

Staff Report

City Commission Regular Meeting



November 13, 2025

To: City Commission

From: Liz Mathis, Human Resources Manager

Meeting Date: November 13, 2025

Item Name: City Manager Annual Evaluation

Background:

The City Manager's contract calls for an annual evaluation:

Section 14: Performance Evaluation

Employer shall annually review the performance of the Employee subject to a process, form, criteria, and format for the evaluation which shall be determined by Employer. Employer shall make reasonable efforts to conduct this performance review in August of each year or as soon thereafter as reasonably possible.

Fiscal Impact:

The City Manager's compensation may be adjusted by the City Commission.

Staff Recommendation:

NA

Attachments:

- 1. Com . Sherman-City Manager Evaluation
- 2. Com . Sherman- Mr. Martin Observations
- 3. Com . Belhumeur-City Manager Evaluation
- 4. Mayor Kings Evaluation of City Manager
- 5. Comm Spradley-City Manager Evaluation
- 6. Com . Sherman-City Manager Evaluation
- 7. Com . Sherman- Mr. Martin Observations
- 8. Com . Belhumeur-City Manager Evaluation
- 9. Comm Spradley-City Manager Evaluation
- 10. Mayor Kings Evaluation of City Manager
- 11. Comm Cooley -City Manager Evaluation
- 12. Comm Cunningham City Manager Review0001

N	а	m	ρ	
v	ш		_	٠

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024 thru September 30, 2025

Definition of Ratings

- (1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- (2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- (3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- (4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- (5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

Individually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

	mating	
1. Relationship with City Commission		15%
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the City Commission.		
B. Reporting to City Commission is timely, clear, concise and thorough.		
C. Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.		
D. Effectively aids the City Commission in establishing long range goals as determined from the Stategic		
Plan.		
E. Keeps the City Commission informed of current plans and activities of administration and new		
developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.		
F. Provides the City Commission with clear report of anticipated goals.		
G. Has an "open door policy" for Commissioners.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
2. Public Polations		100/
2. Public Relations		10%
A. Projects a positive public image.		
B. Is courteous to the public at all times.		
C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.		
D. Responds to requests from the public in a timely manner.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments: (next page)		

Rating Weight

2. Effective Leadership of Chaff		200/
3. Effective Leadership of Staff		20%
A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities.		
B. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling		
confidence, and emphasizing support.		
C. Initiates programs to motivate staff.		
D. Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
4. Fiscal Management		20%
A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand.		
B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.		
C. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.		
D. Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
5. Communication		15%
A. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the		
media, public employees and other organizations.		
B. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
comments.		
6 Parsanal Traits		100/
6. Personal Traits		10%
A. Initiative.	<u> </u>	
B. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.		

C. Fairness and Impartiality.				
D. Creativity.				
E. Visionary.				
Average score for this category				
Weighted Score				
Comments:				
7. Intergovernmental Affairs				10%
A. Maintains effective communication with local, regional, Sta				
B. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursue				
C. Contributions to good government through regular particip	ation.			
D. Lobbies effectively with legislators and State agencies.				
Average score for this category				
Weighted Score				
Comments:				
FINAL				
1.00-1.99 Unsatisfactory				
2.00-2.99 Improvement Needed				
3.00-3.99 Meets Job Standards				
4.00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard				
4.5-5.00 Outstanding				
0.00 0.000				
Overall Comments:				
Overall Comments.				
Signature of Evaluator:	Date:	44/04/2025		
Campa P Shaaman.	Jacc.	11/04/2025		
I (Ismaa K.) haaman.			1	

Commissioner Sherman's Observations

OBSERVATIONS

- · Two things that the Manager does now that this Commission Member would like him/her to continue.
 - 1. I would like to see him continuing to engage the residents of Flagler Beach. I want to continue to see the dinner events that he has hosted, games on the green, and other initiatives that I believe strengthen his relationship with the community.
 - 2. I would also like him to continue with this Friday's notes. This is the type of communication and transparency this commission has valued and needed for years.
- · Two things the Manager does that this Commission member would like him/her to discontinue or modify.
 - 1. I believe that an area where I feel Mr. Martin could be more assertive is during budget time, to be a bit more assertive, and instead of saying it is our budget, to provide a bit more guidance with potential outcomes and alternatives to matters that the commission might be debating on with the budget.
- · Two things the Manager does not do now that this Commission member would like to see him/her do.
 - 1. Create a "data dashboard" or public summary of significant studies, utility trends (water/sewer/stormwater), infrastructure needs, costs, timelines, and current status. This gives citizens a more concrete basis for engaging and asking questions.
 - 2. Develop a clear communications plan: ensure that forthcoming studies, utility rate analyses, budget impacts, etc. are shared proactively in clear language and via multiple channels (website, social media, public forums).

FUTURE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

· Specific goals and objectives to be achieved in the next evaluation period:

First, we need a renewed focus on tidal flooding events that impact our residents. It's time for us to begin advocating at the county and state levels for comprehensive studies on tidal flooding originating from the Intracoastal Waterway.

Second, and closely related, is the need to educate our residents on the difference between stormwater flooding and tidal flooding. I believe there is a significant disconnect in our community on this issue, and improving public understanding will help guide more effective solutions.

Finally, I would like Mr. Martin to begin reclaiming and properly managing the city's rights-of-way. These areas are vital to Flagler Beach, and as we continue improving our infrastructure citywide, it's imperative that we address the right-of-way challenges we currently face.

1	N١	_	m	_	
	N	а	rrı	е	i

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024 thru September 30, 2025

Definition of Ratings

- (1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- (2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- (3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- (4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- (5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

Individually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

1. Relationship with City Commission	15%
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the City Commission.	
B. Reporting to City Commission is timely, clear, concise and thorough.	
C. Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.	
D. Effectively aids the City Commission in establishing long range goals as determined from the Stategic	
Plan.	
E. Keeps the City Commission informed of current plans and activities of administration and new	
developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.	
F. Provides the City Commission with clear report of anticipated goals.	
G. Has an "open door policy" for Commissioners.	
Average score for this category	
Weighted Score	
Comments:	
2. Dublic Deletions	100/
2. Public Relations	10%
A. Projects a positive public image.	
B. Is courteous to the public at all times.	
C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.	
D. Responds to requests from the public in a timely manner.	
Average score for this category	
Weighted Score	
Comments: (next page)	

Rating

Weight

3. Effective Leadership of Staff	20%
A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities.	
B. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling	
confidence, and emphasizing support.	
C. Initiates programs to motivate staff.	
D. Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace.	
Average score for this category	
Weighted Score	
Comments:	
Comments.	
A Fiscal Management	200/
4. Fiscal Management	20%
A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand. B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.	
C. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.	
D. Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability.	
Average score for this category	
Weighted Score	
Comments:	
5. Communication	15%
A. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the	
media, public employees and other organizations.	
B. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback.	
Average score for this category	
Weighted Score	
Comments:	
6. Personal Traits	10%
A. Initiative.	
B. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.	

C. Fairness and Impartiality.		
D. Creativity.		
E. Visionary.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
Comments.		
7. Intergovernmental Affairs		10%
A. Maintains effective communication with local, regional, State and Fed.		
B. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursued.		
C. Contributions to good government through regular participation.		
D. Lobbies effectively with legislators and State agencies.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
FINAL		
FINAL		
	ļ	
1.00-1.99 Unsatisfactory		
2.00-2.99 Improvement Needed		
3.00-3.99 Meets Job Standards		
4.00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard		
4.5-5.00 Outstanding		
Overall Comments:		
Signature of Evaluator: Date:	1	
Jagnature of Evaluation.] 	
Rick Belhumeur, November 07, 2025		

Jame: Scott W. Spradley

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024 thru September 30, 2025

efinition of Ratings

- 1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- 2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- 3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- 4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- 5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

ndividually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

Rating	Weight
	15%
4	
4	
4	
4	
4	
4	
4	
5	
29	4.1428
	357142
	4 4 4 4 5

comments:

Dale does a very good job of communicating the status and results of policy actions to the City Commission, both as a Board and individually in our face to face communications. He is always available when I have questions, comments or concerns regarding City policy or activity.

. Public Relations		10%
Projects a positive public image.	4	
3. Is courteous to the public at all times.	5	
. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.	5	
). Responds to requests from the public in a timely manner.	3	
verage score for this category	17	4.25
Veighted Score		42.5

Comments: (next page)

Dale is excellent at his public relations duties and obligations re: the media. Even though his workload is significant and ever growing, I would like to see Dale improve the timeliness of his interactions with nembers of the community. Success here would in my estimation be well received by the community.

Effective Leadership of Staff		20%
Delegates appropriate responsibilities.	4	
3. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling	1	
onfidence, and emphasizing support.		
. Initiates programs to motivate staff.	4	
). Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace.	4	
overage score for this category	16	4
Veighted Score		80

comments:

Not being privy to staff interactions, it is difficult for me to assess Dale's leadership capabilities with a proad brush. But based on comments made to me by a few staff members whose opinions are credible with me, Dale is a good leader, with any short comings being attributed to Dale's heavy work load. I would ask that Dale continue to strive to have a positive atmosphere for the work place, despite his workload.

. Fiscal Management		20%
A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand.	3	4524.7
3. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.	3	
. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.	3	
). Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability.	4	
verage score for this category		3.25
Veighted Score		65

Comments:

would like to see Dale work to control to the extent possible, redundant and excessive asks by contractors and consultants, which in turn inflate the budget to a degree. I would like Dale to ensure that change orders are approved prior to the commencement of work. I feel this is an area where Dale can and should easily improve.

. Communication		15%
v. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the	1	
nedia, public employees and other organizations.		
3. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback.	5	
verage score for this category	9	4.5
Veighted Score		67.5

Comments:

Dale does well in his communication skills with constitutents and in his written communications.

i. Personal Traits		10%
\. Initiative.	5	
3. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.	4	

. Fairness and Impartiality.	4	
). Creativity.	4	
. Visionary.	4	
verage score for this category	21	4.2
Veighted Score		42

comments:

feel Dale brings a lot to the table with initiative skills and what I see as fair and capable management.

'. Intergovernmental Affairs		10%
Maintains effective communication with local, regional, State and Fed.	5	
3. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursued.	4	
. Contributions to good government through regular participation.	5	The last h
). Lobbies effectively with legislators and State agencies.	4	
verage score for this category	18	4.5
Veighted Score		45
'ammants'		

comments:

Dales communication skills with other governmental units is excellent. His interaction with the City's obbyist is sincere and effective.

FINAL

4.04

- ..00-1.99 Unsatisfactory
- .00-2.99 Improvement Needed
- .00-3.99 Meets Job Standards
- .00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard
- .5-5.00 Outstanding

Overall Comments:

Dale is doing a very good job. He should strive to improve his timeliness and content in response to esident inquiries and complaints. While I understand Dale has an ever growing workload, the time necessary to be responsive to all residents who interact with him will pay great dividends to his professional status as viewed by the residents and by the Commission, in my opinion. Dale is an excellent advocate for the City and I applaud those efforts. Management of the budget process has been good but I would like to see it improve as we move forward with an ever growing list of priority projects in the works or on the horizon.

ignature of Evaluator:

Date:

Name: Dale Martin

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024 thru September 30, 2025

Definition of Ratings

- (1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- (2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- (3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- (4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- (5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

Individually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

	Rating	Weight
1. Relationship with City Commission		15%
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the City Commission.	3	Sulling
B. Reporting to City Commission is timely, clear, concise and thorough.	3	
C. Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.	4	
D. Effectively aids the City Commission in establishing long range goals as determined from the Stategic Plan.	3	
E. Keeps the City Commission informed of current plans and activities of administration and new developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.	3	
F. Provides the City Commission with clear report of anticipated goals.	3	
G. Has an "open door policy" for Commissioners.	4	Market Bar
Average score for this category	23	3.2857
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed.	11 (h)	714285
Weighted Score Comments:	1100000	714285
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed. 2. Public Relations		10%
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed. 2. Public Relations	3	
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed. 2. Public Relations A. Projects a positive public image.	3 3	
Weighted Score Comments:	3 3 3 3	
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed. 2. Public Relations A. Projects a positive public image. B. Is courteous to the public at all times. C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.	3 3 3 3	10%
Weighted Score Comments: Dale always has an open door and shares pertinent info as needed. 2. Public Relations A. Projects a positive public image. B. Is courteous to the public at all times.	3 3 3 3	

I find Dale to be responsive to all inquires. His responses appear to be courteous at all times. 3. Effective Leadership of Staff 20% A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities. B. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling confidence, and emphasizing support. 3 C. Initiates programs to motivate staff. 3 D. Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace. 3.5 14 Average score for this category Weighted Score Comments: To my knowledge staff enjoys the "team" approach that Dale has brought and created. 20% 4. Fiscal Management A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand. 4 B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget. 3 C. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected. 3 D. Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability. 3 13 Average score for this category 3.25 Weighted Score 65 Comments: Dale created the annual budget book, which I find a wonderful addition to our records-In my opinion clear and concise, fairly easy to read, follow and understand. 15% 5. Communication A. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the 3 media, public employees and other organizations. B. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback. 4 3.5 Average score for this category 52.5 Weighted Score Comments: Dale implemented Friday Notes to keep all up to date with projects and all things City related. 10% 6. Personal Traits A. Initiative. B. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.

C. Fairness and Impartiality.	4	
D. Creativity.	3	
E. Visionary.	4	
Average score for this category	19	3.8
Weighted Score		38

Comments:

I believe Dale to be a great leader. Offers staff the ability to do their jobs without misdirection and micromanagment. His vision for our City aligns with the majority.

	10%
3	
3	
4	
3	
13	3.25
	32.5
	3 3 4 3 13

Comments:

I believe that Dale has a good relationship with Edgar which allows for a good team work approach to our Legislators and Representatives.

FINAL

3.37

- 1.00-1.99 Unsatisfactory
- 2.00-2.99 Improvement Needed
- 3.00-3.99 Meets Job Standards
- 4.00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard
- 4.5-5.00 Outstanding

Overall Comments:

I enjoy working with Dale. I find his knowledge of municipal government and leading our City invaluable to not only myself, but to our City.

I find he is fair in all decisions and is always able to explain or defend his decisions with facts and appropriate details.

Signature of Evaluator;	Mayor Patti King	Date:	November 6, 2025
AK	m		

1	N١	_	m	_	
	N	а	rrı	е	i

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024 thru September 30, 2025

Definition of Ratings

- (1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- (2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- (3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- (4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- (5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

Individually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

	mating	
1. Relationship with City Commission		15%
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the City Commission.		
B. Reporting to City Commission is timely, clear, concise and thorough.		
C. Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.		
D. Effectively aids the City Commission in establishing long range goals as determined from the Stategic		
Plan.		
E. Keeps the City Commission informed of current plans and activities of administration and new		
developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.		
F. Provides the City Commission with clear report of anticipated goals.		
G. Has an "open door policy" for Commissioners.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
2. Public Polations		100/
2. Public Relations		10%
A. Projects a positive public image.		
B. Is courteous to the public at all times.		
C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.		
D. Responds to requests from the public in a timely manner.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments: (next page)		

Rating Weight

2. Effective Leadership of Chaff		200/
3. Effective Leadership of Staff		20%
A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities.		
B. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling		
confidence, and emphasizing support.		
C. Initiates programs to motivate staff.		
D. Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
4. Fiscal Management		20%
A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand.		
B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.		
C. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.		
D. Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
5. Communication		15%
A. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the		
media, public employees and other organizations.		
B. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
comments.		
6 Parsanal Traits		100/
6. Personal Traits		10%
A. Initiative.	<u> </u>	
B. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.		

C. Fairness and Impartiality.		
D. Creativity.		
E. Visionary.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:		
7. Intergovernmental Affairs		10%
A. Maintains effective communication with local, regional, State and Fed.		
B. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursued.		
C. Contributions to good government through regular participation.		
D. Lobbies effectively with legislators and State agencies.		
Average score for this category		
Weighted Score		
Comments:	•	"
FINAL 1.00-1.99 Unsatisfactory 2.00-2.99 Improvement Needed 3.00-3.99 Meets Job Standards 4.00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard 4.5-5.00 Outstanding		
Overall Comments:		
Signature of Evaluator: Date:		

City of Flagler Beach City Manager Performance Evaluation Name: John Cunningham

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2024

thru September 30, 2025

Definition of Ratings

- (1) Unsatisfactory: Consistently does not meet the performance standard.
- (2) Improvement Needed: Occasionally meets the performance standard, seldom exceeds.
- (3) Meets: Performs at the performance standard.
- (4) Exceeds: Consistently meets and often exceeds the performance standard.
- (5) Outstanding: Consistently exceeds the performance standard.

Individually assess performance by rating from (1) to (5) based on the definitions above. Mark N/A if you do not have enough information to rate.

Rating	w	eight
1. Relationship with City Commission		15%
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the City Commission.	. 2	
B. Reporting to City Commission is timely, clear, concise and thorough.	2	
C. Accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.	2	
D. Effectively aids the City Commission in establishing long range goals as determined from the Stategic Plan.	2	
E. Keeps the City Commission informed of current plans and activities of administration and new developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.	2	
F. Provides the City Commission with clear report of anticipated goals.	2	
G. Has an "open door policy" for Commissioners.	2	
Average score for this category	14	2
Weighted Score		30
Comments:	<u> </u>	·
See Overall Comments		
2. Public Relations		10%
A. Projects a positive public image.	2	
		1

B. Is courteous to the public at all times.		2	
C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.	<u> </u>	2	:
D. Responds to requests from the public in a timely manner.		2	1
Average score for this category		8	2
Weighted Score			20
Comments: (next page)			

See Overall Comments						
3. Effective Leadership of Staff		20%				
A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities.	1					
B. Effective at directing and developing a team of staff members, encouraging decision making, instilling confidence, and emphasizing support.	1					
C. Initiates programs to motivate staff.	1					
D. Initiates programs to enhance the Flagler Beach workplace.	1					
Average score for this category						
Weighted Score						
Comments:						
See Overall Comments						
4. Fiscal Management	1	20%				
A. Prepares realistic annual budget, which is easy to understand.	1					
B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.	1	<u> </u>				
C. Keeps City Commission informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.	1	 				
D. Ensures the budget addresses the goals and objectives, including readability.	1					
Average score for this category	4	1				
Weighted Score	,	1				

Comments:		
See Overall Comments		
5. Communication	1	15%
A. Facilitates the flow of information regarding Commission policy to the various constituents including the media,	1	<u> </u>
public employees and other organizations.		
B. Written communications are clear, timely, forthright and encourages feedback.	1	
Average score for this category	2	1
Weighted Score		15
Comments:		
See Overall Comments		
		_
6. Personal Traits		10%
A. Initiative.	1	
B. Openness: Encourages participation in decision making process.	1	
C. Fairness and Impartiality.	1	
D. Creativity.	1	
E. Visionary.	1	
Average score for this category	5	1
Weighted Score		10
Comments:		
See Overall Comments		<u>-</u>
7. Intergovernmental Affairs		10%
A. Maintains effective communication with local, regional, State and Fed.	2	 - · · · ·
B. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursued.	2	
<u></u>		1

C. Contributions to good government through regular participation.	2						
D. Lobbies effectively with legislators and State agencies.							
Average score for this category	8	2					
Weighted Score		20					
Comments:	L.						
See Overall Comments							

FINAL

1.00-1.99 Unsatisfactory

2.00-2.99 Improvement Needed

3.00-3.99 Meets Job Standards

4.00-4.49 Exceeds Job Standard

4.5-5.00 Outstanding

Overall Comments:

The City Manager's overall performance has been unsatisfactory and does not meet the expectations of effective municipal leadership. A consistent pattern of **poor management practices, lack of transparency, and limited accountability** has undermined the trust of both city staff and the community.

The City Manager has demonstrated **ineffective oversight of city operations**, particularly those occurring outside of City Hall. There is a clear disconnect between administrative decisions and the day-to-day realities of how the city functions in the field. This has led to operational inefficiencies, lack of coordination among departments, and missed opportunities to address visible issues affecting residents and businesses.

Concerns have also been raised regarding **inconsistent and questionable hiring and firing practices**, which appear to lack clear justification, documentation, or adherence to established policies. These actions have contributed to low staff morale and public criticism of the city's internal management.

Furthermore, the City Manager has shown **limited understanding of how the city is perceived externally**, failing to engage adequately with residents, stakeholders, and community organizations. The absence of transparent communication and proactive public engagement has created the perception of a closed, insular administration.

Overall, the City Manager's performance reflects a lack of leadership, accountability, and strategic oversight. Substantial improvement is required in the areas of transparency, operational management, staff relations, and community engagement to restore confidence in city administration. Without significant corrective action and stronger leadership presence, continued performance at this level poses a risk to the city's reputation, effectiveness, and long-term stability.

Signature of Evaluator:

Date: 11/10/2025

1.35



Staff Report

City Commission Regular Meeting



November 13, 2025

To: City Commission

From: Dale Martin, City Manager

Meeting Date: November 13, 2025

Item Name: Resolution 2025-85. A Resolution of the City Commission of the City of

Flagler Beach, Florida, Adopting the FY 2025/2026 Salary Plan;

providing for conflict and an effective date.

Background:

The City's Personnel Policy (Article XIV, Section 4) calls for a Resolution to adopt an annual salary schedule. Exhibit A attached to the Resolution illustrates the salaries/wages for City staff.

Fiscal Impact:

The salaries/wages are incorporated in the adopted 2025/2026 Budget.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 2025-85.

Attachments:

- 1. 85- Salaries
- 2. 2025 Salary Adjustments Final

RESOLUTION 2025-85

A RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FLAGLER BEACH, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE FY 2025/2026 SALARY PLAN; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICT AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Article XIV, Section 4 of the City's Personnel Policy calls for a resolution to adopt an annual salary schedule; and,

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2025, the Commission adopted the Fiscal Year 2025/2026 budget, approving department positions; and

WHEREAS, the City Manager and Department Directors have completed the annual evaluations and determined the merit pay earned which has been implemented into the attached Exhibit "A" Salary Adjustment Schedule.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF FLAGLER BEACH, FLORIDA AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The "WHEREAS" clauses above are hereby incorporated herein as legislative findings.

SECTION 2. The attached Exhibit "A" Salary Adjustments Schedule is hereby adopted and incorporated into the FY 2025/2026 Budget.

SECTION 3. The City Commission authorizes the City Manager to make minor revisions (not to exceed five percent on an individual basis) to the 2025/2026 Salary Plan during the fiscal year based upon City needs or individual accomplishments, but such revisions will not exceed the departmental funding appropriated for salaries and wages. Proposed revisions that exceed five percent will require City Commission consideration and approval before implementation.

SECTION 4. All resolutions and parts of resolution in conflict with this resolution are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. If any portion of the Resolution shall be declared unconstitutional or if the applicability of this Resolution or any portion thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Resolution and the applicability of this Resolution, or any portion thereof to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION 6. This Resolution shall become effective upon execution.

Upon motion duly made and carried, the foregoing Resolution was accepted by the City Commission of the City of Flagler Beach this 13^{TH} day of November 2025.

	CITY OF FLAGLER BEACH, FLORIDA
ATTEST	
	Patti King, Mayor
Penny Overstreet, City Clerk	

		24/25	24/25			25/26	25/26	
NAME		HOURLY	ANNUAL	EVAL	MERIT	HOURLY	ANNUAL	COMMENTS
	Fire					14.00		Probationary (09/22/25)
,	Fire					14.00		Probationary (09/22/25)
STRICKLAND, J	Fire	14.92	46,334.56	В	3%	15.37	47,724.60	
ADAMS, B	Fire	15.13	46,973.85	С	2%	15.43	47,913.33	Probationary (08/07/25)
MULLEN, K	Fire	16.57	51,462.23	С	2%	16.90	52,491.47	
PRINCE, J	Fire	17.07	52,998.36	В	3%	17.58	54,588.31	
POEIRA, T	Fire	17.71	55,000.00	С	2%	18.07	56,100.00	Probationary (07/08/25)
BEAUCHAMP, D	Building					19.00	39,520.00	Probationary (10/06/25)
MILLER, M	Streets/Storm	16.50	34,320.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Probationary (07/07/25); starting hourly wage to \$19.00
BAKER, B	Facilities	17.00	35,360.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
COLLINS, B	Finance	17.00	35,360.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
STATON, K	Facilities	17.00	35,360.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
STEPHANY, M	Sanitation	17.01	35,380.80	В	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
LILAVOIS, R	Streets/Storm	17.03	35,422.40	В	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
HARGRAVES, J	Facilities	17.20	35,776.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
CLOUSE, S	Library	18.00	37,440.00	С	*	19.00	39,520.00	Probationary (07/08/25); starting hourly wage to \$19.00
CARRE, C	Ocean Rescue	18.58	PT	С	*	19.00	PT	Probationary (08/02/25); starting hourly wage to \$19.00
CARRE, K	Ocean Rescue	18.58	PT	С	*	19.00	PT	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
EVANS, G	Fire	18.68	57,996.14	С	2%	19.05	59,156.06	
MCREE, B	Finance	19.00	39,520.00		2%	19.38	40,310.40	Probationary (08/25/25)
WILLIAMSON, T	Sanitation	18.90	39,312.00	В	3%	19.47	40,491.36	
MELGAR, G	Facilities	18.20	37,856.00	С	*	19.50	40,560.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
REYES PEREZ, R	Streets/Storm	18.52	38,521.60	В	*	19.50	40,560.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
DOMINGUEZ, G	Facilities	18.67	38,833.60	С	*	19.50	40,560.00	Starting hourly wage to \$19.00
ARMELLINO, J	Ocean Rescue	18.58	PT	Α	5%	19.51	PT	
REBOSTINI, E	VOCA	19.78	PT	В	3%	20.37	PT	
THOMPSON, A	Water	20.00	41,600.00	С	2%	20.40	42,432.00	
DENVIR, S	Util. Maint.	20.40	42,432.00	С	2%	20.81	43,280.64	Probationary (08/18/25)
DINARDI, M	VOCA	20.41	PT	В	3%	21.02		
REXROAD, B	Facilities	19.84	41,267.20	С	*	21.20	44,096.00	Compression adjustment

		24/25	24/25			25/26	25/26	
NAME		HOURLY	ANNUAL	EVAL	MERIT	HOURLY	ANNUAL	COMMENTS
ALLEN, A	Util. Maint.	21.00	43,680.00	С	2%	21.42	44,553.60	
FLEET, B	Water	21.00	43,680.00	В	3%	21.63	44,990.40	
BANKS, R	Sanitation	20.88	43,430.40	Α	5%	21.92	45,601.92	
MCBRIDE, K	Finance	20.64	42,931.20	В	*	22.58	46,966.40	Probationary (10/01/25); position reclassified
MCGUIRE, T	Building	18.69	PT		*	23.00	PT	Wage adjustment due to specialized skill
BUTTNER, E	Police	22.60	47,008.00	В	3%	23.28	48,418.24	
RAINEY, M	Fire	23.04	71,531.44	С	2%	23.47	72,877.61	
HOLMAN, D	Sanitation	22.36	46,508.80	Α	5%	23.48	48,834.24	
FICOCELLO, M	Planning	23.00	47,840.00	В	3%	23.69	49,275.20	
SKRZYPINSKI, H	Water	23.50	48,880.00	С	2%	23.97	49,857.60	
ALBRECHT, A	Water	23.50	48,880.00	В	3%	24.21	50,346.40	
MCGEE, D	Sanitation	23.90	49,712.00	В	3%	24.62	51,203.36	
DEPASQUALE, M	Finance	24.19	50,315.20	С	2%	24.67	51,321.50	
ISAACS, J	Public Works	25.00	52,000.00	С	2%	25.50	53,040.00	Probationary (06/30/25)
PEREZ, J	Util. Maint.	24.82	51,625.60	В	3%	25.56	53,174.37	
BRAMER, B	Building	23.59	49,067.20	Α	*	26.00	51,520.56	Wage adjustment due to certification
GIFFORD, J	Planning	25.30	52,624.00	В	3%	26.06	54,202.72	
MARTIN, S	Facilities	25.02	52,041.60	Α	5%	26.27	54,643.68	
LAW, R	Util. Maint.	25.50	53,040.00	В	3%	26.27	54,631.20	
HINEBAUGH, G	Planning	26.00	54,080.00	В	3%	26.78	55,702.40	
DEFRIESE-ROMERO, C	Police	26.50	57,876.00		*	27.83	60,780.72	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
RAMIREZ, D	Police	27.08	56,326.40	В	3%	27.89	58,016.19	
ZIEHL, J	Police	27.10	56,368.00	В	3%	27.91	58,059.04	
BOWMAN, J	Wastewater	27.28	56,742.40	В	3%	28.10	58,444.67	
JONES, S	Wastewater	27.28	56,742.40	В	3%	28.10	58,444.67	
LUTTRELL, E	Police	27.53	59,732.40		*	28.36	58,980.27	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
DURICK, M	Sanitation	27.68	57,574.40	В	3%	28.51	59,301.63	
DUNN, J	Building	28.32	58,905.60	С	2%	28.89	60,083.71	
SNYDER, M	Police	28.31	61,829.04		*	29.16	60,651.34	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
MAHONEY, H	Finance	28.65	59,592.00	В	3%	29.51	61,379.76	

		24/25	24/25			25/26	25/26	
NAME		HOURLY	ANNUAL	EVAL	MERIT	HOURLY	ANNUAL	COMMENTS
	Library	28.75	59,800.00	В	3%	29.61	61,594.00	
SAUNDERS, J	Police	29.73	64,930.32		*	31.22	68,184.48	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
SCHERR, E	Police	30.07	65,672.88		*	31.57	68,948.88	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
ANDERSON, M	Public Works	31.25	65,000.00	С	2%	31.88	66,300.00	Probationary (07/28/25)
KEARNEY, D	Police	30.97	64,417.60	В	3%	31.90	66,350.13	
LAUREANO, J	Building	30.81	64,084.80	Α	5%	32.35	67,289.04	
KUHN, C	City Clerk	31.75	66,040.00	С	2%	32.39	67,360.80	Probationary (06/20/25)
NOBRE, S	Police	32.26	70,455.84		*	33.87	73,972.08	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
OFLAHERTY, D	Executive					33.65	70,000.00	Probationary (01/15/26)
JONES, K	Police	33.17	72,443.28		*	34.83	76,068.72	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
VINCI, R	Police	33.17	72,443.28		*	34.83	76,068.72	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
ALMBERG, A	Water	33.22	69,097.60	Α	5%	34.88	72,552.48	
LUDECKER, B	Finance	34.23	71,198.40	В	3%	35.26	73,334.35	
HARTMAN, P	Water	35.07	72,945.60	С	2%	35.77	74,404.51	
NOBRE, C	Finance	34.20	71,136.00	В	*	36.33	75,566.40	Probationary (10/01/25); position reclassified
RODRIGUES, L	Sanitation	35.86	74,588.80	В	3%	36.94	76,826.46	
GUERRERO, M	Police	35.66	77,881.44		*	37.44	81,768.96	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
RICHARDS, L	Public Works	36.59	76,107.20	В	3%	37.69	78,390.42	
YELVINGTON, A	Police	37.35	81,572.40		*	39.22	85,656.48	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
CREWS, J	Streets/Storm	38.25	79,560.00	В	3%	39.40	81,946.80	
BINGHAM, J	Police	38.74	84,608.16		*	40.68	88,845.12	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
GILLIN, T	Ocean Rescue	40.30	83,824.00	В	3%	41.51	86,338.72	
LYNN, J	Wastewater	40.89	85,051.20	В	3%	42.12	87,602.74	
HASHEM, E	Water	40.88	85,030.40	Α	5%	42.92	89,281.92	
BLANK, D	Police	42.04	91,815.36		*	44.14	96,401.76	Per Collective Bargaining Agreement
IMPSON, D	Info Technology	43.27	90,001.60	С	2%	44.14	91,801.63	Probationary (05/05/25)
SCHOENBROD, M	Police	43.27	90,001.60	С	2%	44.14	91,801.63	Probationary (07/28/25)
FIVEASH, J	Fire	46.15	95,992.00	С	2%	47.07	97,911.84	Probationary (06/23/25)
RYAN, K	CRA	48.08	100,006.40	В	3%	49.52	103,006.59	
BLANCHETTE, L	Police	48.52	100,921.60	Α	5%	50.95	105,967.68	

		24/25	24/25			25/26	25/26	
NAME		HOURLY	ANNUAL	EVAL	MERIT	HOURLY	ANNUAL	COMMENTS
MATHIS, E	Hum. Resources	50.17	104,353.60	В	3%	51.68	107,484.21	
RAMER, J	Water	50.98	106,038.40	В	3%	52.51	109,219.55	
COX, S	Fire	52.03	108,222.40	В	3%	53.59	111,469.07	
OVERSTREET, P	City Clerk	52.96	110,156.80	Α	5%	55.61	115,664.64	
ALLEN, R	Finance	53.65	111,592.00	Α	5%	56.33	117,171.60	
MCCLENNING, L	Planning	55.29	115,003.20	В	3%	56.95	118,453.30	
DOUGHNEY, M	Police	56.75	118,040.00	В	3%	58.45	121,581.20	
MCFADDEN, R	Building	57.30	119,184.00	С	2%	58.45	121,567.68	
HARLAN, H	Finance	62.64	130,291.20	Α	5%	65.77	136,805.76	
MARTIN, D	Executive	79.33	165,006.40		0%	79.33	165,006.40	
FREEMAN, W	Public Works	80.18	166,774.40	В	3%	82.59	171,777.63	