





RRF Recreational Amenities








1. Based on the foregoing background discussion and assumptions, which of the following approaches do you favor for paying for the costs of operating and maintaining our recreational amenities:

		Response Percent	Response Count
I favor the “everyone pays for everything” approach. (This would not require amending the Declaration and is the system that will apply unless the Declaration is amended.)		21.1%	16
I favor amending the Declaration to provide for a “user pays” only approach.		22.4%	17
I favor amending the Declaration to provide for a combined approach in which everyone pays for everything to some degree and users pay an additional fee of use of a particular amenity.		53.9%	41
I have not yet formed a firm opinion on these issues.		2.6%	2

If you have not yet formed an option on these issues, please let us know what additional information would you like to have in order to do so: 11

answered question	76
skipped question	0








2. If you favor amending the Declaration, which recreational amenities would you want to include in a “user pays” system or a combined “everyone pays but users pay more” system:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Golf		71.6%	48
Fishing		80.6%	54
Horse Boarding		83.6%	56
Storage Area		74.6%	50
Other (please specify below)		16.4%	11
		answered question	67
		skipped question	9



3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

	Response Count
	27
answered question	27
skipped question	49

4. Which of the Ranch's recreational amenities do you currently use (check all that apply):

		Response Percent	Response Count
Golf		57.9%	44
Storage Area		9.2%	7
Fishing		59.2%	45
Horse Boarding		3.9%	3
Walking or running on trails in open space		89.5%	68
Bike riding in the open space		65.8%	50
Other (please specify below)		27.6%	21
		answered question	76
		skipped question	0

5. The following information is optional, but would be useful to the Board. The results of this poll will be reported to the members on an anonymous basis.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Name:		100.0%	62
Ranch Address:		98.4%	61
		answered question	62
		skipped question	14

Q1. Based on the foregoing background discussion and assumptions, which of the following approaches do you favor for paying for the costs of operating and maintaining our recreational amenities:

1	I do believe the horse people need to pay those extra expenses and the fishing people need to buy badges. Golf and tennis should remain as everyone pays , no added fees or user pays I am in favor of amending the Declaration if it is not expensive and this is the only area changed. I am not in favor of drastic changes, but for a simple amendment	Mar 22, 2011 4:28 PM
2	We all benefit from all the amenities, even the one's not used.	Mar 22, 2011 7:12 PM
3	All amenities increase everyones property values and fishing already pays for itself with badge purchases	Mar 23, 2011 6:19 AM
4	The question is far too narrow - the board is only considering one source of income.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM
5	The residents of the ranch should get a user fee less than that of the Valley civilians. For example: Golf for the ranch residents should be less than the civilians. Maybe free for the Ranch people and charge civilians a use fee. Horse boarding should be under the same idea. For the pasture use the ranch people should pay less than outside people. There also could be some sort of break in the hay feeding prices. The storage lot should be first for the Ranch people and if any room left the sell space for the valley people.	Mar 28, 2011 9:23 AM
6	Overall everyone should pay a little for everything as all amenities of the Ranch benefit all property owners. I agree that certain groups should pay more for their amenity so they have funds for improvement projects that they find necessary.	Mar 28, 2011 5:20 PM
7	I favor "everyone pays" approach, however, if specific projects are requested for an amenity, above what is the minimum, then that special interest group should be required to raise the funds for their specific request. If there are any funds generated by the leasing or renting of homeowners lands, ie: common ground, then those funds should be placed in the general fund as the property belongs to us all. Also, wouldn't it be possible to shorten the term of the note for the fishing debt if rather than spending accumulated funds on projects such as continued stocking of fish, over maintenance of streams and other unnecessary expenditures, we take those funds and put them towards paying off the loan debt early.	Mar 29, 2011 7:34 PM
8	I believe we should amend the delcarations to allow the Board the power to assess members (and fishing guests) for usage of all amenities. i.e. similar to the way it was prior to this current interpretation from the lawyers.	Apr 5, 2011 2:40 PM
9	Fishing badge fees should continue after the debt is paid off. Golfers should pay fees ASAP	Apr 5, 2011 2:41 PM
10	Non-owners (guests, extended family, public golfers, horse boarding, etc.) can provide an additional fee of use, providing a benefit to owners. This is allowed by the Declaration and does not require a rewrite. Charging a use fee is like changing the rules in the middle of the game; people invested here with the current Declaration, changing it is unjust. If you don't like having to pay for a recreational element of which you choose to not take part, then move. I don't utilize all elements available to me, but I recognize the value the amenity package gives me for both my lifestyle and property value.	Apr 13, 2011 11:22 AM

Q1. Based on the foregoing background discussion and assumptions, which of the following approaches do you favor for paying for the costs of operating and maintaining our recreational amenities:

11 I feel that "fisherpeople" should continue to be charged at least the present "badge" fees. I also feel that the horse owners should be charged board, pasture and feeding fees commensurate with the quality environment at the RARF, relative to other facilities in the RF valley. Users of the RV lot should be charged "going rate" fees. Regarding golf, while I agree that owners should be charged "some" usage fees, I feel that \$10 per round is excessive. Such fees will SEVERELY reduce the amount of use by homeowners, of the golf course. I feel that the Ranch owners take great pride in the course, and go to great lengths to help maintain it, including picking up trash left by "outside" players, as well as attempting to help repair the many "divots" left by "outside" players, as well as ball marks in the greens. It is my opinion that many of the "outside" players are slovenly, have NO CLUE about the rules or etiquette of golf and DO ALOT OF DAMAGE to the golf course. Many share sets of golf clubs, and take inordinate amounts of time to play each hole. If you "dissuade" Ranch owners from using the golf course, due to \$10 green fees, are you then, going to provide "incentives" to "outside" players to increase course usage and revenues ? That will, indeed, INFURIATE many current, Ranch golfers !

Apr 13, 2011 3:02 PM

Q2. If you favor amending the Declaration, which recreational amenities would you want to include in a “user pays” system or a combined “everyone pays but users pay more” system:

1	No answer required.	Mar 22, 2011 1:20 PM
2	I do not favor amending the Declarations	Mar 22, 2011 4:21 PM
3	I do not favor a change.	Mar 23, 2011 6:19 AM
4	There are more than two options.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM
5	Try and keep the monthly HOA's as low as possible. Everyone should pay as they use ie; fishing badges	Mar 23, 2011 1:49 PM
6	I said don't favor amending the Declaration, so I shouldn't have to answer this question.	Mar 23, 2011 5:59 PM
7	I don't favor amending the declaration	Mar 24, 2011 8:15 PM
8	Horse boarding should be paid by the horse's owner. Giving a ranch owner a charge less than outside people. The horse boarding should not be supported by other than horse owners. Storage area should be fully paid by the renter, again giving the ranch people a break on this. use.	Mar 28, 2011 9:23 AM
9	I think fishing badge prices need to be reduced to favor the owners and increase guest badges - similar to 2008 fee structure. Horse boarding costs should be determined by equine advisory committee - but not paid for by general owners. For golf let's look at getting back to the punch pass system - all owners get a 20 punch pass - after you use all 20 punches you pay \$10 a round, or you could buy an unlimited season golf pass (similar to fishing badge) for \$200-\$250 I think the cost of the storage fee has become excessive - I understand the need to charge to avoid overcrowding but why not \$25 instead of \$100??	Mar 28, 2011 5:20 PM
10	You can't have it both ways. Either you are an owner who recognizes your obligation as an HOA member to maintain the property, or, each amenity becomes an exclusive club. The latter goes against the Declarations, reduces marketability of properties, and overall property value. Without the common recreation reserve available to all owners, this is just a 35 year old community facing renovation, undesirable to any prudent investor. I do not favor amending the Declaration.	Apr 13, 2011 11:22 AM
11	Tennis?	Apr 13, 2011 4:11 PM

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

1	I believe a combination approach is most equitable as increased property values based on quality amenities benefit everyone whether they use any amenity or not. Users should pay more but not bear the full burden as everyone benefits as mentioned above. I also think that a combination approach allows for more flexibility with respect to budgets as one amenities users may agree to a higher user fee to implement improvements to that amenity. I think this was the case with some of the fishing improvements paid by early badge purchases.	Mar 22, 2011 10:54 AM
2	I think that everyone should pay some portion of the cost of each amenity, because their property value is increased by the presence of these amenities whether or not they use them. On the other hand, I think the Ranch should be able to charge the users of an amenity an additional amount, especially if they want to invest more in the maintenance and improvements for that amenity and are willing to pay extra to do so. For example, if the horse owners wish to underwrite the cost of new stables with increased annual dues they should be allowed to do so. Likewise, if fishing badge holders want to fund more extraordinary stream improvement through increased badge fees, they should be allowed to do so. This funding scheme is likely to result in better amenities than the "everyone pays" approach.	Mar 22, 2011 11:20 AM
3	All these amenities were part of the association and our dues when we purchased. It makes sense to institute the combination of 'everyone pays but users pay more'. There is inherent value to the homes to offer these amenities whether they are used or not. Having those that use pay more probably makes it more palatable to those that have no intention of ever using certain amenities.	Mar 22, 2011 12:35 PM
4	Has anyone thought to reexamine the opinion of counsel that we received?	Mar 22, 2011 1:20 PM
5	We should not amend the Declarations. I believe that it is going to be more costly and take much longer than projected and I personally believe it is going to be very difficult to accomplish. The water way loans should be paid off before 2017. The outstanding balance is about \$275,000 payable at 5% interest. We have about \$600,000 of the Bailey Fund which we are getting about 1% interest on. It is simply good business to use \$275,000 of our own money to pay off the loans. They are costing us 4% in interest that we don't need to pay. The Ranch can use that money to better advantage. The loan from the Bailey fund to pay off the waterway loans can be paid back by charging guest fishing fees. Last year these amounted to approximately \$30,500. If it needs to be approved THEN GET A VOTE ON THIS ISSUE! this board has got to stop "kicking the can down the road" with the Bailey Fund.	Mar 22, 2011 4:21 PM
6	Please consider opening up a dialogue with the owners.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM
7	The only equitable way for all homeowners is for a "user pays approach" for all of the additional amenities, even though there will be a substantial cost in amending the declarations to accomplish this.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------|
| 8 | I strongly favor a modified "everyone pays for everything" policy (that is, a policy under which users of at least some of the amenities pay something additional for the use of them, or perhaps for more than a baseline level of use of them). I am mindful of the Tragedy of the Commons and I am inclined to agree with what Aristotle's position would have been (he famously said "That which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it.") I have had experiences in other settings where fees or other restrictions on the use of resources were eliminated, resulting in increased demands on the resource and a concurrent reduction in funds and manpower provided to care for, maintain and nurture them, resulting in a substantial deterioration in the quality of the experience those resources had previously provided. I am concerned that an "everyone pays for everything" policy risks a similar result for the Ranch, particularly the fishery, and I would hate to see that happen. | Mar 24, 2011 4:38 PM |
| 9 | It is important, in my opinion, to have everyone feel invested in the Ranch recreational amenities and to be able to enjoy those amenities. At the same time, we are likely to need more funds to keep the amenities in good condition than we will be able to fairly obtain only through an everyone pays system. Certain amenities, like fishing, and perhaps golf (if we need a new sprinkler system) will need more funding than others. Also the size and make up of the constituencies are different, that is, about 50% of HOA members fish, and about 50% play golf (not the same 50% who fish), whereas many fewer board horses. Others also use the storage area. So it seems fair to ask those users of a particular amenity to contribute to its maintenance, over and above the common assessment to everyone. I worry that not doing this "combined" approach, and only doing an everyone pays approach, will result in a deterioration of our recreational amenities. That is not what we want. And it is not good for our property values. We also need to consider how to obtain additional revenues from charging guests for use of amenities while at the same time limiting encroachment of users who are not members of the HOA. I understand that charging guests and defining who is owner versus guest is a separate issue, but it also will have impacts on what fees are ultimately charged to owners under any system. Thank you for the opportunity to express my views on these important issues. | Mar 25, 2011 10:41 AM |
| 10 | The "user pay" option is the direction the Ranch has been going for the last 30 + years with everyone's blessings, then the Ranch found out this method was not in compliance with the original bylaws which were set forth in the 1970's or 1980's. Therefore I like the way the recreational amenities on the Ranch are being handled right now and recommend they amend the Declaration. | Mar 26, 2011 12:40 PM |
| 11 | I would like the board to define Owner/Guest as it pertains to fishing. As an example who would be an owner in the LLC that is owned on the ranch and is used for group fishing. One on the web page has a portion for sale with 5 other members. In that fishing club can each one of the members of the LLC fish on the owners badge? That being the case the group would pay \$66 each for the share of the owners \$400 badges. Also, on the web, there is an add for leasing a condo with the ability to fish on the ranch. Both these examples are not far for the homeowner who will pay the \$400 and use the fishing badge as it is described in the fishing rules. | Mar 28, 2011 9:23 AM |
| 12 | We should be trying to do as much as possible to benefit the owners and charge guests - not catering fees/dues to favor the guests. I think the money spent on fishing has become out of hand. As a fisherman the excessive cutting of grass, dredging of ponds every year is overkill and a waste of money. | Mar 28, 2011 5:20 PM |

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|
| 13 | I firmly believe that every member of the community benefits from each of our recreational amenities, and should therefore, pay something for each amenity to maintain the quality of our property. I am, however, fearful that without a "user pays" system of some kind, each one of our amenities could suffer under various boards as the composition, and therefore, personal user preferences change. I would prefer to have each constituency represented on every board, but that most likely is not realistic. We should be able to stock our board each year with willing hearts and minds rather than quotas for particular amenities. Those two may just not always coincide. | Mar 29, 2011 3:24 PM |
| 14 | The budget figures for fishing and horse expenses appear to be high and I believe they could be reduced. Over the past several years there has been a great deal spent towards these amenities and it must be recognized that this can not continue. These expenses could be reduced in order to minimize the hit to everyone pays. | Mar 29, 2011 7:34 PM |
| 15 | Although noone wants to see additional chages for recreational activities the reality is that these activities come at a cost. I currently purchase 2 fishing badges every year and do not begrudge the cost given the great fishing experience we have at the Ranch. However, I have no interest in equestrian activities so don't wish to individually support that recreation, other than sharing the basic cost of the open space, nor do I expect them to support my fishing hobby. I do play golf occasionally and will have no problem with a small fee (\$10) when I choose to play. Some have recently opposed this charge but I believe it is comparable to a golfer paying to play at a muniocipal golf course even though some of the city tax revenue (like our HOA dues) goes to help purchase and maintain a public golf course. I do think that all residents of the Ranch must support the cost of maintaining the open space lands and trails since that is a benefit to all residents even if they don't fish, golf or keep horses. I assume that cost is covered with the majority of our HOA dues. | Mar 30, 2011 6:14 AM |
| 16 | If the board has information to refute the comments in item #2 above regarding the golf course please let us know. If we don't hear from you we will assume that you agree this information as accurate. | Mar 31, 2011 10:17 AM |

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

- 17 The Board cannot simply ask if the owners want a "user pays" or "everyone pays" approach for each activity without proper analysis of the activity itself. The resources for each activity and the expenses related to those activities are entirely different, so each activity must be dealt with separately. For example, there is only so much storage space by the maintenance sheds. What if every owner wanted to park a car, boat or RV in the storage lot? Obviously there would not be enough room! So the limited space in the storage area must be allocated according to the law of supply and demand. A fee should be charged for storing items in the storage yard and that fee should be raised until there is a sufficient vacancy factor (perhaps 5%) indicating that the supply and demand for storage space is approximately equal. The money raised from the fees should be used to maintain the storage area and any excess should be paid into the general fund. There is nothing wrong with this approach since the storage yard belongs to the Ranch Homeowners and anyone storing an item in the storage yard is getting a benefit that they should pay for. The homeowner is still getting a bargain since the storage fee would probably be less than a commercial storage facility would charge. The same logic applies to the boarding of horses. What if every homeowner had two horses? There is not enough room on the Ranch for 300+ horses! So the limited boarding area should be allocated by charging a fee to board horses, and the law of supply and demand should determine what that fee should be. Again, the money raised should be used to pay for fencing, haying, etc. and any excess paid into the general fund. Just as with the storage yard, the horse owner's monthly cost would certainly be far less than any commercial horse boarding facility would charge so the homeowner is still getting a bargain. The golf course is another matter altogether. The fact that our golf course is open to the public necessarily limits the owners use of the golf course. The public's use of the course is a natural supply and demand limitation on the owner's use of the course because during busy times the owner's cannot get on to play! So charging the owners to play the golf course does not make sense. Not only are owners already limited as to when and how much they can play, but even if ALL of the owners showed at once to play they could only tee off one at a time! In other words, they all could play if they waited their turn. An entirely different situation from that of the storage yard or horse boarding! Fishing is an activity that has its own unique limitations. The Ranch can only accommodate so much fishing pressure without harming the resource, so there must be some limitation on who can fish. If each member of each family at the Ranch could fish without limitation then there would be a tremendous pressure upon the fish, and the fishing experience itself would suffer because of the crowds. The Ranch should limit each house to two fishing badges which would be provided at a nominal cost. Two additional badges could be purchased for a higher fee. Basically, the same system as is now in place. The existing system of charging for certain activities and not charging for others has developed over the years for a reason. It is a system that works and would have continued working if the Board had not decided on its own prerogative to change things. We simply need to codify the existing "user pays"/"everyone pays" system into the declarations.
- Mar 31, 2011 10:46 AM
- 18 The fishing badge monies have always been considered as belonging to the fishing community - for use to improve and maintain the fishing amenities. It is not meant to be used for the general funding of the ranch. No charges should be made that might change that structure.
- Apr 5, 2011 2:40 PM

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|
| 19 | <p>The following does not require amending Declarations, maintains common areas in an equitable manner for all owners, provides for non-exclusive use for all owners, and enables additional funding for improvement or addition to individual recreational amenities by charging non-owners for use, as is allowed by the Declaration. This owner proposes: 1- All owners pay for maintenance to prevent disrepair or demise of all common areas. All owners share in the ownership of the property and should pay to maintain common areas, funded via annual assessment. Purchase of property at the RRF grants membership in the HOA, inherent to this is an obligation to maintain the property. 2- Any recreational amenity/common area open to non-members charges those non-members for use and allows members use of that amenity at no additional fee beyond the annual assessment. If we want it private, we all pay for it; if we want non-members to help fund it, members get non-exclusive use. The golf amenity is currently an example of this concept; were it not for public use, owners would pay about \$85 per month to have the amenity for their exclusive use. Non-owners are charged a use fee for individual amenities and this provides funding for improvements or additions to that common area. This creates a benefit to owners for non-owner usage. Currently, the fishing amenity allows non-owner use. It is unjust to allow non-owners to use an amenity when an annually assessed owner cannot use an amenity of which they are part owner. This system is unfair to those paying monthly dues to maintain a common element! All maintenance line items and administrative overhead currently allocated to the various "cost centers" should be non-allocated and instead be common operating expense, funded via annual assessment. From this point, each individual amenity that is open to any non-member has the ability to create funding for that amenity through non-member use fees.</p> | Apr 13, 2011 11:22 AM |
| 20 | <p>I feel that the current user fees should continue to be charged for horse owners, fishermen and users of the RV storage lot. I DO NOT feel that you should charge \$10 green fees, per round of golf, to Ranch owners. I personally, would seldom play the Ranch course for that fee !! I feel that a COMBINATION of some reasonable, monthly fee to ALL owners, plus a nominal, green-fee fee of say \$5.00 per round would be a reasonable solution. If you charge a fee for the fishing badges significantly lower than presently, the number of people fishing on the Ranch may rise significantly, resulting in overcrowding of the streams and lakes, particularly on or near holidays ! Furthermore, it will then be much harder to "police" who is fishing, by what means, and whether they are following all of the Ranch fishing rules. For a dedicated, flyfisherman the present, \$250 badge fee, is by comparison to comparable, quality, private fishing elsewhere, A GIFT !</p> | Apr 13, 2011 3:02 PM |
| 21 | <p>I feel our assements are high. I try to keep in mind that water, sewer, and trash are included. Also insurance. I pay \$42 a month in Temecula, CA, an hour from San Diego, and that includes trash and perimeter grounds. Lot of shrubs, trees and grass all year round. A 172 unit HOA, all free standing homes.</p> | Apr 13, 2011 4:11 PM |
| 22 | <p>The golf course is unique in that the public defrays a large part of the expenses, so don't penalize the golf players unnecessarily.</p> | Apr 14, 2011 7:41 PM |

Q3. Please provide any additional comments you would like the Board to consider on these issues:

23	<p>Over 80% of the golf course expenses are covered by fees from the general public. I got this figure from Tom Vail. It's actually 82%. As a result, I feel that the small remaining portion of costs can be born by the full membership as we all benefit in terms of property value. If homeowners had to bear the full cost of the golf course I think that a user pay portion would be appropriate. After our legal financial obligation to the fishing project is complete I would be in favor of a smaller user fee for the fishing amenity such as there was during the 1990s. We do not fish, but we purchased 2 badges annually so that guests and family could enjoy the ranch fishing. I would be happy to do so again under similar terms. The storage facility should be pay for use. WE have fenced and monitored the area and it is now cut off from general homeowners access (as it should be). The fees charged are very reasonable. Horses. There should be extra fees for them beyond feeding and ice breaking. I've no problem with pasture land set aside. But there are manpower costs involved in fencing, irrigating etc. And those should reasonably be charged back to owners. (I love seeing the horses in the fields and I'm willing to subsidize them just for the privilege of seeing them! - to a degree)</p>	Apr 14, 2011 8:06 PM
24	<p>The whole idea of living in this unique community, is to benefit from the use of our incredible ammenities. We can still charge the public (golf, boarding outside horses, fishing) for user fees, but the privilege of owning a home/condo here should include use of everything under our dues.</p>	Apr 20, 2011 10:50 AM
25	<p>I am still up in the air a bit on this, but I feel if we have an "everyone pays" system then there is likely to be more traffic on the ranch and we will have a much harder time policing ammenities such as fishing. I did move to the ranch because of it's ammenities and am concerned over the "user pay" system in such that it will become too costly, such as the storage area fees that were ammended not too long ago.</p>	Apr 21, 2011 9:23 AM
26	<p>I find the "editorial" nature of the comments given before the survey inappropriate. No one knows just what the cost of the items would cost and these numbers seem to be pulled out of the air. A survey should not come with comments preceeding it that can sway the choices that one makes.</p>	Apr 21, 2011 9:31 AM
27	<p>1) Storage : \$1/ month x160 units =\$1920/yr More than enough to for weed control and administration. maybe a one time nominal fee at check in. 2) Golf : combination; owner guests get discount as well 3) any fees based on costs ; Cost centers not Profit centers</p>	Apr 22, 2011 10:35 AM

Q4. Which of the Ranch's recreational amenities do you currently use (check all that apply):

1	rv storage	Mar 22, 2011 12:35 PM
2	Playground	Mar 22, 2011 2:27 PM
3	We enjoy all of the amenities of the Ranch. That is why we moved here.	Mar 22, 2011 4:21 PM
4	dog walking	Mar 23, 2011 7:58 AM
5	.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM
6	Vehicle Storage in Lot - we use and do not consider the fees to be too high.	Mar 23, 2011 9:46 AM
7	RV Storage Lot	Mar 28, 2011 7:36 AM
8	Storage area	Mar 28, 2011 6:23 PM
9	Dog walking in our open space	Mar 29, 2011 5:30 AM
10	Tennis courts (should have been listed as part of #4) Besides playing tennis, we see folks playing basketball, rollerblading, etc. on those courts.	Mar 29, 2011 10:38 AM
11	Storage Area	Mar 29, 2011 3:24 PM
12	Fishing used to be among my activities before it became so expensive that only a few homeowners' or fishing clubs could afford it. It has come to feel like an "elitist" group. The issue of multi-owners has become a detriment to the process and must be addressed by the board.	Mar 29, 2011 7:34 PM
13	I have a trailer in the storage area	Mar 30, 2011 6:41 PM
14	Storage Area	Apr 5, 2011 2:40 PM
15	Storage Area	Apr 5, 2011 2:44 PM
16	cross country skiing	Apr 11, 2011 8:41 PM
17	LZs	Apr 13, 2011 11:22 AM
18	We USED TO use the skeet/trap range all of the time, before we were banned from doing such to accomodate the dog walkers, horseback riders, bicyckle riders etc. We were not given any say-so in that matter before shooting sports on the Ranch were, effectively, BANNED ! I would hope that the "Open Space Committee" does not get ideas about restricting access to Ranch open space by owners, other than on certain, " designated" paths ! As a fisherman, I reserve the right to access any no-private, open space, at anytime, without restrictions ! Over time, Ranch owners have been, increasingly "restricted" as to where they can fish (portions of the Raoring Fork River, for example) and, even more so, as to where they can drive and park their vehicles ! We now, no longer have access to Sopris Creek from the northwest, cul-de-sac. We cannot drive off of the river road leading to the old. skeet range. We cannot drive past the skeet range parking lot. Parking spaces are restricted next to the maintenance sheds.	Apr 13, 2011 3:02 PM
19	None of the above.	Apr 13, 2011 4:11 PM
20	bird watching	Apr 14, 2011 8:06 PM

Q4. Which of the Ranch's recreational amenities do you currently use (check all that apply):

21	I feel that the ammenities are being taken away and nothing is being added (ie. skeet, hunting). There is plenty of room out there for everyone to be happy and to do the things they wish to do. We have a lot of acreage that is completely unused and some that most residents have never set foot on. I did an open space survey with Julie recently and I feel that the board should take a good look at the ideas that have been brought out.	Apr 21, 2011 9:23 AM
----	---	----------------------