

**From:** [annettels@comcast.net](mailto:annettels@comcast.net)  
**To:** [Morris, Cleve;](#)  
**cc:** [becky campo;](#)  
**Subject:** MOU  
**Date:** Sunday, December 27, 2009 12:18:27 PM

---

Cleve,

Staff report states "The purpose of this review is not for Council approval but to direct staff as outlined in the MOU.

Under recommendation: "Review and Approve MOU"

MOU Sections 6-9 are a problem for me. That initiative should be dropped by Keystone now. We are agreeing to the needed changes to bring docs in order, and proceed with lightening speed to facilitate a zoning amendment for the district. What do they do? Add another attorney to the mix. It is a "cake and eat it too" scenario, & I don't like it, and that is not what we said when we initiated the MOU in our last closed session. It was Keystone going to the judge and getting the initiative stopped because we have agreed to a zoning amendment process. If anything fails in the process they will attempt to come over the top of us with the initiative, or if all goes well, they can still come over the top of us with the initiative. They need to kill it up front. That is why they brought in another attorney....to do what Petro now cant. That attorney represents the proponents and is not obligated to back off, keystone will play dumb, and we will get the short end of it.

Also, why is there not a side by side view of Exhibit F and the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance Table. Isn't that how we got into this, not performing side by side analysis? (Granted that was prior to both of our involvement) But still some comparison would be nice.