Owner comments for Rules & Regulations Update Task Force

Received December 29

As a computer science expert, I'm aware that "AI" is an often misused term or misapplied tool. However, for some basic tasks, such as writing clear rules and regulations it can be very helpful.

Microsoft's "Co-Pilot" tool is one readily available AI service.

Here's an example ... I asked Co-Pilot what was the mathematical flaw in the Design Manual Subsection 3.18.c.2 "Continuous welded wire physical tree protection barriers are the only form of physical barrier that is allowed for individual or grouping of trees. They are not to exceed 48" in diameter maximum surrounding the tree(s)."

The Co-Pilot response was (emphasis in original response):

The rule says:

"Continuous welded wire physical tree protection barriers are the only form of physical barrier that is allowed for individual or grouping of trees. **They are not to exceed 48" in diameter** maximum surrounding the tree(s)."

The serious mathematical flaw:

"Diameter" is being used for things that do not have a diameter

The rule never states that the barrier must be **circular**.

"Continuous welded wire physical tree protection barriers" could be:

Rectangular

Irregular polygons

Any arbitrary closed shape

But **"diameter" is only well-defined for a circle** (or at least for shapes where you define it very carefully, like the longest distance across). As written, you get an ill-posed condition:

Diameter of what shape?

If it's not a circle, which pair of points defines this "48 inches"?

Is it the longest chord? The minimum bounding circle? Something else?

So mathematically, the constraint:

"barrier … not to exceed 48" in diameter"

isn't well-defined for the very class of objects the rule allows (any welded wire barrier), because their geometry isn't restricted to circles.

In other words:

The rule uses a circular measure ("diameter") without requiring a circular geometry, so the constraint is undefined or ambiguous in a strictly mathematical sense.

Of course, you would need only a high school level of plane geometry to not write this type of flawed criteria. But it would at least be prudent for folks presuming to impose restrictions on other owners to check their proposed rules before making such obvious mistakes as this one (and numerous others) in the Design Manual.

Co-pilot is there to help.

–Paul Conte

Received January 8

Non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians shall not ride or walk over utility corridors. This appears in 2.03 Letter O.

It is unclear what a utility corridor is. If the easement for MidState Electric at the end of Thelison off of Imnaha where gated, is a utility corridor, then signs need to be changed to indicate that this not a Sunriver pathway to the National Forest. Bicycles and pedestrians should not enter.

In additions signs then need to be put where hikers and bikers come out of the forest. County plot maps also list this area as Common and according to signs on almost every corner in Sunriver we are to stay on the pathways and not walk on common ground.

Thank you in advance of the clarification.

–By Kenneth Balk

Received January 23

I am writing regarding the rule limiting the parking of RVs at a residence to no more than 48 hours. I respectfully request that the Association consider an explicit exclusion for Class B RVs from this restriction.

Class B RVs are built on standard van chassis (typically MB Sprinter, Ford Transit, or Ram Promaster) and are similar in size, height, and visual impact to large passenger vans or work vehicles that are

commonly permitted in residential driveways. Unlike larger Class A or Class C RVs, Class B vehicles do not obstruct sightlines, occupy excessive space, or detract from neighborhood aesthetics in the same way that the rule is intended to address. They also do not have slide-outs or cab-over designs.

Many owners, including ourselves, use Class B RVs as dual-purpose vehicles for both daily transportation and recreation. Applying the same limitations designed for large motorhomes to these smaller vehicles creates an unintended burden without a corresponding benefit to the community.

I believe allowing Class B RVs—while maintaining existing restrictions on larger RV classes—would preserve the spirit and intent of the rule while providing a reasonable and practical accommodation for homeowners.

I would exclude all Class B RVs from the current RV parking prohibition. I would not restrict it to length as stated by other owners. If the Class B RV fits in the driveway without impeding the roadway, it should be allowed. Others have suggested to limit it to RVs that fit in a standard parking spot. I would challenge anyone to find a proper definition for a standard parking spot - this would just create further ambiguity. Also, for example, why would we want to exclude a 22' Class B but allow a 22' pickup truck (most truck brands sell a super duty/heavy duty crew/king cab with 8' bed that exceed 22') - this would not make sense.

–By Paul Arthur

Received February 7

The Term “electric bike “ as being excluded from roadways is not realistic. I have to ride my CLASS 1 electric bike on my street (Redwood) to Hickory to reach the bike path on Cottonwood. The language in this ?revision? (Would help if you published a redline) would put me in violation every time I ride to the store and post office. I would suggest either eliminating any reference to bicycles or spelling out class 2 &3 as prohibited. If that is chosen you probably need to add skateboards, skating, hoverboards etc, etc. Eliminating bikes in the list solves the problem of illegally crossing the roads where the bike path requires crossing the road.

Section 6 does not rule in or out (hopefully in) the discreet placement of security system monitoring signs. There is currently a significant amount of them displayed. I would suggest they be added to “approved” list with a size limit. One advantage is if an audible alarm is not silenced a neighbor would have a number to call.

–By David Heath
