

ROXBOROUGH FORUM

THE COMMUNITY VOICE

June 2, 2006
Volume 1, Number 7

Welcome again to the Roxborough Forum.

The Roxborough Forum is independent from the Roxborough Park Foundation and its Board of Directors. Opinions presented in the Forum are entirely those of the submitting members and the editor.

The Forum is here for you and is your voice if you choose to use it in the Roxborough community. The Forum is a media in which you may ask questions, voice opinions, or make suggestions on important community issues. The Forum will come out about every other week. If you address a question to the editor we will obtain the answer as quickly as possible and send it back to you via email. Then your question and answer will also appear in the Forum's next edition along with the suggestions and comments of other members of the community.

We realize that in our busy lives many interested members of the community may not be able to attend board of director meetings. The Forum is here so that you may, at your convenience, voice your questions, comments, and suggestions. We promise that you will be heard and your questions will be answered.

We say hello to three new subscribers to the Forum this week. Welcome aboard.

If you wish to be added to the mailing list to receive future editions of the Forum send an e-mail to roxboroughforum@earthlink.net

Dennis Kennedy, editor (PH: 303-948-7538)

And now to this edition's submissions from the membership:

SUBMITTED BY P: On page 8 of the new Rox Rules and Regulations handbook there is section 2.060 which states: "The foundation may order the removal from Rox Park of pets that frequently, repeatedly, or continually bark, etc." What is the procedure in Rox to report such noises and what will be the level of enforcement? I grow weary of being awakened by dogs barking or trying to enjoy a peaceful weekend afternoon on my deck while listening to constant barking. I read your response re collars and scents. But what I want to know, since it is in the regs, what will the foundation do? Thanks.

FORUM RESPONSE: Thanks P. I must admit I had forgotten about Section 2.060 (and I was co-chair of the documents committee). Perhaps if some members of the community, plagued by the barking dog problem, complain directly to the Foundation

and/or Board of Directors and remind these folks of Section 2.060 some action will be taken.

SUBMITTED BY R: This is a "NO BRAINER" installation of a guard rail on "Dead Man's Curve". The only thing that would make this a "Dead Man's Curve" is the driver that refuses to drive and comply with the signage that leads to the curve. Please do not refer to our exit as "Dead Man's Curve" as that has not happened. There is no guarantee that a railing would prevent this from happening. Yes we could improve the warning signage leading to this curve but we can not control the speed and risk you desire to take.

Let's take an arbitrary cost to install a guard rail of \$10,000 to \$15,000 and add on to this cost an arbitrary annual cost of \$5,000 to maintain this rail as it will be scraped. Should we be assessed this fee because we have people in our community who want to take the risk as to whether they can make it around the curve at a speed beyond the warning of 20 miles per hour? Don't send me the bill.

FORUM RESPONSE: Thank you R. Good thoughts. There are some in the community however who are concerned that not putting a guardrail on that curve may leave the community liable for an expensive lawsuit at some point in the future. They point out the various areas in the community that are protected by guardrail where a guardrail is not needed. They ask why is there a guardrail where one is not needed and not where one is needed on that curve. They also point out that it is more likely that someone not living in the community will miss that curve and end up in that ten foot deep ditch.

SUBMITTED BY K: With the drought conditions we are (and expect to continue) experiencing we all need to pay close attention to fire mitigation and to spend whatever effort necessary to create "defensible space" around our homes. I am aware of at least one instance where one resident took it upon himself to cut old-growth trees on an adjoining property without his neighbor's permission. What advice can you offer to Neighbor (A) who feels that trees and scrub on Neighbor (B)'s property is a potential fire hazard?

FORUM RESPONSE: While I sympathize with Neighbor A in what I believe must be a hypothetical example, no one has a right to cut trees on another person's property. That is called trespassing and may also be vandalism. We do have a serious problem with the fire threat where we live—and that threat is mitigated by the ongoing drought. Some people living here have suggested that we take some of the money allocated to the building project and use it for fire mitigation to give the community a higher level of protection. Use of this money for fire mitigation would benefit all members equally and perhaps avert a community disaster.

SUBMITTED BY D: Dear Forum, first of all, thanks again for the publication. It fills a much needed gap.

With regard to the proposed rec center, I looked at the proposed plans at the fire house

and dutifully made my comments and placed my straw vote. One question I asked and did not get an entirely satisfactory answer, concerned the rec center concept itself and when this morphed from an office building, to an office building with added meeting space to a full blown rec center that has offices added to it.

Frankly, I support a center if the costs are kept in check because I believe that not only could it add to our community at large, but it has the potential to allow multi-faceted uses including emergencies if wisely administered. However, I now see a contingent of folks in the community who might have been in favor of an office in the Park, but will not vote for a rec center for all of the reasons I have heard expressed both in and out of your Forum. Might we be in danger of losing the most practical part of why this was conceived in the first place because of what might be perceived as an overzealous plan? Might we have had at least one of the architects design a building that was a permanent office in the same place, but with contingency plans for adding the rec center at a later time?

P.S. The planning committee has worked hard on this and whether or not people are in agreement, they deserve kudos for the time & effort.

SUBMITTED BY S: We moved to Roxborough because of its beauty and isolation. If we were looking for a big sense of “community” we probably would have chosen something like Highlands Ranch. There are plenty of wonderful facilities for entertaining that are not far from here if your home can’t support the kind of party you want to hold. I, for one, would never entertain at a “community center” and my neighbors have voiced similar opinions.

I do, however, like the idea of having the foundation office on-site for ease of access and more accountability. It would make it easier for the current residents to review plans for new homes and access any other information that the foundation has.

I don’t think it’s reasonable to have the foundation offices linked to a community center because one benefits all and the other benefits only a few.

How about an alternative plan for JUST the foundation offices – how much would that cost? I thought I remembered at one point there was discussion of a building for the offices at around \$300,000. Can we go back and revisit that?

SUBMITTED BY K: Love it as always and thanks for the doggie comments. And can you get the community to stop whining about the new center? I went to a Ken Caryl art fair last Saturday and it was a beautiful yet older center that drew all sorts of people together and was a vibrant component of the area, great for concerts and small gatherings. Our residents need to feel that this is their home with no need to go outside for a venue...so there! Some people will always be disgruntled if the ideas and thoughts are not their own or the vote doesn't go their way...

SUBMITTED BY H: Please build us the most attractive and useful community center possible. It will be an enormous improvement to our neighborhood! Go for it...don't scrimp. Build something that will last and that we will all be proud of.

It's time!

SUBMITTED BY B: Return the money to the homeowners. This is most a unnecessary expenditure!

SUBMITTED BY R: I just don't see the need. I would like to see a list of WHO would really use the community center. When the Recreation Center was built, they did a survey to see if enough people would use it to pay for having one. Let's look at it as a business would. Who would pay a fee each month to have one? Maybe on a yearly membership. Then if there is a commitment to warrant it, sell the memberships and build it. Let the members who use it pay for it. If not – then we obviously don't need it.

SUBMITTED BY H: While in favor of the building project I have concerns about rising construction costs. I believe that the board will hold to the \$970,000 plus number but as a person familiar with construction some of the estimates for various costs to complete are quite low. For example the committee has budgeted \$30,000 for site development. I believe this refers primarily to the parking areas. That amount won't come close to covering the necessary grading, paving, painting, curbs, gutters, and required lighting which Douglas County will require. Site development will more likely cost in excess of \$100,000. There could be other under budgeted items and this was alluded to by one of the competing architects in a recent board meeting.

The community will vote soon on this project. We will vote for a building not to exceed \$979,000 before the architect designs building plans and before this project is ever put to bid. If the vote is successful and the bids come in higher than the \$979,000 ceiling the board will have to lower the quality or reduce the size of the building to remain below the ceiling. That means the community will not get what they voted for. In that event I recommend a community vote again to approve or reject this project. Or, why doesn't the board just spend the money to develop a set of construction plans and put this project to bid before the community vote?

FORUM RESPONSE: Our thanks to all of you who submitted comments on the building project. Good comments, both pro and con.

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Some time back the Forum received an inquiry about possible effects due to radiation emitted from the traffic monitor device now in use in our community. We visited the Traffic Safety Committee's website, www.roxtraffic.org and found the following:*

Q: What about radiation levels emitted from the traffic monitor device, should I be concerned about possible health effects?

A: Short answer: no, not based on the specifications of the device, the limited time of exposure, and the physical distances involved.

The international standards body known as the *International Council on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection* (ICNIRP) has produced guidelines for non-ionizing radiation exposure to both the *general public* and those who are *occupationally* exposed.

The traffic monitor device has a *Nominal Power Output* of 10mW, a *Frequency* of 24.150 GHz \pm 50MHz, and *Output Power Density* of 0.5mw/cm² according to the monitor's specifications (see downloadable document description below). With these specifications, the radiation emitted falls below the exposure safety threshold for the general public.

To compare police radar with other common household devices such as children's walkie-talkies and conventional mobile phone hand units, please refer to the paper titled "[Human Exposure to Radio-Frequency Fields from Police Radars](#)" published by the IEEE.

A downloadable PDF document providing specifications for the traffic monitoring device, as well as other details from ICNIRP, are available by clicking this [link](#). If you have trouble downloading or printing the PDF file, please send an email to RoxTraffic@msn.com.

That's all for now folks. More in about two weeks. Please continue to send your thoughts, questions, comments, and suggestions to roxboroughforum@earthlink.net and pass the Forum on to your friends and neighbors. We would like to increase our membership.

Bye