



City of North Port

4970 CITY HALL BLVD
NORTH PORT, FL 34286

Meeting Minutes City Commission Workshop

CITY COMMISSIONERS

Christopher B. Hanks, Mayor
Debbie McDowell, Vice-Mayor
Vanessa Carusone, Commissioner
Peter Emrich, Commissioner
Jill Luke, Commissioner

APPOINTED OFFICIALS

Peter Lear, City Manager
Amber L. Slayton, City Attorney
Kathryn Peto, City Clerk
Heather Taylor, Deputy City Clerk

Monday, February 4, 2019

9:00 AM

CITY HALL ROOM 244

NOTE: This is a draft copy of the minutes of the 2-4-2019 City Commission Workshop Meeting, has not been approved by the Commission and is subject to change.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The North Port City Commission Workshop Meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. in Meeting and Training Room 244 by Mayor Hanks.

Present: Mayor Hanks; Vice-Mayor McDowell; Commissioners Luke and Emrich, City Manager Lear; Assistant City Managers Branco and Yarborough; City Attorney Slayton; City Clerk Peto; Recording Secretary Hale and Police Chief Garrison.

Absent: Commissioner Carusone.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Commission.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

2. GENERAL BUSINESS:

A. [19-0063](#) Performance Evaluations for Charter Officers

City Manager Lear provided an overview and Human Resources Director McDade and Human Resources Manager Hope presented the item for discussion and options for Commission consideration.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was opined that the City Clerk and Deputy City Clerk should not be evaluated in an identical manner as some items should be specifically based on the City Clerk; (2) a suggestion was made to remove the position of Deputy City Clerk as a Charter Officer and that it be presented at the next election; (3) concerns were expressed that Commission insight to the Charter Officers capabilities and interactions with staff are only observable during meetings and not in the day to day operations, hindering full evaluations; (4) the evaluation forms can be modified to reflect conditions that are visible to the Commission; (5) it was recommended that the evaluations include items from the employment agreements.

There was a unanimous consensus to leave section one Leadership/Supervision in the evaluation form as is.

There was a unanimous consensus to leave section two Execution of Policy in the evaluation form as is.

Commissioner Carusone joined the meeting at 9:18 a.m.

Discussion continued: (1) concern was expressed that the Commission does not have a method to measure performance for community relations; (2) it was suggested that the third bullet point in the Community Relations section of the City Manager's form be used in all evaluation forms.

There was a consensus that the third bullet point in section three Community Relations of the City Manager's form be used in all evaluation forms for the Charter Officers.

Discussion continued: (1) a suggestion was made to reword the last bullet point listed in Administrative Duties to make it clear that it is about providing transparency for the public.

There was a unanimous consensus to reword the third bullet point in section four Administrative Duties to clarify that the intent is to provide transparency for the public.

Discussion continued: (1) it was explained that some items listed in the previous evaluation form were consolidated to remove redundancies; (2) it was suggested that if language is added back in regarding the City Manager's responsibility for staff performance it should be included in the Leadership/Supervision section.

There was a unanimous consensus that sections six, seven and eight will remain as is.

There was a unanimous consensus to add City Manager's responsibility for staff performance in the Leadership/Supervision section.

Discussion continued: (1) it was suggested that section nine regarding Financial Management/Budget should be included in the evaluation forms for the other Charter Officers; (2) concern was expressed with the third bullet point in section seven of the City Attorney's evaluation form because this is an interdepartmental function that the Commission isn't able to observe, and it was suggested to remove this item.

There was a unanimous consensus to remove the third bullet point from section seven of the City Attorney's evaluation form.

Discussion continued: (1) a suggestion was made to tweak the language in the fourth bullet point of section two in the City Attorney's form to clarify "given the issues arise".

There was a unanimous consensus to reword the fourth bullet point in section two of the City Attorney evaluation form for clarification.

Discussion continued: (1) concern was reiterated about evaluation factors regarding a Charter Officer and their staff; (2) section four appears to be a duplication of section twelve in the City Clerk form; (3) a suggestion was made to remove sections four and section twelve of the City Clerk evaluation form; (4) it was suggested to draft new wording for section four to include maintaining levels of competency and staff learning achievements; (5) a suggestion was made to incorporate section four into section twelve.

There was a unanimous consensus to combine section four with section 12 and eliminate items that do not apply.

Discussion continued: (1) a suggestion was made to remove section eight because a relationship with the press and media would be a function for the Public Information Officer (PIO), not the City Clerk.

There was a unanimous consensus to remove section eight.

Discussion continued: (1) it was suggested to remove the third bullet point in section ten for the City Clerk and Deputy Clerk because participating in professional organizations is optional pursuant to their contract; (2) concern was expressed that the Commission does not have a way to measure performance of their participation with professional organizations.

There was a unanimous consensus to remove the third bullet point in section ten.

Discussion continued: (1) it was suggested that staff bring an agenda item to remove the Deputy City Clerk position as a Charter Officer.

There was a unanimous consensus to remove the Deputy City Clerk from Charter position be brought back to vote as a Charter amendment in 2020.

Discussion continued: (1) it was noted that a performance evaluation of the Deputy City Clerk will still need to be done until the voters approve the change to the Charter; (2) a suggestion was made to remove interactions with staff from the Deputy Clerk evaluation form.

There was a majority consensus to remove section two in the Deputy Clerk evaluation form.

Discussion continued: (1) concern was expressed for evaluating communication skills because it's unknown who prepares or types reports; (2) it was suggested that the City Clerk assist in evaluating the Deputy City Clerk; (3) concern was expressed with having the City Clerk assist with evaluations for the Deputy Clerk; (4) a suggestion was made to remove evaluation of public records requests and inquiries from the Deputy Clerk as it is solely the responsibility of the City Clerk as stated in the Charter; (5) it was suggested that the Deputy Clerk be evaluated for assuming duties of the City Clerk if required. There was no public comment.

There was a unanimous consensus to remove the second bullet point in section five.

B. [19-0064](#)

City Manager/County Administrator Compensation Comparison

City Manager Lear gave an overview of the item.

Discussion ensued: (1) the previous City Manager had a \$200 per month business allowance under an unaccountable plan that was utilized for meals at meetings; (2) future use of the business allowance can be addressed during budget discussions and should be under an accountable plan; (3) deferred compensation is offered to all City employees;

(4) the deferred compensation comparables in the chart are paid by the employers and each varies based on employee contracts. There was no public comment.

C. [19-0066](#)

Discussion Regarding How Human Resources, Charter Officers and Commission Should Address Issues with a Charter Officer Department

City Manager Lear gave an overview of the item.

Discussion ensued: (1) concern was expressed that the Charter as it is worded today may be construed that employees in the City Clerk's and City Attorney's office cannot utilize Human Resources if they have concerns; (2) it was clarified that the language in the Charter addresses hiring and dismissal of employees by Charter Officers, it does not remove those employees from the personnel policy; (3) employees are to share their concerns following the chain of command, it was explained that if an employee concern is regarding the Human Resources Director, the employee could present their issue to the Assistant City Manager; (4) investigations are conducted and appropriate actions are taken based on the situation; (5) concern was expressed that if an issue is regarding a Charter Officer, the City Manager cannot take actions beyond investigation; (6) it was suggested that if there was an issue regarding a Charter Officer it should be set as an agenda item; (7) it was explained that the City Manager submits a memo to the Commission regarding an investigation, and that the Commission could set it as an agenda item if necessary; (8) all employees including Charter Officers are subject to the personnel policy as long as it doesn't conflict with employment contracts, and that the personnel policy should be adhered to so there isn't a legal issue; (9) it was recommended that a written policy be implemented to outline procedure when issues arise concerning Charter Officers; (10) it was suggested that the policy could include that matters involving a Charter Officer could be overviewed by another Charter Officer who can submit findings to the Commission; (11) a suggestion was made that the policy consider who has authority to authorize and pay for an external investigation if an issue is regarding an individual(s) above the Human Resources Director.

There was a unanimous consensus that a policy be brought back as an agenda item.

Discussion continued: (1) it was explained that the policy can come back attached to a resolution. There was no public comment.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

4. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Luke: (1) it was suggested to change the Commission meeting date scheduled on April 4 because the Braves are having a Sarasota County Day in Atlanta on that day.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was suggested to discuss the calendar at the next meeting on Thursday.

There were no other Commission communications.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL REPORTS:

City Manager Lear stated that public attendance has been greater than the seating capacity in Meeting Room 244 when the Commission conducts workshops, and

suggested that workshops be conducted in Chambers to ensure adequate seating space.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was noted that the seating capacity in Meeting Room 244 is 59.

There was a unanimous consensus that all workshops will be conducted in Chambers.

6. ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Hanks adjourned the North Port City Commission Workshop Meeting at 10:30 a.m.

City of North Port, Florida

By: _____
Christopher B. Hanks, Mayor

Attest: _____
Kathryn Peto, City Clerk

Minutes approved at the City Commission Regular Meeting this ____ day of _____, 2019.