

2025 City Manager Annual Evaluation

Please rate the City Manager using the following scale:

5	Exceptional	Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds expectations.
4	Highly Effective	Performance frequently exceeds expectations.
3	Proficient	Performance consistently meets expectations.
2	Inconsistent	Performance meets some, but not all expectations.
1	Unsatisfactory	Performance consistently fails to meet minimum expectations; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.
N/A	Not Applicable	Employee has not been in position long enough to have demonstrated the essential elements of the position and will be reviewed at a later agreed upon date.

The nine (9) categories below are the areas being rated, not each bulleted item. These items assist each Commissioner as they evaluate each category. The items in each category are not meant to be all inclusive. At the end you should have nine (9) categories rated.

Please return your evaluation form to the City Manager.

1. Leadership / Supervision
Leadership - Inspires others to succeed - Actively promotes efficiency in operations - Demonstrates a high regard for personal ethics - Exhibits composure, appearance, and attitude appropriate for the executive position - Seems to assume responsibility for the outcomes of staff performance - Maintains a standard of respect for department head's ability and encourage their initiative - Demonstrates knowledge / understanding of departmental operations - Challenges staff to perform at their highest level
COMMENTS: - Doesn't always inspire others to succeed - Seems to actively promote but not always execute efficiency in operations - Demonstrate a low regard for personal ethics "A great leader recognizes the multiple talents-whether natural or acquired that any employee brings to their position". I sent that line in an email to Todd Miles. In my view he had done a great job serving the Commission. He was fired right after he emailed each commissioner and asked us to share a feedback about his job performance with the Commission.

- Todd Miles was the only employee the Commission was allowed to talk and deal with freely—the person we could ask legislative and other Commission or city related questions. **Because that was his job, he asked commissioners whether he was doing it well. For doing that he was fired on the spot.** This is just one comment from the city manager about Todd Miles' performance: "However, improvement is needed in how he engages with both staff and all commissioners not just one or two there are five. To strengthen his effectiveness, Todd should focus on engaging others with great collaboration, empathy, and respect for differing viewpoints. Going forward Todd is encouraged to lean on his interpersonal skills to build stronger rapport with staff and commissioners practice practicing active listening and framing his input in ways that foster teamwork and shared ownership of solution."
- He was fired for the very reason he was hired: to interact and communicate with the Commission. We can only infer why such a valuable employee was let go. No replacement was provided even though the city manager personally told me he would find one. Many other people were fired during this past evaluation.
- In my view, the pattern is that they spoke the truth. Some have sued. There are number of lawsuits pending against the city of North Port.
- One of the most important laws of leadership is the law of addition: valuing people. True leaders add value to others by serving them. That shifts the focus from what a leader can get from the team to what the leader and give so that team members can grow and succeed. I have witnessed the opposite.
- Todd Miles told me numerous times that he was open to help to do my job and other Commissioners' more effectively and had an open door policy for **ALL** commissioners.
- A weak leader fears talent beneath him. A true leader looks for it. A true leader is not threatened by staff who are smarter, more skilled, or more direct. Insecure leaders fire people who outshine them. I can conclude that this pattern matches Todd Miles' situation. If the job was to talk to the Commission, asking the Commission for feedback is not insubordination. In conclusion, a true leader is not afraid of stronger qualities in his subordinates; he depends on them.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☒ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

2. Execution of Policy

- Understands the laws and ordinances of the city and cause them to be fairly enforced
- Offers workable alternatives to the Commission for changes in law or policy when an existing policy is no longer practical
- Supports the actions of the Commission after a decision has been reached, both inside and outside the organization

COMMENTS:

This is just one example of how the city manager tries to influence the commission:

Section 5.01 Powers of the city Commission states: “The city Commission shall determine the manner in which such powers of the city shall be executed as prescribed by ordinance or resolution.” The Commission is the policymaker. It is the only body authorized to legislate the policies that bind this board, the staff—not the other way around. The city manager instituted his own policy affecting the Commission.

Policy 6.8 which states that “**City commissioners are expected** to communicate with employees through the city manager or designee.” My question is this: **how does one enforce that policy when the Commission does not answer to the city manager?** Under the city charter the city manager is a subordinate of the Commission not the other way around.

This policy has ethical implications and most likely legal ones as well—including the First Amendment. The city manager has said numerous times that some commissioners do not follow the law. Even though I publicly stated at the annual retreat on January 6th, 2026 that I would abide by his policy. He continued to say that I violate the charter.

These accusations must stop. The City Charter does not prohibit commissioners from speaking with city employees. It says the city Commission should deal with administrative services through the city manager. In a commissioner-manager charter, “**deal with**” means conduct official business through—give directions, make requests, and handle day-to-day administration by going through the city manager, not by issuing order to staff by a commissioner.

Asking an employee a question is a conversation. Conversing with city employees or asking them questions is not prohibited by the North Port City Charter. That is why Policy 6.8 is stricter than the Charter. The Charter targets **command**. His policy targets **communication**. Those are not the same word.

When the question was posed to the city attorney at the December 9th, 2025, North Port City Commission meeting—whether the Charter forbids an individual commissioner from asking questions of the city staff employees—the city attorney answered, “if you ask ten attorneys you may get twenty opinions”.

In his self-evaluation, the city manager says Policy 6.8 is not his because it was created before his tenure. He signed it. Once he signed it, it became his policy—whether he changed the text or not.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☒ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

3. Community Relations

• Works with community members and properly handle their complaints • Demonstrates a willingness to meet with community members and discuss issues of concern; initiates follow-up as appropriate • Represents the City in a professional, articulate manner when attending/presenting at community events, neighborhood meetings or social gatherings
COMMENTS: • As the City Manager stated, he works well with community members. For the most part, properly handles their complaints. • Demonstrates a willingness to meet with residents, however, there are number of people that contacted me directly that their needs were not met and/or the CM refused to meet with them and unfortunately I couldn't help them because it is outside of my authority. • The CM represents the City in a professional, articulate manner when attending/presenting at community events, neighborhood meetings or social groups gatherings.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☒ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

4. Administrative Duties
• Effectively manages personnel issues including employee insurance, fringe benefits, promotion, pensions, and union negotiations • Provides regular information and reports to the Commission concerning matters of importance to the City • Ensures that reports are produced and handled in a way to convey the message that affairs of the City are transparent
COMMENTS: • Doesn't provide regular information and reports to the Commission concerning matters of importance to the City. A perfect example is Deep Park Data Center project. • The city manager on multiple occasions failed to provide the city Commission with timely and complete information on matters that directly affect the city and its residents. A clear example is the Deep Park Data Center project. As an individual commissioner, I first became aware of this project on June 25th, 2026. I immediately requested that an agenda item be placed before the Commission so that we could discuss the data centers and the potential impact of such a project on our community.

That agenda item was subsequently brought forward at the request of the city clerk through the city attorney with the supporting materials that included information from other jurisdictions concerning data-center moratoriums.

Then, at the July 21st, 2026 Commission meeting, immediately before the Commission's decision, during the discussion and right before the vote, the Commission was informed that a data center application has been submitted the previous evening.

That raises a very serious question: if the city staff and the city manager were aware of the project and its development activity (and they were) before the Commission was informed, why was the information not provided to the Commission when the issue was first brought forward for discussion?

The Commission cannot properly perform its legislative and oversight responsibilities if individual commissioners are not giving timely and complete information about significant development projects affecting the city.

This is not about one commissioner having more information than another. It is about transparency, accountability and ensuring that all commissioners have the information necessary to make informed decision on behalf of the residents of North Port.

- Another example is mandatory water-hookup letters. They were sent out without notifying the Commission. After the community backlash, the city manager placed an agenda item for discussion and possible Commission direction on April 7th, 2026.

The following is another example of how another matter was handled poorly by the city manager. Below is a timeline of Geotechnical Reports Summary that lasted through 2026.

- Initial email to David Greenbaum (Building Official) on October 4, 2023. In this reply email Mr. Greenbaum states the reason for the geotechnical report was based on chapter 18 of the Florida Building Code-Building (FBC-B). **Mr. Greenbaum also made the point that this report was always required and that his predecessors did not understand the code correctly.** Mr. Greenbaum made the basic assumption that all the previous building officials were wrong and he was correct.
- On October 5th, 2023 there was an in person meeting between Mr. Greenbaum Josh Thurmer (City Deputy Building Official) and Mr. Drumm. In this meeting Mr. Drumm brought up the requirement of chapter 4 of the Building Florida Building Code—Resident (FBC-R). Mr. Greenbaum was insistent that his interpretation of the code was correct and would not change his mind even though Mr. Drumm had pointed out sections of the code that contradicted his interpretation.
- On October 12th, 2023, Mr. Drumm sent emails to Jerome Fletcher (city manager) Jason Yarborough (assistant city manager) and Mr. Greenbaum explaining the situation and the error/mistakes that Mr. Greenbaum was making. Mr. Drumm explained the increased costs to the owner builders for every residential home there was a lot of back and forth in those emails and another meeting was scheduled.

- On November 8th, 2023 an in-person meeting was held at City Hall with Jason Yarborough, Alaina Ray (Director of Building Development Department), Mr. Greenbaum and Mr. Drumm and several other local engineers. In this meeting Ms. Ray made it clear that the city staff could not direct or influence Mr. Greenbaum's decision decisions or interpretations as the Building Official (this is a key point to remember). **However, if Mr. Drumm obtained rules from BOAF (Building Officials Association of Florida) that Mr. Greenbaum would abide by BOAF's ruling.** Again, in this meeting Mr. Greenbaum made his arguments and the core of his argument was based on chapter 18 of the Florida Building Code Building (FBC-B) NOT Florida Building Code-Residential (FBC-R). Later that day, Mr. Greenbaum emailed the code reference that outlined his point of view.
- On November 9th, 2023, Mr. Drumm obtained Informal Interpretation Report #8846 which stated that as a general rule, FBC-Residential is a stand-alone document and that the FBC-Building is not to be used. The only exception to this is when the FBC-Residential does not cover a topic and then you are to refer to the FBC-Building. The example given for this is the fact that the FBC-Residential does not have a section in it to cover residential aircraft hangers, therefore, use the section in the FBC-Building for aircraft hangers.
- On December 19th, 2023 the city of Nort Port acknowledged the ruling of report #8846 but did not accept the ruling and wanted Mr. Drumm to get another ruling: a Binding Ruling.
- On July 15th, 2024, Mr. Drumm obtained **Binding Declaratory Statement DS 2024-014** and it states chapter 4 of the Florida Building Code Residential (FBC-R) is to be used for foundation design of residential homes and NOT chapter 18 of the Florida Building Code—Building (FBC-B). Remember, Mr. Greenbaum has cited chapter 18 of the Florida Building Code—Building as the reason for the geotechnical report being required for residential construction. In fact, it was the first statement Mr. Greenbaum made and the initial email sent to Mr. Drumm on why he was requiring the report in the first place.
- On July 18th, 2024, the City sent email to city staff, commissioners and Mr. Drumm and stated that the DS2024-014 ruling Mr. Drumm obtained still did not address the issue. In fact, there is a new accusation the City made that stated Mr. Drumm was not designing the foundation and fill material in accordance with chapter 4 of Florida Building Code—Residential (FBC-R). However, the Building Department never rejected any permit that was engineered by Mr. Drumm before, during or after the geotechnical report requirement stating this fact. This email essentially stated Mr. Drumm was not doing his job correctly as the engineer BUT the city never did anything to address it.
- **On October 31st, 2024, Jerome Fletcher called Mr. Greenbaum to discuss the geotechnical report requirement. The call was made because there was a contractor (known by Jerome Fletcher personally) looking to permit several homes in the city of North Port and did not want to pay for the geotechnical reports (each report would cost around \$1,000 to \$3,000). That person showed Jerome Fletcher all the rulings that Mr. Drumm has received from Building Officials Association of Florida (which were the same rulings that Mr. Drumm had been emailed to Jerome numerous times already) and Jerome instructed Mr. Greenbaum to drop the geotechnical report requirement for residential construction.**

- On November 1st, 2024, **(the next morning)**, Mr. Greenbaum sent an email to Jerome Fletcher and other staff members that stated “in the spirit of consistency with adjacent jurisdictions, a geotechnical report for one or two family dwelling will no longer be required at time of permit application.” This statement also contradicts past statements of Mr. Greenbaum and other city staff as they said geotechnical reports for residential construction were normal and what was done in other areas. Mr. Drumm had provided in prior months emails from local adjacent Building Officials which clearly stated geotechnical reports for residential construction were not required.
- On April 1st, 2025, Mr. Drumm sent an email to City Staff, Commissioners and the City Attorney to get clarification on the fact the city staff accused/insinuated that he did not design homes in accordance with chapter 4 of the Florida Building Code—Residential (FBC-R) but never once rejected any of his plans or other local engineers that designed the homes in a similar fashion. Mr. Drumm never received a reply from any of the city staff that he sent that email to.
- This is only one example of how administrative duties have been handled under this city manager. **That practice cost single family homeowners millions of dollars.** One can only speculate why that practice/requirement was put in place. Did someone inside or outside of the city benefit from a requirement that was abruptly dropped after years in use. At the public meeting, on March 2nd, 2026 the city manager stated that he has absolutely no authority to tell the Building Official what to do. The timeline tells a different story. The handling of this issue was in many ways administratively unprofessional and unethical.
- On or around June 30th, 2026, Mr. Greenbaum was fired by the city and we might never find the reasoning why this practice was instituted.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☒ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

5. Economic Development
• Develops strong relationships with developers while protecting the City’s interest • Works to increase the City’s tax base through economic development
COMMENTS: • As stated by the city manager, he strengthened relationships with developers and worked to increase the City’s tax base through economic development.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☒ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

6. Intergovernmental Relations
• Cooperates with neighboring communities and community members while looking after the interests of North Port • Maintains open communications with other local government in the area, particularly as it may affect or relate to the City
COMMENTS: Cooperates with neighboring communities and community members. Maintains open communications with other local governments in the area.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☒ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

7. Strategic Planning
• Involves himself in the planning process to the correct degree • Review the processes and look for better ways to handle development activities • Demonstrates the ability to implement and achieve strategic objectives as set by Commission
COMMENTS: As far as strategic planning, two of the three projects selected for potential borrowing to proceed with implementation – in my opinion, we have more pressing needs in our city, such as infrastructure. I do not perceive this as a strategic planning. Even presenting these projects as the list of projects doesn't demonstrate a necessity to include them when, in just last year's budget, the commission faced imminent failure of water-control structures, utility-pipe upgrades, and so forth.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☒ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

8. City Commission Relations
• Works well with the City Commission to make sure there is adequate information available prior to meetings • Responds to requests for information or assistance by the Commission and/or individual members

- Carries out directives of the Commission as a whole as opposed to those of any one member or minority
- Sets meeting agendas that reflect the guidance of the Commission as a whole
- Demonstrates willingness to meet with Commission members to deal with individual problems and issues

COMMENTS:

There were some serious allegations by the city manager against an elected official (myself), and they were factually deficient and false. On January 27th, 2026, an email went to all commissioners summarizing an accusation against me, as a sitting commissioner, of using my official position to seek preferential treatment. Nothing could further from the truth.

I want to focus on this section of that email sent out to commissioners and later made it public through a public meeting addressing me as a sitting commissioner using my official position to seek preferential treatment.

This is a section of that email written by Alaina Ray:

“On Friday, January 23, Mr. Timothy Drumm – Engineer, visited the Building Division and represented himself on behalf of Commissioner Petrow.

- **Mr. Drumm forcefully and publicly insisted that the Chief Building Official and Building Division Staff were “liars” and that the Chief Building Official was wrong – that the new plans meeting current FBC should not be required.**
- **Mr. Drumm repeatedly invoked Commissioner Petrow’s name with overtures of negative consequences for staff for not approving the Commissioner’s permit as-is.”**

After the accusations were made public, they turned out NOT to be true—something even city staff later confirmed in their email exchange. That is clear from the email exchange between Alaina Ray and Kyle Hoffman (who was present at the meeting). **Ms. Ray wrote to Kyle Hoffman asking any mention of Commissioner Petrow on January 30th, 2026 at that meeting. In Kyle Hoffman’s email response dated also January 30th, 2026, he confirms that my name nor my title was ever mentioned.**

Moreover, on February 17th 2026, Tim Drumm emailed Kyle Hoffman separately and asked him to confirm the same facts—including whether Mr. Drumm had called the Building Official a “liar”. Kyle Hoffman replied that my name was not mentioned at all and that Tim never called the building official a liar.

Here is the exact wording of Kyle Hoffman’s response to Tim Drumm in the email dated February 18th, 2026. “During the discussion between you (Mr. Drumm) and Mr. Greenbaum, I do not recall you calling him a liar. I do recall you stating that he had been wrong previously.....I do not recall Commissioner Petrow’s name being mentioned at any point, nor did I have any knowledge that the gentleman you were with was related to him. I was not aware of that fact until after the conversation had ended and all parties had left.”

What other proof is necessary to refute what was sent to each individual Commissioner and other staff members on January 27th, 2026 when the City employee who witnessed the events directly testified to the facts?

It is telling that every Commissioner was notified of this slander of my name on January 27th, 2026—and that three days later Alaina Ray went to verify the facts with the person who was actually present at the meeting.

No apology was made to me, publicly or privately.

It is also telling that her January 27th email to Jerome Fletcher—which he forwarded to the Commission—begins, “Good afternoon, as directed per our discussion yesterday...”

One can only ask whether Ms. Ray was directed to put a false accusation against a sitting commissioner into that email.

Moreover, Mr. Fletcher requested agenda item 26-0416 for the February 24th, 2026 public meeting: *Discussion Regarding Administrative Safeguards for Permit Processing and Development Services Interactions Involving Elected Officials and Related Parties.*

The legislative text is telling: Under Recommended Action it says: **“No action is requested. This item is for discussion and transparency purposes only.”**

Almost a month later, he still wanted those accusations aired in public—retelling, in an open meeting, the false claim to my name, title, or position was used to obtain preferential treatment.

I said at that meeting, and I will say it again: I never wanted preferential treatment because of my official capacity. I never took steps to get it. What I want is the truth.

At that meeting, staff did not present the emails between Kyle Hoffman and Alaina Ray. Staff did not present the email exchange between Kyle Hoffman and Tim Drumm confirming that the allegations were false. **There was no correction and no apology.**

But what was presented—by me—was Timothy Drumm’s Sworn Affidavit that he didn’t invoke or mention my name at all. I also presented email exchange between staff, between staff and Tim Drumm. Those are attached as a back up materials for that meeting dated February 24th, 2026. Mr. Drumm (Engineer) gave a public comment confirming that the allegations were false.

What I can attest is that I suffered emotionally and physically, and that my quality of life has been significantly diminished by these repeated attacks and accusations. They also affected my ability to serve in my official capacity.

I had a newborn at that time and was and still caring for our son with special needs. The false accusations cost me sleep and took a real toll on my emotional health.

To substantiate what I have said, anyone may file a public records request for the emails that I have referenced and watch the meeting that was held on February 24, 2026 and/or look up the email exchange on the city’s website (back up materials) for that meeting.

But there is more. That same email accuses me of meeting with the city about proposed development by my brother. **I have never met with ANY staff regarding any development as it was stated in that email.**

In his self-evaluation, the city manager states, “for nearly all of this evaluation period, two member of this Commission – Commissioner Duval and Commissioner Petrow – have engaged in a sustained pattern of conduct that by their own public statements, was a deliberate departure from the Charter’s non-interference provisions.”

I remember of two instances ONLY when I spoke with the city employees that in the City Manager’s criteria was the violation of his policy. And after he spoke to me, I didn’t continue to “violate” his policy. Claiming that I do not agree with his policy does NOT mean I violate the Charter.

I can think of no examples—other than those two conversations—that, even by his own criteria, show I failed to abide by that policy. My question to the city manager is this: what repeated conduct, and what violation of my oath, have I displayed? I cannot conceive how this Commission has tolerated all these accusations.

Another thing I want to address is the city manager’s accusation about an NDA he eloquently describes and references many statues in his self-evaluation. The city manager claims that on May 21st, 2026, I confronted him and my “persistence was such that, to satisfy my repeated concerns that NDA was not moving forward,” he “pulled” a department director into active meeting to satisfy one commissioner’s personal interest. No department director was present at that one-on-one.

I didn’t “press” the city manager into anything. I asked a question.

To spin that into political plot is beneath the office. I have the right to ask a question on behalf of any resident. I have the same right to ask a question that concerns by brother.

What happened at that one-on-one meeting is what happens usually weekly at our one-on-ones: if the city manager does not know the answer, he picks up the phone and calls the appropriate department head so the discussion of city business can continue. I abided by his policy. I directed the question to the city manager directly.

The city manager’s claim, repeated in his self-evaluation, that I used my official capacity to “press” him and then a department director for preferential treatment is FALSE.

I asked the city manager one simple question. I asked no one else. I pressed no one. I didn’t communicate with any department director. I sought no preferential treatment.

The further statement that this occurred “despite Commissioner Petrow having no stated role in that transaction” is also false. The city manager’s self-evaluation recasts accusations as facts. That’s the problem. At the meeting on May 21st, 2026, I stated, on the record, that I had no role in that transaction. That statement stands.

These are no isolated misstatements. They form a pattern of unfounded accusations offered as self-defense. The record doesn’t support them. I did not use my office to extract special treatment; I did not press staff. I didn’t even talk to staff. Those facts should be stated clearly and left on the record.

What the Charter actually forbids—and what it does not.

Section 5.02 is the provision he is invoking. It forbids **giving orders** to, or **making requests** of, the city manager's subordinates unless the city manager authorizes it.

What it does **not** forbid is a commissioner asking the city manager a question. That is the opposite of violation, it is compliance. A clear example of a real 5.02 policy violation would like this: a commissioner goes around the city manager, calls a department director, and says "Hire that person, process this and so on". That is an order or a request to a subordinate and that's what the City Charter blocks.

Defamation in Florida requires a false statement of fact that harms reputation. The accusations contained in the city manager's self-evaluation do not constitute proof evidence or substantiated findings of misconduct. Rather they appear to represent a repeated pattern of unsupported allegations directed at a sitting City Commissioner and his official capacity.

This is not a trivial matter. The city manager's official evaluation is a governmental document and statements contained within that document can carry significant credibility and reputational consequences.

A disagreement between the city manager and an individual Commissioner does not transform an allegation into an established fact. Continued conduct of this nature may warrant appropriate action to protect the reputation of the Commissioner and the proper functioning of the Commission.

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☐ 2-Inconsistent ☒ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

9. Financial Management / Budget
• Ensures the budget is prepared and executed in a productive manner • Addresses the budget concerns raised by the Commission as a whole • Administers the adopted and amended budget within the approved revenues and expenditures
COMMENTS: When the Commission directed a 5% cut to the FY27 budget, the city manager did not deliver that cut. He treated it as an “exercise,” then walked it back. He told the board the assignment was to take a flat budget and reduce it by 5%. Department heads were told to find the cuts. Fire was used as a scare example—about 18 positions if the cut were applied there. Then when he presented the Commission his budget, it was not a 5% smaller budget. It was described as flat budget, with about \$2.7 million planned for possible borrowing, not returned to taxpayers as a true reduction. I would classify it as noncompliance. That is relabeling. The excuse does not hold when the revenue side improved: • Taxable value came in higher than planned—\$1.2 million more in property tax revenue than staff has projected. • Insurance premiums were flat • Personnel is still about 75%-80% of the General Fund. Protecting every FTE was the manager’s stated first goal—not the Commission’s 5% directive. A 5% cut on a budget of that size is several million dollars. A “flat” budget after higher property values and flat insurance is closer to a 2% real reduction—or less, once growth in the tax base is counted. The difference is not rounding. It is failing to follow direction of the Commission. The city manager later stated “we said that we would cut it by 5% and we did” but the numbers don’t match his statement. An exercise that is reversed because it “affects employees,” then replaced with a flat spend, plus reserve for borrowing, is not a Commission’s directive. Direction from the board is NOT optional. If the manager believed 5% would harm public safety, the appropriate response was to bring alternatives back to the Commission and ask for a new vote/consensus—not to substitute his own “flat plus \$2.7 Million” plan. A similar strategy was used in last year’s budget discussion and virtually no cuts were made for FY2025-2026.

☐ N/A-Not Applicable

OVERALL RATING

Score

☐ 5-Exceptional ☐ 4-Highly Effective ☐ 3-Proficient ☒ 2-Inconsistent ☐ 1-Unsatisfactory
☐ N/A-Not Applicable

(CITY COMMISSIONERS COMMENT)

I no longer have confidence in the city manager.

(EMPLOYEES COMMENT)

CITY MANAGER SIGNATURE / DATE:

(INSERT SIGNATURE)

(INSERT DATE)

CITY COMMISSIONER SIGNATURE / DATE:

Demetrius Petrow

9/8/2026