

Here are highlights of Council e-mails of February 17, 2009:

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:03 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject:

Are the votes there to postpone?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:09 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE:

Not sure. Hieft might be a yes. Rapundalo is likely no, but not definite. I'm a no. Taylor is a likely no.

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:19 PM
To: Smith, Sandi
Subject:

I assume DDA would not be happy with a postponement of the structure, yes?

From: Smith, Sandi
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:35 p.m.
To: Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: Re:

True. But postponing to a date certain may be palatable...

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:40 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

[Irrelevant material omitted]

Are you supportive of postponing the structure?

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:41 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

No. Why is anyone thinking about it?

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:43 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: Re: tomorrow...

Marcia!

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:44 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten; Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

But why?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:46 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: tomorrow...

She's against 5th/Division and wants time to work on excluding that.

[Irrelevant material deleted.]

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009

7:49 PM

To: Greden, Leigh/ Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

Doesn't that put her squarely against Sandi?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:49 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

Yup. And against Hewitt and maybe Gunn. I told her that. She doesn't care.

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:50 PM
To: Greden, Leigh; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

She cares...

Frm: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:55 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

She said she doesn't.

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:56 M
To: Greden, Leigh; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

She told me what you said, and she was not happy... I think she does care. Does Sandi know what's going on?

From: Greden, Leigh

Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:57 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

I was only telling her the truth.

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:56 PM
To: Greden, Leigh; Teall, Margie
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

In any case, I believe Sabra likely to propose postponement if no one else does.

From: Hohnke, Carsten
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:04 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Greden, Leigh
Subject; RE: tomorrow...

I mentioned it to Sandi. She said she preferred no postponement, but might be OK with date certain.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:05 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten; Teall, Margie
Subject: RE: tomorrow...

No postponement. It's not necessary. 1 person has a problem with 5th/Division... and remember... we already voted on this and approved it.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:07 PM
To; Smith, Sandi
Subject: .

No postponement!

From: Smith, Sandi

Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:07 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: .

Excellent!

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:08 PM
To: Smith, Sandi
Subject: RE: .

Carsten said you might be up for it.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:27 PM
To: Briere, Sabra; Smith, Sandi
Subject: I won't be asking for a postponement

From: Smith, Sandi
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:27 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: I won't be asking for a postponement

;-)

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:42 PM
To: Rapundalo, Stephen; Derezinski, Tony
Subject: Speech

Announce that you “plan to bring a resolution at the next Council meeting asking staff and the Planning Commission to begin a process to revise the R4C zoning code. We’ve seen too many problems with the R4C zoning code recently, such as lack of parking and too many bedrooms per unit. I look forward to a debate to make this section of the zoning code more appropriate for our community, and I plan to bring this resolution at our next meeting.”

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:42 PM
To: Fraser, Roger
Subject: Note

Pls slip a note to John and ask him to call on Tony D first during Council comment.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:16 PM
To: Derezinski, Tony; Rapundalo, Stephen
Subject: R4C

BTW, Marcia will attack you for addressing zoning. She doesn't want anyone touching zoning. Just play sweet and dumb.

From: Derezinski, Tony
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:18 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: R4C

My humbly Bad.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:24 PM
To: Derezinski, Tony
Subject: RE: R4C

You did the right thing Mayor wanted it. But just be advised. Rapundalo can help.

From: Derezinski, Tony
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:04 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: R4C

I did talk to him about it yesterday when we were together at the Dingell conference. Would definitely want his help.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:48 PM
To: Derezinski, Tony
Subject: R4C next steps

Meet w/Jayne to draft a resolution. Tell her to use flexible timing b/c of their staff constraints.

From: Derezinski, Tony
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:08 PM
to: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: R4C next steps

Right. Per your earlier email, I called both Jayne and Mark and told them what I intended to do. Neither called me back. I also talked to Bonnie Bona, who had brought it to my attention a month ago, and told her this was the night to bring it up, and then to introduce it at the next meeting. She will be at it; I will also see her at the Planning Comm meeting This Thursday.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:10 PM
To: Derezinski, Tony
Subject: Re: R4C next steps

Sounds good. Jayne & mark have been tied up preparing for tonight's council mtng; I suggest sending an email instead.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday,, February 17, 2009 7:33 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: 5th/Division

The bond resolutions, as written, don't include 5th/Division. Sandi plans to amend them to include it. Makes sense for you to vote no. But if Sandi's amendment passes, why vote against the whole project? I know I tease you about "Groome," but that's exactly what Groome did. It doesn't make sense to vote no against the much larger and greater project, simply b/c it include one piece you don't like. AND the DDA can still postpone

or even cancel the project, and thus not bond the money. But I think we're much better off if THEY make that decision, not us. After all, we already approved the project.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:38 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

Where is the information that you were showing me upstairs located?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:44 PM
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

I'll forward it

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:04 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

Why remove 6M from the project as being fiscally responsible and add in 6M for the 5th and Division site?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:06 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

They already have \$6m in their cash budget for 5th/Division. So, we're not actually adding a new \$6m. This simply shifts it from their cash fund to their bond fund, so they have the chance to bond for it if they see fit.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:22 PM
To: Greden, Leigh

Subject: RE: 5th/Division

If it's in the original approved bonding, can they choose not to use it? Doesn't that cost us more money?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:24 M
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

This is a MAXIMUM authorization, not an actual amount. Recall PD/Courts—the actual bond amount was different than the approved. So, we approve the max, which gives them flexibility, but they could issue far less than the authorized amount. This process costs us nothing. It actually saves money by avoiding multiple bonds (which require multiple underwritings).

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:26 PM
To: Greden, Leigh

Subject: RE: 5th/Division

Thanks.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 8:39 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

I've been pushing them to defer and/or cancel projects. They, of course, resist. But, a few people on DDA oppose 5th/Division and would entertain postponement and/or cancellation. Might be good to say on the record that you encourage them to delay or postpone... but, I think we look much better to both the DDA and the environmentalists if the DDA makes that decision, rather than us.

What do you mean encourage them to delay or postpone? You lost me.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:18 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: 5th/Division

I've been working closely with them thru partnerships to make their budget work. Their suggestions for balancing their budget include "rebate the \$1.5m bond issuance fee to us" and "we'll jack up rates and blame you" and "we'll give you less than \$2m per year." I say, "unacceptable. Delay projects and/or use demand based pricing."

Subject: Update to Council Packet for 2/17
Date: Wed, 11 Feb 2009 16:07:27 -0500
From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
To: City Council members and others

Hi:

The February 17 packet has been updated to include:

INT-1 Dicken Woods 5th Anniversary.

The link includes the current agenda. There are no associated attachments with this item.

From: Carsten Hohnke
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2009 5:18 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia; Teall, Margie; Greden, Leigh R.
Subject: [Fwd: Update to Council Packet for 2/17]

"The February 17 packet has been updated to nclude INT-1 Dicken Woods 5th Anniversary."

Is the first pre-Council meeting Golden Pandy?

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 7:28 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten; Higgins, Marcia; Greden, Leigh R.
Subject: RE: [Fwd: Update to Council Packet for 2/17]

I would be honored. I've never been the recipient of the Pandy. But alas, Marcia would have done the same for our honored Friends of the Woods. I am afraid I cannot accept. The Pandy is open for tonight!

From: Teall, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:35 PM
To: Hohnke, Carsten; Greden, Leigh; Rapundalo, Stephen; Smith, Sandi; Higgins, Marcia
Subject: Leigh Greden...

Out in front for the Golden Pandy!

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:38 PM
To: Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten; Greden, Leigh; Rapundalo, Stephen; Smith, Sandi
Subject: RE: Leigh Greden...

pullinnggg awwwwaayyyyy. He has crossed the finish line. The winner is LEIGH GREDEN!

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:43 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia; Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten; Rapundalo, Stephen; Smith, Sandi
Subject: RE: Leigh Greden...

Now WHO did I pander to????!?!?

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:16 PM
To: Teall, Margie
Subject: .

Isn't it nice when we script things? SB screws it up, but otherwise it's perfect.

From: Greden, Leigh

Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:23 M
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: .

Please don't vote with the moron.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:26 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: .

I'm not voting against the site plan. I probably with vote against Sandi's amendment.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:26 PM
To: Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE: .

I also have not idea what he is talking about.

From: Greden, Leigh
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:27 PM
To: Higgins, Marcia
Subject: RE: .

Neither does he. He's reading Karen's materials, and mis-stating it b/c he doesn't understand it.

From: Higgins, Marcia
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 9:27 PM
To; Greden, Leigh
Subject: RE .

This is why we have time limts for speaking.
