

RETREAT LANDOWNERS' ASSOCIATION

Minutes from the Annual Meeting

Feb. 27, 1973, Boulder Public Library, Boulder, Colo.

The first annual meeting of the RLA was declared open at 7:15 by the Presiding Chairman, Mr. JOHN YOUNG.

WELCOMING COMMENTS were made by the Chairman who expressed appreciation at the good turn-out in attendance (48 landowners, representing 30 member-ownerships). The Chairman introduced himself and the other 2 Board Directors: Mr. ROD ROMERO and Mr. LYNN T. WELLS. Also introduced were: Retreat Sales Counselors Phil Stewart, Ernie Conrad and Mark Miller, invited to observe the first RLA meeting; Carolyn Wells, to help register attending landowners; and Dorene Romero, to take minutes of the meeting, in the absence of an official Corresponding Secretary.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS regarding the RLA were delivered by the Chairman:

1. It is critical that the RLA be a strong, moving force within The Retreat. The RLA is an association of owners; as such, the purpose of meetings is to have landowners organize, discuss, decide and implement their ideas. The RLA may work with the developer or separate from him. RLA members are assessable for road maintenance, upkeep of recreational facilities and any other facilities or activities it decides to have and/or maintain.
2. Lynn T. Wells is resigning this evening from the Board of Directors to make way for landowner representation on the Board. Nominations to this position will be entertained during the business agenda.
3. The Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws of the RLA are the governing rules of the Association. Landowners should know them so they can participate effectively.
4. Proxy votes were sent to out-of-staters so that they could be represented. Two members here tonight are proxy holders for other Retreat landowners. Proxy holders will have their proxy votes counted in a separate vote count. Therefore, please do not represent your proxy votes during a hand count --- just your own. Once the hand count is completed, proxy votes will be called for in a 2nd count.
5. Reminder: there is one vote per membership, regardless of the number of lots owned and regardless of the number of persons owning that lot or those lots. Members who are owners in either Joint Tenancy or a Tenants in Common agreement should confer between or among themselves to decide who will be raising a hand during vote counts.
6. The Board of Directors was originally set up under the By-Laws as having 5 Directors. Initially, in July, 1971, only 3 Directors were needed when the RLA was created simultaneously with The Retreat. In a recent discussion, the present Directors felt that the By-Laws requiring FIVE DIRECTORS should be amended to THREE DIRECTORS for the 1973 year; and that 5 Directors be required for the year 1974 to accommodate the increased RLA responsibilities expected. Discussion on this proposal will be entertained during the business agenda.
7. Since Rod Romero has received 26 proxy votes, he will automatically second any nomination for office made from the floor.
8. The Corresponding Secretary is appointed by the Board. We'd appreciate it if you would let us know who among you would like to serve in that position.
9. The responsibilities of officers need not be repeated since they are outlined in the the By-Laws. We wish to point out, however, that the position of Treasurer is very important since that person will be dealing with large sums of money on behalf of the RLA.
10. Let's observe procedures as set up according to Roberts' Rules and Regulations guidelines. We'll be more informal but request that when you wish to speak, you wait to be recognized; and that we keep the discussions to the motion before the floor.

BUSINESS AGENDA

1. NOMINATIONS from the floor were entertained to ELECT A LANDOWNER TO THE POSITION OF DIRECTOR on the RLA Board of Directors, this spot now vacated by Mr. Wells' resignation. Two candidates were nominated and seconded: Mr. J. LLOYD JONES and Mr. LLOYD ANGELL

DISCUSSIONS (Questions from the floor, answers by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- A. Do the original Directors and By-Laws have to be adopted and ratified by the present membership?
-- No, they were adopted and ratified in July, 1971, as needed to become an official Association.
- B. Can we postpone deciding since we don't know the gentlemen nominated? -- No, we must have nominations and election tonight. Perhaps the candidates would say a few words and introduce themselves to the members

J. LLOYD JONES: I'm head of our Family Association which owns the land we have at The Retreat. We are interested in The Retreat and in protecting the interests which we and all other landowners have there. I feel that somebody should do this, be on the Board, and I would try to do a good job as a Director.

Mr. PAT HALLIGAN (speaking for LLOYD ANGELL who is not present due to an out-of-town business engagement) : Mr. Angell is one of the early Retreat landowners and has substantial interest holdings in The Retreat. He has been very interested in The Retreat since the beginning and has expressed to me several times that he would like to serve on the Board. He also has the time to devote to the responsibilities and lives in the area.

Mr. JONES : I'd like to add that Mr. Angell and I live in the same vicinity, he in Loveland and I, in Ft. Collins. In fact, we know each other; we have the same first names, we're both artists and we're also friends ! (General laughter and appreciation of this from the membership body)

NOMINATIONS WERE CLOSED and a vote count called for. Mr. LLOYD ANGELL was elected to the position of Director. Rod Romero voted his proxies in favor of Mr. Angell and prefaced his vote delivery with the following remarks:

ROD ROMERO: I am acquainted with both Mr. Jones and Mr. Angell and have talked with both gentlemen on several occasions. I am, however, better acquainted with Mr. Angell as I have known him longer. He's at the property almost as often as the sales counselors are and has a great affection for the land. Mr. Angell has also talked with me at great length about the RLA and told me way back in the beginning and also quite recently that he has the time and interest and would like to serve on the Board. For these reasons, I cast my proxy votes for Mr. Angell.

2. The motion was made & seconded to consider: AMENDING THE BY-LAWS FROM REQUIRING 5 DIRECTORS TO 3 FOR 1973 and to REQUIRE 5 DIRECTORS STARTING IN 1974.

DISCUSSIONS (Questions from the floor, answers by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- A. How often do the Directors meet? -- At least twice a year, once within 30 days following the annual meeting. Special meetings can and usually are held several other times to decide issues that come up.
- B. What was your reason for wanting 3 Directors instead of 5? -- You can have faster communications with 3 people and get quicker action. It's also simpler for 3 people to get together than 5. Having 5 Directors starting in 1974 seemed reasonable to accommodate increased responsibilities that will be coming as RLA membership grows.
- C. How many Directors have to meet in order to make decisions? -- You need a majority of the Board in attendance to constitute a quorum and a majority of the quorum to carry a decision. So, if there were 5 Directors, you'd need to have 3 show up, and of those 3, two would have to be in agreement when voting in order to carry a decision.
- D. LANDOWNER COMMENT: It seems to me that with 5 Directors, there'd be better landowner representation.
- E. The By-Laws say that 4 officers (Pres., Vice-Pres., Sec'y., Treas.) are elected from among the Board members. How would you provide for all positions with only 3 Directors? -- By combining the responsibilities of Secretary-Treasurer into one person.

The landowner who made the motion to consider amending from 5 to 3 Directors WITHDREW HER MOTION in light of the discussions. The motion was not entertained further.

3. NOMINATIONS FOR 2 DIRECTORS were presented, seconded. The nominees were J. LLOYD JONES, and WILLIAM ROSENBERG. Comments made by the member nominating Mr. Rosenberg included mention that he, an interested landowner, is also a landscape architect and as such, could be of help to the RLA. Mr. JONES and Mr. ROSENBERG were voted in as the 4th and 4th Directors on the Board.

CLARIFICATION: Is it correct to interpret these Directorships as being for the 2-year period, as provided for in the By-Laws? -- Yes, that is correct.

(POST SCRIPTUM: The answer given by the Chairman was incorrect. As stated in Section 2 of Article III of the By-Laws: "All directors shall serve to and including July 15, 1974. Thereafter of the initial board of directors, one (1) shall serve for one (1) year, two (2) shall serve for two (2) years, and two (2) shall serve for three (3) years."

Because of the initial lengths of time involved, the Board may wish to re-examine the terms of office of the initial Directors of the Board.)

CHAIRMAN: Since the new Directors have been voted in, we'd like to invite them to come up here (to the head of the room) and help conduct the rest of the meeting. Simultaneously, then, we hereby accept Mr. Wells' resignation.

4. The motion was made and seconded to: CONSIDER ADOPTING INTO THE BY-LAWS THE PARAGRAPHS REQUIRED BY LARIMER COUNTY as per "Subdivision Regulations," adopted by Larimer County on 8/24/73.

CHAIRMAN: There's really not much we can do except vote to include these regulations into our By-Laws. The regulations concern road maintenance by property owners' associations and require that this responsibility be acknowledged and accepted by all property owners' associations in the County.

(The paragraphs required by Larimer County were read by Mr. ROSENBERG before the membership body)

DISCUSSIONS (Questions from the floor, answers by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- A. How can we enforce payment of assessments for road maintenance from landowners? -- You can deny them the use of the private roads within The Retreat if they fail to pay assessments.
- B. What is the implication of these excerpts from the Subdivision Regulations? -- The County is concerned about road maintenance only. They're not interested in maintenance of recreational facilities. Prior to these regulations, if a property owners' association failed to maintain their private roads, the County could do nothing about it. Now, if the association fails to maintain its roads, the County has the right to come into the development and onto private roads to maintain them. The County wants a guarantee that the private roads won't be abandoned (in upkeep).
- C. MR. ROSENBERG: If the County maintains the roads, it will be paid by taxation. In essence, this would be a special (and extra) assessment to Retreat landowners.
- D. Is the Association able to maintain the roads? -- Yes.
- E. Are the roads built to Larimer County standards? -- Yes, they're built to County standards for private roads (curve, grade, width, etc.). This had to be done this way for the plats to be approved by the County.
- F. Do we really have a choice about accepting or rejecting this? -- In a word, no. (General laughter from members)
- G. Have I misunderstood you to say that the roads are built to County standards, that is, does this mean that paved, asphalt roads will be constructed in The Retreat? -- Yes, you have misunderstood and no, there will be no paved, asphalt roads in The Retreat. Paved roads are required for public roads. Dunraven Glade Road, for example, is a county road (i.e., not paved but otherwise constructed to county standards) and all the private roads were built to county-road standards.

DISCUSSIONS WERE CLOSED and a vote taken. All were in favor of accepting the requirements concerning road maintenance as put forth in the excerpts from Subdivision Regulations issued by Larimer County on August 24th, 1972.

5. TENNIS COURTS, STABLES, FIRE-FIGHTING EQUIPMENT

CHAIRMAN: We now come to what is probably the most controversial issue we'll be dealing with tonight. Many landowners have expressed to us either directly or through the sales counselors that they would prefer not to have tennis courts and stables built at The Retreat. Some of the landowners did make the specific suggestion that the developer provide fire-fighting equipment in place of courts and stables. As the Board of Directors, we can only present to you this issue for consideration, as requested by these landowners.

The developer is obligated to provide these facilities as promised by contract and as contained in the property report. To have this changed would require unanimity on the part of the landowners. One landowner can refuse to sign a waiver releasing the developer from his promise to construct tennis courts and stables and the developer would be bound under Federal law to provide these facilities to the development. We have a letter from one landowner, Mrs. Kleinman, an out-of-state landowner, expressing her feeling on the issue and I'd like now to read to you her comments:

"Stated very simply, it would appear that the Landowners' Association is legally out-of-order in their proposal to break our contracted agreement of September 19, 1971 with Escape Properties, Ltd. According to page three of the Property Report attached to that contract 'two tennis courts and livery stables will be constructed by developer by the end of July, 1973.'

It would seem that any omission or delay in the stated construction would constitute a breach of contract by Escape Properties, Ltd. Can a group of people legally break our contract with Escape Properties without our consent? If so, what sort of contract is this, and what portions might next be eliminated or added without our consent?

We request simply that the chairman of the Association either rule this item of the agenda out-of-order, or that we be supplied with the legal basis for the action so that we can submit it to our lawyer for his evaluation of its validity.

We respect your desire to protect the natural environment of the Retreat. We ask that in addition you respect and protect the individual's rights in contracted agreements."

The motion was made from the floor and seconded to : DISCUSS THE DESIRABILITY OF REQUESTING THE DEVELOPER TO PROVIDE FIRE-FIGHTING EQUIPMENT IN LIEU OF TENNIS COURTS & STABLES.

DISCUSSIONS (Questions from the floor, answers by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- A. Who would man the equipment? -- The Association would be responsible for manning the equipment as, similarly, it would be responsible for maintaining any courts and stables provided.
- B. What's the water supply situation for fire-fighting purposes? -- There are 2 functioning wells already in existence and available for this purpose. The streams can be used for emergency, also. The developer has available to him for purchase a 4-wheel truck with 400 gallon capacity.
- C. Why even discuss this if we need unanimity? -- The issue was brought up by an appreciable number of landowners for consideration and we are presenting it to the membership for their thoughts on it.

- D. What are current fire-fighting resources in the area and what is their response time to call for help?
 -- Fire-fighting resources are in Drake and in Estes Park. (Added Rod ROMERO): In the summer of 2001 there was a small fire up the road from The Retreat which we got to a few minutes after spotting the smoke. There were fire-fighters there within 10 minutes from the time we arrived ourselves.
- E. LANDOWNER COMMENTS:
- + It seems we can get help if we need it. I'd like to see us get the recreational facilities as promised. We can contract with local people for help and equipment.
 - + Having fire-fighting equipment is a basic preservation need. I think we should consider that aspect and then proceed from there.
 - + I'd like to know why we weren't told this by our salesman. If this goes through (having recreational facilities), our land will go on the market tonight. We bought land at The Retreat to get away from just that sort of thing.
- CHAIRMAN: The promise of tennis courts and stables is stated in your Filing 1 property report, which is a part of your contract and acknowledged by your signature prior to agreement.
- F. What is the proposed location for the tennis courts? -- There are 3 sites under consideration but none has been selected yet as soil studies and a traffic pattern analysis need to be done first. But the sites under consideration are: 1) an area south of the Dunraven Glade Road as you travel up the road to Cheley Gate, 2) a plateau just north of the old sales cabin and then directly east, and 3) a meadow north of the 2nd Filing, along an extension of the Miller Fork Road. However, one of these sites (the plateau north of the old sales cabin) is to be discussed more a little later on, since it involves 20 acres which the developer has under option to purchase and which the RLA may wish to purchase for its own use. However, the likeliest spot for the courts, then, is off the Miller Fork.
- G. How much does it cost the developer to provide either courts and stables or fire-fighting equipment?
 -- Between \$20,000 and \$30,000, based on cost estimates. Fire-fighting equipment is very expensive; and courts and stables are also expensive because of the cost overruns always associated with any kind of mountain construction. Tennis courts are also a high-cost maintenance item, again, because they're in the mountains.
- H. Isn't it possible to ask the developer to put in a savings account, say, \$27,500 instead of providing recreational facilities, and then let the RLA decide at a later date what to do with the money? -- Yes, that is possible. The Board would have to approach the developer on this figure and again, as in the other case, you'd have to have unanimity in order to release the developer from his promise of courts and stables. However, this is not the motion on the floor. The motion deals with replacing courts and stables with fire-fighting equipment.

The motion was made and seconded to WITHDRAW THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR concerning the desirability of requesting the developer to provide fire-fighting equipment in lieu of tennis courts and stables.

(The motion was made and seconded to : CONSIDER THE DESIRABILITY OF REQUESTING THE DEVELOPER TO PLACE \$27,500 IN A SAVINGS ACCOUNT ON BEHALF OF THE RETREAT LANDOWNERS' ASSOCIATION WHICH ACT OF DEPOSIT WOULD THEREBY RELEASE THE DEVELOPER FROM HIS OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE TENNIS COURTS AND STABLES and that THESE FUNDS COULD BE DISPOSED OF BY THE RLA AT A LATER DATE AND FOR THE PURPOSE(S) IT DECIDES.

DISCUSSIONS (Question from the floor, answer by the Chairman)

- A. Does this mean that if we vote "yes," it'll be that way (that is, that the developer will be released from his obligation and that the money will be deposited in savings)? -- No, this means that you wish to pursue the matter further and that all landowners will be contacted and polled on this particular issue. Again, the rights of people who have contracted with the developer must be honored. Absolute unanimity is required in order to legally release the developer from his obligation to construct courts & stables and, instead, place the money into an RLA savings account.

The motion was made and seconded to CLOSE THE DISCUSSIONS. A vote was taken; the motion was PASSED, with 2 members opposed.

6. The motion was made & seconded to: AMEND ARTICLE VIII, SECTION 4 of the BY-LAWS, BY ADDING THAT NO ONE PERSON MAY HOLD OVER 30% OF THE PROXY VOTES AND THAT PROXY VOTES CANNOT BE COUNTED TO DETERMINE A QUORUM.

DISCUSSIONS (Questions from the floor, answer by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- A. CHAIRMAN: We provided for proxy votes in a special board meeting so that out-of-state landowners could be represented. (Added Rod ROMERO): I think that one reason why I received so many of the proxy votes was because my name was the only name offered, the other choices being "Elected Landowner Officer" and "Other (landowner)." I realize how this could seem unfair that I hold so many proxies and I'm open to suggestions.
- B. Wouldn't it be a fairer way to do things if all proxy votes were divided as equally as possible among the Directors of the Board? -- Yes, that's an excellent idea. In fact, there are probably many corrections and refinements that could be made in the By-Laws. I'd suggest that an Ad Hoc Committee be organized at the end of the meeting, a Rules and Regulations Committee, to study the RLA regulations and among them, the proxy vote guidelines. Then the Committee could make suggestions to the Board and members as to what changes should be implemented.
- C. Shouldn't this annual meeting be held in the summer, so that more out-of-state landowners can be present? -- Yes, but at the time we drew up the By-Laws, we stipulated that the annual meeting take place within the first 60 days after the new year. It wasn't a very good time to select, we now

unusually affect the population. The project was simply not possible from an environmental standpoint. Also, the cost estimates to construct a dam come in at about \$112,000 which was much too costly. Some of the lots in Filing 2, where the proposed dam was entertained, were then platted and sold when we obtained negative recommendations from the study. So, it's totally out of the question now.

- + Why don't we set up a committee to look into this and report back to the Board on their findings and recommendations. Then the Board could bring it before the members for decision and action. -- Yes, and at that time, the Board could poll all landowners. There's not a motion on the floor about this. We will entertain now such a motion.

The motion was made and seconded to: AUTHORIZE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO CONSIDER THE PURCHASE OF THE 20 ACRES AFTER IT HAS RECEIVED THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF A COMMITTEE and to MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE RLA FOR FURTHER ACTION.

A vote on this motion was taken and the motion PASSED, with 5 members opposed.

8. FINANCIAL REPORT

CHAIRMAN: The developer assumed the costs for road maintenance and snow removal in 1971. In 1972, the costs are the responsibility of the RLA. For snow plowing during the winter season and road maintenance and upkeep throughout the 1972 year, the total bills paid by the developer and now assessable to landowners is \$3,951.13. This comes out to be \$40 per owner. The Treasurer will be contacting each landowner for payment.

QUESTIONS: (answers by the Chairman)

- + Is this sum going to be prorated? -- No, the cost division is based on the ownership list as of the end of 7
- + How does the developer share in the cost? (-- As one member). Is this fair representation? -- Yes, because the developer, who owns all the unsold land, still has only 1 vote in the RLA and is accountable to the RLA for one assessment.

9. AD HOC COMMITTEES

CHAIRMAN: We're almost finished with the agenda now and getting closer to those donuts and coffee.

Please consider serving on the Ad Hoc Committees which will be set up just after the meeting. They are:

- 1) Road Maintenance : to oversee proper upkeep, snow removal, quality of services contracted, etc
- 2) Rules & Regulations : to study & make recommendations on changing or refining the By-Laws.
- 3) Social : to arrange for landowner get-togethers and activities.
- 4) Facilities Acquisitions & Maintenance : to research and study the 20 acres proposal

MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:10 PM.

Everybody stretched out for the coffee pots and donuts.

POST MEETING NOTES:

The Ad Hoc Committees were organized after the meeting and the following landowners are participating:

- 1) ROAD MAINTENANCE : John Markham, Ron Roberts and Mike Harris
- 2) RULES & REGULATIONS : Ted Pauli (Chairman), Earnie Garner and Don Sturgeleski
- 3) SOCIAL : Mary Howarth
- 4) FACILITIES ACQUISITIONS & MAINTENANCE : Ken Pitman, Liz Schoeberlein, John Spidell, Wilfred Howarth
Bill Jones (Chairman), Jim Jensen, John Betts and Ray Ston

Mrs. Barbara Betts expressed her interest in serving the RLA as the official CORRESPONDING SECRETARY. As such, Mrs. Betts will be information coordinator between the Board, the RLA membership body and all outside agencies in communication with the RLA or its Board of Directors.

As required by the By-Laws, the Board of Directors must meet within 30 days after the annual meeting. The Board has scheduled a meeting for March 12th, for organizational purposes and decision making.

The Facilities Acquisitions and Maintenance Committee has already scheduled March 4th, Sunday pm, for a meeting at The Retreat and inspection of the 20 acres suggested for purchase by the RLA. By the time you receive these notes, the Committee members will have had the opportunity to study the land and draw up some preliminary thoughts and recommendations on the property.

Lose a pair of gloves? A pair of men's winter gloves was found in the Community Room of the Boulder Public Library after the meeting. Please call the Boulder office (447-2180) if you think they might be yours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorene Romero
Acting Corresponding Secretary
March 3rd, 1972

...we felt that the Association should get together as soon as possible and did not want to amend this annual meeting date (for the first one) and postpone the first Association meeting until summer, 6 months away.

- D. If we accepted the motion on the floor right now, could we amend it later on, after knowing the recommendations made by the Rules Committee? (-- Yes.) Then, let's accept the motion as it now stands (no one person can hold over 30% of the proxy votes and proxy votes cannot be counted to determine a quorum) and then amend it when the Committee has done its study and made its suggestions -- Great idea.

The motion was voted on and PASSED, with 2 members opposed.

POSSIBILITY AND DESIRABILITY OF THE RLA PURCHASING 20 acres surrounding the entrance into The Retreat.

CHAIRMAN: The developer presently holds the option to purchase 20 acres surrounding the entrance into The Retreat. This includes the old sales cabin, the meadows to the left and right as you enter The Retreat at the pond to the left of the old cabin, also as you enter The Retreat. Further, the land north of the cabin and then directly east includes that plateau we mentioned a while ago as a possible site for tennis courts. This 20 acre parcel also includes prime river frontage along the North Fork of the Big Thompson River.

The 20 acres are presently owned by Mr. Walter Maitland, from whom the developer purchased the Retreat property. When the option is up, in June, Mr. Maitland can do what he wants with that land. He had planned to develop it into small parcels but the new minimum size for lots in Larimer County prevents him from doing that. The developer has decided not to exercise his option to purchase those 20 acres; therefore the option is open to the RLA for consideration, as suggested by the Board of Directors.

This is how the price & costs break down. The cost on the 20 acres is \$110,000. It requires an \$11,000 down payment and will be financed over 10 years at 8%. I'll be giving you 2 sets of figures in a payments breakdown: one set is based on the cost division as per the actual number of landowners (about 100); the other is based on the cost division as per the expected total number of landowners in the Retreat (about 300)

Figuring the cost division based on 100 landowners: for the down payment, that comes to \$110 per owner-membership as a one-time payment. The annual payments amount to \$147 per year per member-ownership for a period of 10 years.

Figuring the cost division based on 300 landowners: for the down payment, that comes to \$37 per owner-membership as a one-time payment. The annual payments amount to \$50 per year per member-ownership for a period of 10 years (assuming that new landowners are billed for this purchase on a prorated basis).

(POST-SCRIPTUM: In double-checking these numbers with the developer, the anticipated number of total Retreat landowners is closer to 400, not 300. This further reduces the costs per member-ownership to \$27 (down payment) and \$37 (annual payments).

This is a very fine and pretty piece of land. It is river frontage property, which is prime mountain land, as you know. It includes the cabin which has been renovated by the developer and is quite comfortable. The cabin could be used for any one or combination of purposes: as a rental, managed by the RLA (therefore income producing), as a residence for a caretaker (therefore, security supervision) or for the private uses of Retreat members and their guests.

Before a motion to pursue this further is entertained, we'll open the floor to questions about the 20 acres.

QUESTIONS: (answers by the Chairman unless otherwise noted)

- + What is the size of the pond and what are the boundaries of this parcel? -- The pond is just under half an acre. (A map was produced and the area marked off by Mr. Romero to situate the land as related to the first filing and main entrance into The Retreat)
- + Are there any fish in the lake? -- (Mr. ROMERO): Yes, and I can speak from personal experience that it's a great place to fly-fish. The pond was stocked in the summer of 1971 and last summer (1972), it was still great for fly-casting. There's also an excellent site for livery stables on the meadow behind the cabin running along the North Fork of the Big Thompson River, and natural access to the river from the meadow
- + Do we have to buy the whole 20 acres? Can't we just buy a part of it? -- No, you have to buy it all.
- + LANDOWNER COMMENT: I'd like to point out that the plateau you mention as a possible site for tennis courts is a very beautiful open meadow, which overlooks the valley to the east of it and which, in turn, is very visible from all up and down the Dunraven Glade Valley. I'd sure not like to have the view spoiled by a tennis court in that location. That site is just too visible from too many other parcels.
- + Is there a barn on the property? -- No. There is an old shed to store hay, however, but it's not suitable nor large enough for horses.
- + Is a unanimous agreement needed on the part of landowners in order to purchase this property? -- Frankly I'm not really sure. There's no provision for this in the By-Laws, so we can't give you an answer on that. This may be something the Rules and Regulations Committee could study to figure out what kind of agreement would be necessary for the RLA to acquire anything along these lines, when it involves special assessments to all landowners.
- + DIRECTOR JONES: When we purchased our property, we read about a feasibility study which was being done on the possible creation of a lake up the Miller Fork. I'd like to know what the results were.
- + If there's a lake planned already for another part of The Retreat, I might not place as much value on that pond in the 20 acres.
- + (The Chairman deferred to developer Lynn Wells for the answer about the feasibility study). Mr. WELLS: The results of the study showed that the damming of the Miller Fork at the point we'd proposed would