

-----Original Message-----

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning <Troy.Krenning@cityofloveland.org>  
To: <Guchwale@aol.com>  
Cc: Temp CCMail <TEMPCC@cityofloveland.org>  
Sent: Fri, Jan 23, 2015 7:06 am  
Subject: Fwd: Meeting 1-20-15

If there was any doubt about the dress rehearsal and scheme leading up to Tuesday's stage show, this seems to put such doubt to rest.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning  
<Troy.Krenning@cityofloveland.org<mailto:Troy.Krenning@cityofloveland.org>>  
Date: January 22, 2015 at 2:34:25 PM MST  
To: Bill Cahill <Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org<mailto:Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org>>  
Cc: City Council <CCouncil@cityofloveland.org<mailto:CCouncil@cityofloveland.org>>, Temp CCMail <TEMPCC@cityofloveland.org<mailto:TEMPCC@cityofloveland.org>>  
Subject: Re: Meeting 1-20-15

Thank you for the responses.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2015, at 12:24 PM, "Bill Cahill"  
<Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org<mailto:Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org>>  
wrote:

One on one. As you know, I try to have regularly scheduled meetings with individual Councilors. As part of this, my practice is to refrain from transmitting positions or opinions expressed by Councilors from one meeting to

another.

Thanks.

Bill

William D. Cahill  
City Manager  
City of Loveland  
500 East Third Street  
Loveland, CO 80537  
v 970.962.2306  
f 970.962.2900  
bill.cahill@cityofloveland.org<mailto:bill.cahill@cityofloveland.org>

<image001.png>

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning  
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 12:19 PM  
To: Bill Cahill  
Cc: City Council; Temp CCMail  
Subject: Re: Meeting 1-20-15

Thank you. Were these all one on one meetings, aside from the mayor/mayor PT encounter?

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2015, at 12:13 PM, "Bill Cahill"  
<Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org<mailto:Bill.Cahill@cityofloveland.org>>  
wrote:

Yes, I spoke with other members concerning the Sprouts project generally but not about the agenda item specifically, except at the meeting with the Mayor and the Mayor ProTem, as stated to the entire Council in the e-mail (reproduced below) that I sent to you just after 5 pm Friday, January 16.

I had regularly scheduled individual meetings with Councilors Clark, Fogle,

Trenary and Shaffer during that time period. At each, the topic of Sprouts was discussed, primarily the same points that were discussed in e-mails from the City Attorney and from me to the Council: that the Council's first actions on this matter were proper and that there were factual and other errors in the citizen letter we received. Councilor Fogle urged putting reconsideration on the agenda but to be candid, at that time I was not inclined that way. At the time of each of these meetings, I didn't expect that this matter would be put on the agenda, so we didn't talk about agenda placement, order or details. At none of these meetings was it the only topic; it was one of several discussed in the course of normal update on City activities and issues.

These meetings all preceded the decision to place this item on the agenda for possible reconsideration. That decision was made on Friday afternoon in discussion with the City Attorney's Office, and then confirmed at the meeting that afternoon with Mayor Gutierrez and Mayor Pro Tem Clark, who were in the Civic Center on other business at that time.

Thank you.

Bill

William D. Cahill  
City Manager  
City of Loveland  
500 East Third Street  
Loveland, CO 80537  
v 970.962.2306  
f 970.962.2900  
[bill.cahill@cityofloveland.org](mailto:bill.cahill@cityofloveland.org)<mailto:bill.cahill@cityofloveland.org>

-----Original Message-----

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning  
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:38 AM  
To: Bill Cahill  
Cc: City Council; Temp CCMail  
Subject: Meeting 1-20-15

Bill,

This past Tuesday you stated that you had spoken with the Mayor prior to our 1-20-15 meeting concerning the mechanics of that meetings agenda.

Did you speak with other members of the Council, subsequent to the Woods protest and prior to the 1-20-15 meeting, about the agenda and/or Sprouts project?

Thank you,

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

My E-mail to Council at 5:17 pm on Friday, January 16

The City Attorney's office and I have spent quite a bit of time today considering the best response to the objection letter sent by Brian Wood, dealing with the Council's adoption of the appropriation ordinance for the Sprouts project. We also had the opportunity to meet with the Mayor and Mayor Pro-Tem this afternoon while they were at the Civic Center on other business, and consulted with them.

We believe that the City's actions were proper, and that Mr. Woods' letter is incorrect in both facts and conclusions. However, out of an abundance of caution, we think it may be appropriate for the Council to take additional action, essentially to reconsider and re-adopt the ordinance. Therefore, I am adding to the agenda for next Tuesday night an item for "Possible Re-Consideration of the Evergreen Incentive Ordinance".

Please note: I do not have the authority to have the Council reconsider an action, and understand that full well. Under the Council rules, re-consideration of a Council action can be initiated by a Councilor who voted on the prevailing side on an action, and then the Council as a whole votes on a motion to allow re-consideration. My action to place this on the agenda provides the background material, and allows the Council to re-consider the action IF a Councilor who voted on the prevailing side asks for reconsideration, and then a majority of the Councilors present votes in favor of reconsideration.

If no Councilor from the prevailing side wants reconsideration, then nothing will happen.

We are taking this action so it can be published in advance and the public alerted of the opportunity.

An additional note: I will leave any additional comment on the validity of Mr. Woods' points to the City Attorney. However, there is one simple error of fact in Mr. Woods' letter I need to correct, when he asserts that the contract for the incentive does not reflect the terms sheet approved by Council, in the topic of termination of the Evergreen guarantee if the food sales tax is changed. He says that does not appear in the term sheet and that is simply incorrect – which you can see for yourself by looking at page 2 of the terms sheet, as contained in the November 4 City Council packet (first reading).

We will assure that on Monday you will receive an amended agenda for Tuesday, as well as agenda item material. Thank you.