Keri O'Brien

From: gregory lloyd <glloyd7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 6, 2026 9:22 AM
To: Keri O'Brien; Keri O'Brien; City Clerk External E-Mail
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Agenda Item #13 Opposition Letter

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners,

We are writing to formally raise process and oversight concerns regarding the proposed City Manager raise and contract extension.

The City Manager's first day of employment was in January 2025. Within six months, his contract triggered an automatic salary increase from $215,000 to $230,000. Now, in February 2026, barely one year into his first City Manager role, additional major amendments are being proposed, including a substantial raise and an extension of the contract term from two years to four. This compressed timeline raises fundamental questions about proportionality, oversight, and process.

These proposed changes represent a material modification of compensation and contract term, yet they were placed on the Consent Agenda, precluding public discussion and meaningful Commission deliberation. Decisions of this magnitude, with long-term financial and governance consequences, are not routine matters and ordinarily warrant transparent review.

The timing is particularly concerning. Approving a major raise and extending the City Manager's term immediately prior to a new Commission being seated effectively pre-decides leadership and materially limits the discretion of incoming elected officials. This timing raises concerns that decision-making is being insulated from future oversight.

This action is framed as promoting "stability." However, stability achieved by accelerating compensation and contractual protections before a complete, outcome-based performance record exists and before an election undermines accountability rather than supports it. Stability should flow forward from elections, not be locked in ahead of them.

The process used further amplifies these concerns. Placement on the Consent Agenda eliminated public input on a matter involving taxpayer funds, executive compensation, and long-term contractual exposure. When combined with the timing, this creates, at minimum, the appearance of impropriety and avoidance of scrutiny.

There are also proportionality concerns. The proposed compensation would place the City Manager among the highest-paid municipal executives in Florida, despite the City having approximately 25,000 residents, many of whom are seasonal. This disparity raises legitimate questions regarding fiscal stewardship and alignment with the City's size and operational scope.

In addition, the performance evaluations relied upon to justify these actions raise oversight concerns. While multiple evaluations were conducted, only two contained substantive feedback or measurable criteria. The remaining evaluations largely reflected uniform top scores with little or no explanatory analysis. Such evaluations do not provide a meaningful basis for assessing executive performance, particularly for a first-time City Manager.

Evaluations lacking benchmarks, outcome measures, or critical analysis function as affirmations rather than assessments. Reliance on these evaluations to support repeated and accelerated compensation increases raises concerns about the rigor of oversight.

Further, materials cited in support of this action appear to treat routine administrative duties and high-impact policy matters as equivalent indicators of performance. Managing directives, assigning tasks, and providing status updates are core responsibilities of the City Manager position. Without weighting based on significance, outcomes, or public benefit, such materials do not provide a reliable basis for evaluating exceptional performance or justifying accelerated compensation.

These concerns are heightened by the fact that major reforms remain unfinished, and workplace complaints and performance concerns remain unresolved. Advancing a raise and long-term extension while these matters are pending creates a chilling effect on accountability and limits the City's ability to respond appropriately should corrective action later be required.

By increasing severance exposure now, the City also raises the cost of corrective action for future Commissions, shifting financial pressure onto officials who have not yet been elected.

Taken together, the timing, use of the Consent Agenda, scale and pace of compensation increases, deficiencies in the evaluation process, and unresolved performance matters raise significant concerns regarding transparency, oversight, and public trust. These issues warrant deferral, not acceleration.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge that both the raise and the contract extension be deferred and evaluated openly by the next Commission, with full public discussion and a complete, outcome-based performance record.

Respectfully,

Gregory and Jennifer Lloyd
805 United Street