolidation
4. School Siting/Planning
5. Economic Development
6. Land use Issues

Other Key Intergovernmental Collaboration Challenges

Florida City County Managers Association, June 26, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management/security</td>
<td>New revenue sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass transit</td>
<td>Judicial system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School siting and resource allocation</td>
<td>Relationship among constitutional officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency</td>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental land acquisition</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management including, waste management, e.g., land fills</td>
<td>Health and social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance—home rule, charters</td>
<td>Relations among and between local elected City and County officials and between elected official and managers on dealing with intergovernmental cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida League of Cities, August 15, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management disaster response, City, County, DCA and federal agencies</td>
<td>New revenue sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation funding DOT/City/County Mass transit; Traffic signalization</td>
<td>Relationships among and between local elected City and County officials and between elected official and managers on dealing with intergovernmental cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Relationship among constitutional officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply/quality issues</td>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/conservation land acquisition</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management including, waste management, e.g., land fills</td>
<td>Health and social services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City and County Relations: What’s Up in Florida?

Can Consensus building and Dispute Resolution Bring Forth Better Outcomes for Intergovernmental Issues?

6th Annual Florida City and County Management Association Winter Institute
February 7-8, 2002
Tampa, Florida

Institute Objectives

• To learn about governance trends, development patterns and other issues in Florida that have created intergovernmental challenges and conflicts.
• To identify key intergovernmental issues confronting Florida’s cities and counties that present complex challenges for managers to address.
• To learn about the context for intergovernmental dispute resolution and evolving local governance and management responses and hear of lessons learned from collaborations and conflict resolution in jurisdictions around the state and country.
• To hear presentations on some emerging models aimed at mitigating or resolving intergovernmental issues faced by Florida local governments and their managers.
• To review and seek a shared understanding of the various elements and the overall design of dispute resolution and prevention models for intergovernmental issues.
• To consider possible next steps for the Florida City/County Managers Association and others in assisting managers in consensus building and dispute resolution efforts.

Institute Agenda

Thursday, February 7, 2002
9:00 Welcome and Opening Remarks
9:15 Florida Cities and Counties: A Historical Review and Discussion
   Dr. Lance deHaven-Smith, Professor, Florida State University
10:45 Break
11:00 Identifying Key Intergovernmental Challenges and Issues
12:00 Lunch
1:15 Developing New Mechanisms for Intergovernmental Problem-solving: Using Negotiation and Consensus building
   William Potapchuk, President, Community Building Institute, Annandale, Virginia
2:00 Making it Work in Florida—Overview of Governmental Dispute Resolution and Consensus building Models in Florida
2:30 Principles for Designing Dispute Resolution Processes to Meet Key Intergovernmental Challenges
2:45 Break
3:00 Roundtable Discussions on Key Challenges and Issues
4:00 Round Table Reports on Issue Areas
4:50 Review of 2nd Day’s Agenda
5:00 Recess
Reception in Evening

Friday, February 8, 2002
8:30 Developing an Effective Intergovernmental Dispute Resolution and Prevention Model(s) for Florida’s Cities and Counties
8:35 Consensus building Models for Intergovernmental Issues—Applications and Lessons Learned
10:00 Break
10:15 Plenary—Building an Agenda to Improve Intergovernmental Problem-solving—City and County Managers
11:50 Summary and Institute Evaluation
12:00 Adjourn
Counties and Cities Living in Harmony: Fact or Fiction?

*Can Consensus building and Dispute Resolution Bring Forth Better Outcomes for Intergovernmental Issues?*

Florida Association of Counties Annual Meeting
Marco Island, Florida
June 26, 2002

4:00 **Session Opening Welcome and Introductions**  
Pam Bragianco  
President Elect FCCMA, Acting County Manager, Charlotte County

4:10 **Intergovernmental Collaboration—What Makes for Success?**  
Robert Jones and Camilo Azcarate  
Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

4:20 **Roundtables—What Makes for Success in Intergovernmental Initiatives?**

- Participants identify examples of successful Intergovernmental collaboration (post-it exercise).
- Participants identify what are the key ingredients.
- What are ways to improve coordination and decision making on intergovernmental issues?
- What roles can/should elected officials play?
- What roles can/should managers play?

4:45 **Brief Roundtable Reports—Key Ingredients for Success**

4:55 **Pinellas County: Intergovernmental Cooperation—Success in the Making?**  
The Honorable Barbara Sheen Todd  
Chairman, Pinellas County Commission  
Steven Spratt, Pinellas County Administrator  
Question and Answer

5:25 **Final Thoughts and Next Steps**  
Pam Bragianco  
President Elect FCCMA, Acting County Manager, Charlotte County

5:30 **Adjourn**
Florida League of Cities’ Annual Conference
Pre-Conference Workshop

“Building Models for Conflict Resolution: City and County Relations in Florida”

Co-sponsored by the Florida City and County Management Association
August 15, 2002 at the Boca Raton Resort — Addison West Room
9:00 a.m. – Noon

9:00 Call to Order—Moderator Clay Ford

9:05 Remarks from FCCMA—Joseph Yarbrough, City Manager, City of South Daytona and FCCMA immediate past president

9:10 Introduction of Mr. Jones—Clay Ford

9:15 Successful Intergovernmental Initiatives and Leadership Lessons Learned (post-it exercise at round tables with reports on ingredients for success)

9:45 Review of Ingredients for Success

10:00 Ranking of Most Critical Intergovernmental Issues

10:15 Conflict Resolution 101—An Overview of the Approach

10:30 Break

10:45 Convene Small Groups on Critical Intergovernmental Issues
• What’s the context?
• What does the current process for managing and resolving the issue look like?
• How can the process be improved to bring about solutions and better enhance intergovernmental relations?

11:30 Brief Issue Area Highlight Reports

11:40 Building an Agenda to Improve Intergovernmental Problem-solving
• What are some potential strategies?
• What resources are needed to implement the strategies?

11:50 Closing Remarks
Joseph Yarbrough—City Manager’s Perspective and Reflections
Clay Ford—Elected Official Perspective and Reflections
Robert Jones—Resources/Information on Consensus building and Conflict Resolution

12:00 Adjourn
Public disputes can generally be resolved in three different ways, by: 1) reconciling interests to achieve a consensus solution, 2) determining who is right, or 3) determining who is more powerful. Research and experience have shown that dispute resolution procedures work best when they focus on reconciling interests of key parties to reach consensus on a solution. The costs in relying on a rights or power approach to resolve public disputes are familiar: hours wasted in futile quarreling and resulting delays, large direct and indirect costs of lawsuits and administrative litigation, political gridlock, and the stress and damage to valued ongoing relationships among leaders and stakeholders and public and private organizations.

To illustrate, consider a local dispute over a transportation corridor alignment. Using a “rights” approach, the alignment can be seen as a decision based on private property rights and laws related to access management balanced with public welfare concerns made by a local government through its Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Florida Department of Transportation. Using a “power approach” the parties may choose to exercise their power to influence public managers and their staffs, or to get the votes they need on the local County or City commissions or to appeal to the Governor and Cabinet to intervene or overturn a local decision on the alignment. A focus on reconciling “interests” would seek a solution that optimizes owners’ utility of their property, while protecting the public interest in efficient transportation and environmental quality.

While interests are usually considered as a part of existing public dispute resolution procedures, when the emphasis is placed on the determination of rights and on the influence of those exercising power the result is winner and a loser, without long-term resolution of the underlying conflicts.
Costs of Power-Based and Rights-Based Approaches to Public Disputes:

- Hours wasted in futile quarreling and resulting delays;
- Large direct and indirect costs of lawsuits and administrative litigation;
- Political gridlock; and
- Stress and damage to valued ongoing relationships among public and private organizations.

EFFECTIVE SYSTEM

**Interests**

**Rights**

**Power**

Benefits of Interest-Based Approaches to Public Disputes:

- More effective and more creative bi-partisan solutions while reducing transaction costs and reaping the gains resulting from more efficient resolution of public disputes;
- Quicker decisions that can be implemented;
- Dollars saved by finding an earlier and longer lasting settlement to a public dispute;
- Greater public confidence and trust and investment in lasting solutions, and
- Strengthened community and professional relationships as a result of constructive face-to-face problem-solving.
Elements of an Effective Resolution Procedure

A mechanism for making a final decision is essential, but not the only element of an effective resolution design. Provisions for informal negotiations, assisted negotiations, “loop-backs” to earlier informal steps, and “leap forwards” to decision making are needed in a successful procedure design. The process diagram below illustrates the relationship between and among these elements:

- **Leap-Forwards**
- **Informal Negotiations** → **Assisted Negotiations** → **Final Decisions** → **Appellate Decisions**
- **Loop-Backs**

**Informal Negotiations.** This includes unassisted staff discussions, meetings, document exchanges, coordination committees, task forces, etc.

**Assisted Negotiations.** This references the assistance of a third party professional neutral and includes facilitated problem-solving, mediation of public disputes, facilitated vision and strategic planning exercises and facilitated policy dialogues.

**Final Decisions.** These may be made by designated boards, authorities, commissions, agency heads, City or County managers, hearing officers or courts. Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms may also be used, such as: binding arbitration, mini-trials, or special masters.

**Appellate Decisions.** This would include appeals of decisions to any higher body, e.g. local elected bodies, Department of Administrative Hearings, Governor and Cabinet, or the Courts.

**Leap-Forwards and Loop-backs.** The procedure should permit skipping elements and returning to earlier elements as appropriate. Caucusing, task forces, expert studies, cooling-off periods and court referrals to mediation are examples of what can happen in a “loop-back.” The objective should be to have a procedure flexible enough to provide time for “loop-backs” and “leap forwards” as appropriate.
Guidelines for Effective Dispute Resolution
Procedure Design

1. Clearly identify and resolve problems as early as possible

Procedures should provide for early resolution of general issues to reduce time and expense of plan and project development based on unacceptable assumptions. Staff can separate policy from technical problems in submittals and refer potential policy disputes to the appropriate level for resolution. Where there are multiple steps, including appeals, passing it up to the next level without clarification of the differences or attempts to bridge those differences, should be discouraged. Getting neutral assistance at an early point may avoid the need for going through a lengthy multi-step process.

2. Utilize elements in a low-to-high cost sequence

It is axiomatic that resolving issues in informal negotiations is preferable to incurring the costs of an assisted negotiation or the formal decision process. Also the use of procedures such as non-binding arbitration or mini-trials to encourage negotiations with a preliminary "rights determination" may be less costly than going through a formal adjudication procedure, especially where there are lengthy case backlogs.

3. Allow flexibility in the use of elements

Making elements optional can minimize time/resource costs. The time periods for informal or assisted negotiations could be waived by mutual consent of the parties if it is clear that a “rights determination” is needed by a final decision-maker or adjudicator. The standard time periods should be kept short and the number of steps should be limited to minimize the total time needed for resolution. This can also serve to discourage delays by those who may benefit from no agreement. It should also be possible to extend time periods by mutual agreement, if progress is being made but more time is needed for fact-finding and problem-solving. It is also important to permit the tolling of any specified time frames or deadlines to allow for loop-backs to informal or assisted negotiations when fact-finding or problem-solving is needed.

4. Provide for appropriate involvement of affected and responsible parties

Requirements for participation or “standing” in both interest-based and rights-based determination processes are needed to prevent claims made to raise unrelated issues or delay the process. This may not require full participation of affect or responsible parties in negotiations, but provisions should be made to get all input needed to shape an optimal solution that will not be challenged in later proceedings. All elements in a public dispute resolution procedure should be described in public information and the resolutions should reviewed in a public forum to assure that the parties’ solution does not inadvertently impact unrepresented parties or develop self-serving agreements.

Provisions should be included in regulations or in the ground rules established for negotiations that assure that participants have the authority to negotiate for the parties they represent. Where interests are not fully represented by the participating parties, public workshops, opinion surveys, etc. may be used to assure adequate involvement.

5. Provide assistance when needed

A professional facilitator or mediator may greatly enhance the efficiency of any negotiations or planning process on controversial public issues or projects, not just when an impasse is reached. This neutral process expert can allow policy and technical experts to focus on shaping a solution that meets their parties’ interests. The savings in time and expense usually far outweigh the cost of the assistance.
Parties often resist initiating mediation because they fear it will imply that they are willing to compromise. Making assisted negotiations a required element of a resolution procedure or using a neutral group like the Florida Growth Management Conflict Resolution Consortium (CRC) or a Regional Planning Council (RPC) can increase the use of neutral assistants. It would also be possible to have designated dispute resolution specialists in state agencies and local governments who are responsible for improving the way disputes are resolved (this could be modeled after the Federal Dispute Resolution Act).

Neutrals usually charge from $700-1500 per day. These expenses may be shared equally or according to a formula by the principal parties, paid by one party, or paid from a special fund or grant that can be used for this purpose.

6. Permit the use of low-cost “rights” and “power” backups

These include: various forms of arbitration, mini-trials, summary jury trials, surveys, voting, special masters, expert panels and others. Depending on the nature of the situation use of these procedures may be mandatory/binding or voluntary. In most cases, existing procedures would need to be modified before it is possible to use these alternative techniques. In some cases, especially binding third party procedures, there may be legal restrictions against their use in public disputes.
Design Options

Who manages the process?
♦ Program staff
♦ Legal staff
♦ Political leader or a joint leadership team
♦ A professional neutral (mediator, facilitator, manager)

At what times in the formal decision making process should alternative options be used?
♦ During project or problem definition
♦ In discussion of options
♦ When complaints first arise
♦ Before or after an initial decision is challenged
♦ Before or after the final decision is challenged
♦ Before or after the court or administrative hearing has been requested, or a hearing date is set?

What is the procedure for initiating a collaborative process?
♦ Required within a specified number of days of…..
♦ Request by one party, if certain conditions are met, following notice procedures (with incentives or mandated for the other’s participation)
♦ Informal request

How will parties be represented? (for all sessions or mixed format)
♦ Individuals or representatives of all potential parties/interests
♦ Teams—parties with common interests select one representative
♦ Open participation—multiple members of each party attend

What incentives or disincentives will there be for each party to collaborate?
♦ Quicker treatment of permits or other relevant determinations
♦ Financial support for costs in participating and retaining a third party neutral
♦ Uncertainty of a third party decision maker
♦ Time and cost savings by avoiding litigation
♦ Deadlines for collaborative decisions
♦ Penalties for non-cooperation, e.g., paying the other’s legal costs

What delegation of responsibility will there be to those participating in the process?
♦ Agency requests advisory recommendations
♦ Agency participates in a shared decision process
♦ The group is empowered to decide without Agency involvement

How will the procedure be institutionalized?
☐ In law, ordinance or rule (mandatory or voluntary)
☐ Through policy guidance and with a pilot project
☐ Ad hoc—administrative decision to convene parties in a specific case
Resolving Intergovernmental Challenges

1. What is the context for the topic/challenge?

   - What does the current process for addressing the topic/challenge look like and what are the problems with it?

   - What would a better process that addresses this topic/challenge while improving coordination and decision-making look like?

   - How do we get a better process? How do we get Cities and Counties to push together for a more thoughtful process?
Implementation Plan for Enhanced Resolution Procedures

Individually or in teams determine:

Who needs to approve and support enhanced procedures?

Who needs orientation or training to implement the new procedures and how should that be done?

Who needs new skills to participate effectively?

Who needs to take what steps to implement your procedure? Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>By When</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Local Government Dispute Resolution and Consensus Building

Robert M. Jones, Director
Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium

"More than ever, communities are being forced to find new and creative ways to meet the challenges before them. The realities facing community problem solvers have never been so complex or so difficult."
—Christopher T. Gates, National Civic League

1. The Context for Local Government Cooperation and Conflict Resolution

There are many ways to handle issues and problems. However, the complexity of the problems and the diverse interests often make problematic traditional approaches such as: get it done yourself; stake out a position; set up a study committee; consult and decide. More and more, to make progress in addressing key problems at the local level, it is necessary for elected and appointed leaders and managers to bring groups together to reach a consensus on the problem and agree on its solution.

Local elected and appointed officials are constantly being asked to do more with less. Increasingly, they must think smarter, act quickly and learn new and better ways of working together—with each other and with others to focus limited time, energy and resources on counties' most pressing problems. Rapid social, cultural, economic and environmental change transforms communities, bringing to the forefront conflict between groups and individuals with divergent interests. Often frustrations grow with meetings that don't work and with processes that may not produce a genuine "public voice" and may instead substitute the voice of "professional citizens." These problems, left unattended quickly turn into powerful barriers to positive community change and result in litigation, political gridlock, and public dissatisfaction.

In Florida's communities, the context for decision making, governance and leadership is a constantly changing and challenging proposition. Coalitions form and dissolve around specific issues and the composition and agenda of groups change over time. Local government and elected and appointed officials are called upon to address deficiencies in housing, public safety, transportation, recreation, social services, economic development, quality of life issues against a backdrop of:

- Uncertain sources of funding;
- Increasing responsibilities for problem-solving without adequate resources;
- Polarized interest groups; and
- A public that is feeling frustrated, distrustful, overtaxed and alienated from governmental decision making.

The all too familiar syndrome in government of "decide, announce and defend" has led to public resistance of top-down solutions and further widens the gulf between elected and appointed officials and the public they serve. Add to this, the rapid changes in Florida's communities that make it difficult to develop and maintain a consensus on current priorities and longer term visions for communities' futures.

In this setting, public officials, whether appointed or elected, need new consensus building tools and the skills to use them in work with their own jurisdictions, governing bodies and in engaging the public and their constituencies when:

- Basic values are at issue and conflict erupts;
- When tradeoffs have to be made;
- When the nature of the problem is unclear;
- When there is political gridlock.
2. Dispute Resolution and Local Government

"The days of simply saying 'I'll see you in court' are over. The taxpayers are not interested in funding law firms with endless litigation; they just want results. The various alternative dispute resolution methods available today address almost any situation in a more cost effective and satisfactory way than the lawsuits of the past."

—Emeline C. Acton, Hillsborough County Attorney

"I believe the skills required for these consensus processes are integral to effective public leadership in our increasingly shared-power world."

—Barbara Sheen Todd, former President of the National Association of Counties and Florida Association of Counties

"Training as a mediator was helpful in my role as a local official. For example, it helps to focus on interests and not positions, to not dwell on personalities, to be hard on the issues, and to listen carefully to what is truly bothering the constituent."

—Steven Seibert, Secretary, Florida Department of Community Affairs

There is growing interest and experience at local level in Florida in collaborative approaches that can bring people together to:

- Develop consensus for action;
- Increase inter-agency and inter-governmental cooperation, coordination and collaboration;
- Resolve disputes using procedures that can produce results.

Examples of effective applications have dealt with a variety of issues such as affordable housing, water supply, emergency medical services provision, school siting, future visions, budgetary priorities, environmental and land use issues and personnel claims and grievances.

Disputes involving local governments generally fall into several categories:

A. Disputes among constituents concerning issues that cities and counties may not directly regulate but which constituents bring to an elected or appointed official for a solution (e.g., neighborhood boundary or noise disputes, etc.)

B. Disputes concerning issues over which the local government has flexible regulatory authority (e.g., a zoning dispute involving a shopping center's request for a permit affecting residential properties where the local government recommends mediation to the disputing parties).

C. Internal disputes (e.g., personnel matters, policy initiatives, roles and responsibilities, resource allocations (e.g., a facilitated retreat for a City or County Commission and senior staff focused on organizational issues or mediations of public employment discrimination claims).

D. Disputes between and among local governments. Local governments may find themselves at odds with each, with school districts, with neighboring counties, regional, state or federal agencies over issues such as transportation, tax issues, annexation, land use patterns, water supply issues, shared service agreements and facility sitings. Mediation and facilitation has been used successfully in these conflicts.

The concept of building consensus for action on problems at the local level involves the following premises:

- There is often potential for agreement on complex issues. Latent shared interests can be identified in a good process and serve as a basis for agreement on solutions;
• Changing notions of effective leadership benefit from supplemental consensus processes for facilitating constructive change;

• Consensus building processes can be a means for achieving good government;

• Citizens increasingly expect meaningful ways to participate in decisions affecting their lives. Citizen participation in decision-making processes is important for leaders at the local level to succeed;

• Effective consensus building and conflict resolution can save time, money and preserve important relationships but requires and investment of resources and a support structure for staff and parties using these procedures.

The potential advantages of consensus building and conflict resolution include:

1. **Better Decisions.** As groups learn about each others' views and needs and develop common ground for action, they can create solutions that better reflect the concerns of other parties as well as their own.

2. **Faster Implementation.** Parties are less likely to block implementation if they understand that a plan reflects their input and interests. Parties involved in consensus building often make commitments to participate in the implementation.

3. **Bridge Community Differences.** There are increasingly complex challenges and problems at the local level that are becoming the responsibility of local government. Consensus building process allow communities to bridge differences and work together to find mutually acceptable solutions based on common interests.

4. **Educate Constituencies.** Consensus building processes can educate constituents on the complex nature of the problems and issues and on others' concerns that will need to be addressed in solutions.

5. **Deal Productively with Shared Power for Decision Making.** Consensus building processes bring a wide array of stakeholders to the table to seek mutually beneficial solutions as a response to the reality that power has become widely and thinly distributed with many interests able to block or veto the possibility of action.

6. **Create New Resources.** There are fewer federal, state and local dollars available to deal with critical issues facing our society. Consensus building processes can engage a range of public, private and community institutions and leadership to bring a wider array of resources to bear on the problem.

7. **Manage Diversity and Build Common Ground.** Consensus building processes can help increasingly diverse communities improve inter-group relations, build trust and find common ground.

8. **Intergovernmental Collaboration.** Consensus building can effectively involve different governmental units and non-governmental actors in building a collaborative agreement on issues that cut across jurisdictional lines.
Additional Readings and Resource Materials on Consensus building and Conflict Resolution

Managing Public Conflicts in Florida: A Guide to Collaborative Approaches

Eds. Susskind, McKearman, and Thomas-Larmer, Sage Publications, 1999. This comprehensive 1000 plus pages includes contributions from the leading practitioners and academics in the field of public policy dispute resolution.

Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making

Resolving Conflict: Strategies for Local Government

Successful Negotiating in Local Government
ICMA, Washington D.C., 1985. Description of arenas for negotiation and outlines nuts and bolts of negotiation procedures and provides cases studies.

Pulling Together: A Planning and Development Consensus-Building Manual

Involving Citizens in Community Decision making: A Guidebook

Facing Racial and Cultural Conflict: Tools for Rebuilding Community

The Facilitators Manual: A Step by Step Guide for Groups to Brainstorm Ideas; Create a Shared Vision, Develop Plans, Make Choices

The User's Guide to Collaborative Dispute Resolution

Mediation Handbook for Cities

National Civic Review, "Collaborative Problem-solving Symposium"
Volume 80, No. 2, Spring 1991. Presents case studies on collaborative methods communities have applied to constructively address change.

National Civic Review, "Keys to Consensus"
Volume 77, No. 4, July-August, 1988. Presents articles on mediation and consensus building at the local level.

The Pursuit of Significance: Strategies for Managerial Success in Public Organizations
Photographs

League leaders open the session on intergovernmental problem-solving at the Boca Raton meeting.

Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium staff assist FLC workshop participants to identify problems and possible solutions.
Tom Taylor works with managers to develop a list of intergovernmental issues.

Bob Jones watches as manager describe examples of successful intergovernmental cooperation.