

Introductory remarks (Erik)

1. Intro (Erik)
 - Purpose is to review the facts and chronology related to the NM TC and grant renewal negotiations
 - Provide an overview of the village's financial position, and why the NM grant is critical to fiscal stability
2. Staff report (Curt)
3. Village president remarks (Erik)
4. Allow board members to comment on the negotiations

~~*~*~*

Eriks' Comments (after Curt's presentation)

- A) Emotions are running high on this topic, and so I'd like board members focus the issues and avoid personal attacks.
- B) There are also a few key questions that have been asked, so I'll address them directly.

Who is trying to kill the deal?

- No board member is trying to 'kill the deal'. The bottom line is that all Winfield board members want an equitable agreement with NM-CDH. We just have different experiences and opinions on how to get there.
- Board members making an accusation that others are trying to 'killing the deal' are indulging in a personal attack. This rhetoric is designed to inflame and antagonize, and it raises the temperature.
- People of good conscience can agree to disagree, or they can make personal attacks. This is a choice. What choices will board members make?
- In addition, making information public is transparency in government.

Who is being professional?

- Board members that accuse others of 'not being professional' are really indulging in a personal attack that means "I don't like you".
- It is fair to say you disagree with choices. Or that you have a different way you would have done things. These are fair observations. This can be the topic of healthy debate
- Calling other people names is not helpful, even if it feels good at the time.

Did anyone ever say the deal was dead?

- No. This is a personal attack that is intended to enflame opinions
- What in the December Winfield Word is the 'final offer' from NM as described in the 11/25/2019 Development Agreement outline.

Was information provided in the December Winfield Word accurate?

- Yes. The information was based communication from NM on the final offer from NM as described in detail in their 11/25/2019 development agreement outline
 - The information was further checked by village staff including but not limited to Manager Barrett and Attorney Elliott.

What about the communication from NM on December 16th?

- I am personally very glad that NM changed their positions on many of the issues the Winfield board felt strongly about. This is what I asked for on behalf of the board on Friday December 6th
- As to other comments and NM taking offense, this is NM's take on the matter and it their right to have that opinion
- Speaking for myself, I was just as offended by NM's take-it-or-leave-it position, cancelling the scheduled monthly meeting, cancelling all future meetings until village agreed with NM's position. So both parties have cause to take offense at actions and statements of their counterparts.
- It was even more concerning that NM was dismissing the VOW's concerns by ending negotiations. But what is important is that the communication from NM on December 16th shows there certainly was room for compromise.
- In addition, there were some rather creative assertions regarding the Riverwalk and other issues. We can parse these in detail, if the board would like.

C) TRANSPARENCY - I also believe that the village board should do a better job being open and transparent with respect to the NM negotiations.

- Therefore, would like board members to give direction to have future board discussions in COW and not the secrecy of executive session.
- In addition, all negotiations with NM should be in the open, and the public should have the ability to see who is saying what and participate if they so desire.

D)

