
RCI Class Action Settlement Comments Sent to TimeSharing Today Magazine

It's time something was done to improve availability with RCI but, I seriously doubt that this settlement will have any serious turnaround in customer service.

Henry Habel

I am an RCI member for many years (points, reluctantly) and I believe the change should be permanent AND especially that any deposited weeks should be withheld from rental until at least 60 days before vacation date! Imagine how that would increase access to owners who exchange, which was the original idea!

Gary R. Birchler

I think RCI should adopt the policy of holding deposited weeks exclusively for members' exchanges and not using them for rentals for more than just 31 days after the weeks are deposited unless they publish some alert to let members know these weeks are available. 31 days isn't long enough, especially if the week is deposited one or two years in advance.

Also, the policy should not expire in two years but stay forever.

Karen Gunderson

I think RCI has pulled a fast one on the court and is the clean winner of this suit. RCI is an exchange company for timeshare owners. They have no right to make an additional financial gain by renting the timeshares deposited by owners into an exchange system. For the past 4 years, I have not used RCI for exchanges. In 2008, I did 5 exchanges privately/directly with other owners, and will do another 4 in 2009. I do not agree with the business ethic of RCI and have decided to use better methods to exchange.

Doug Click

Those deposited weeks should be available only for exchange from the date they are deposited until at least 90 days prior to the start date of the week. If the week is still available at that time, then RCI can offer it on their other programs. However, rci members should still be allowed to exchange into these weeks, even after they are on the other lists if they want to. That way all deposited inventory is always available to members. That is what the program is supposed to be for and what I pay a lot of money to be able to do.

Robert Perino

I fail to see how this change will be of much benefit to RCI members. It seems to me that if a week is deposited with the intent of it being exchanged, then it should be available to another member to reserve it without any limitations as to timing.

Dennis Truss

Deposited weeks should not be available for rental until 60 days before the beginning of the rental period. They should be available for the use of members, not the general public until

the last minute.

Jeanne Munn Bracken

The change doesn't go far enough! RCI should be able to rent non-used exchange weeks but exchanges should have a very high priority. RCI should ONLY rent weeks within six months of the use time. That will still allow them to rent unused weeks in a timely manner and give owners their rightful first choice in reserving vacation time.

Charlie Brown

What a nice little wiggle to try to get out of an indefinite change. They are willing to give us a little bit more of what we paid for and expected all along just as long as they can go back to business as usual stealing from us after the two years. It is so nice doing business with a reliable partner.

If it is a membership organization for members to trade weeks to each other then what is deposited by a member should be for a member and the week should only be pulled from inventory if there is a comparable or better week deposited. If they can't agree to leave our deposited inventory alone for member's trades then they should stop collecting the membership fees.

Scott Leturno

Why is there a 2 year expiration date on the settlement agreement going forward? It seems that the new rules should apply indefinitely or we'll be back to having the same issues in another lawsuit.

Gerald Matia

I think exchanged weeks should REMAIN exchanged weeks --not available for rental. What this new proposal says to me--I need to be constantly searching for weeks. Not everyone knows when and where they want to go. I banked some Hawaii weeks really early--and so now those weeks if not picked up by an exchanger goes to the rental bank and where does the "rental money" go. Do any of the exchangers see it? We only see increased exchange fees.

No name

If I am reading this correctly, deposited weeks will only be available exclusively for exchanges for one month and then it is available for anything RCI wants to do with it. If this is the case that is totally ridiculous! This would mean that I would have to make my vacation plans more than a full year ahead of time to have exclusive access to exchange weeks. A deposited week should be exclusive for exchange at least 6 months, preferably 3 months out then it could be available for rental by RCI. Why should rentals get good weeks when I have gone more than once with no week available when I have asked in August for anytime in the following Feb-Mar for a ski week.

I signed up for exchanging. Maybe it is time to get out of

exchanging and just rent!

Maureen C. Colgan

A measly 31 day window in which a timeshare owner can book a unit and not have to compete with non-owner renters? This is a wimpy and disgusting "compromise" on RCI's part.

I cannot deal with RCI. We own three timeshares and have terrible results trying to exchange. I tell everyone now not to buy timeshares. They can rent the units much cheaper than buying and paying maintenance fees. RCI has ruined timesharing for all of us!

Judi, Arizona

Units need to be held for exchanges for longer than 31 days since it only apply to units deposited a year out. Most renters do not make reservations more than 6-8 months out since they wait on getting air fare. Need the unit reserved for exchanges for the max amount of time since these units were paid for by time share purchases.

Rick Cline

This proposed change is not fair. Before depositing a week, maintenance fees must be paid. This means maintenance fees would have to be paid far in advance of a year in which one planned to spacebank a week just in order to meet RCI's criteria. In order to meet criteria for week starting in March 2010 one would have to pay 2010 maintenance before March 2009. Most people will not be able to do that.

Les Brower

I read your article about the RCI settlement and I don't think it amounts to very much. Seems after two years, RCI can go back to doing the same thing they were doing - renting units out when members can't exchange to the resort because of lack of availability.

We have been RCI members in the past, but because of the rental practice, we are no longer members and have no intention of joining again.

William R. Coutler

I look at this 31-day holding period exclusively for exchange, after a unit is deposited, as a free license for RCI to rent the unit after that 31 days. I don't feel that they should have this free license. I believe that renting the unit should be a last resort - maybe only during a 31-day period before the unit's exchange availability will expire.

Should the 31-day period after deposit hold, and the unit subsequently be rented by RCI, I suggest that the person who deposited the unit should reap some benefit of the rental fee. This could reduce RCI's incentive to rent the unit. Now that I think of it, will the depositor still have to pay an exchange fee if his/her unit is rented and not used in an exchange?

In either case, RCI should be primarily in the exchange business and not the rental business.

Dr. Roy W. Roth

BTW, as a party to the lawsuit, I don't feel that pursuing a measly \$20 - or whatever other options are available - is worth

the effort of making a claim.

While I'm not exchanging with RCI anymore, I have followed this issue through TST ever since this issue saw the light of day. It is my opinion that the Settlement, as written and as commented by TST, would not ultimately solve the problem of RCI using deposited weeks and make them available to the non-ownership general public. We have all seen the result of this practice by RCI as witnessed by bargain basement rental prices which can be lower than the per annum maintenance fee for the property. This practice diminishes the value of timeshare ownership for all the reasons that have been very clearly listed by TST, owners and other experts who are knowledgeable and represent the owner's interests. Only owners should be allowed to dispose of their weeks as they see fit through personal use, exchange, gifting to someone else or renting. If the general public wants to partake of the benefits of lodging in a timeshare unit, it is only fair that they pay the owner the asking price. Also, developers have no right to make weeks available to RCI that they do not own. The original purpose of exchange companies must be restated. The owners, if they choose, can use RCI as their agent only with their permission. This Settlement should be revised to include the foregoing. The original purpose of exchange companies must be restated rejection of this proposed Settlement.

Armando Russo, MD

31 Days! What a JOKE!

It should be 365 days - pure and simple!

Sheila Kay Riley

I am writing to express my complete disapproval of the proposed changes to RCI's procedures. The proposed change does not go far enough in protecting timeshare-owners' rights.

The sole purpose for the existence of RCI is to provide a method for timeshare owners to exchange weeks. Any week deposited into the RCI inventory should be available exclusively for exchanges. Period! RCI should not be in the business of renting timeshare weeks to non-owners. It is a total conflict-of-interest, and is a complete disservice to timeshare owners.

Now, I am willing to bend a little on that basic philosophy. If a deposited week has not been used for an exchange by two months prior to the vacation week date, then RCI should be allowed to offer the week as a rental to timeshare owners (i.e. a short notice "getaway").

Chris Collins

I think that the proposed settlement is a waste of time and money. Since it only covers a two-year period, it is fine for the two-year period, but in actuality does not correct the problem. After the 2-year period is over, RCI is free to go back to what they had been doing. If the settlement was made permanent, I would approve of the settlement.

In reweighing the settlement, it makes me think that the situation is even worse than I had thought it was. It truly seems like once a week is deposited RCI feels that the week is theirs to use as they wish. The deposited week is not really part of a true exchange program. It appears that if RCI can rent the week before someone asks for it in exchange, it will be rented.

Charles Trenkle

We own three time shares...and book most about one year in advance. We often trade those for variety. I do not see where 31 days does me a lot of good...It seems to me that this feature is for those who want to trade more often than we do...but only 31 days? What am I missing?

Norm Beal

I believe the proposed settlement is very flawed because it allows RCI to return to behavior that seriously harms exchangers after a short two year period.

Since RCI began renting weeks it has severely limited our exchange possibilities. We have only been able to complete exchanges by exchanging down for lesser quality, season, size and such in order to complete our exchanges. Because of this we have done more and more of our exchanges through alternative exchange companies. I am currently using two different alternative exchange companies. However, we are sometimes forced to use RCI.

In conversations with other timeshare owners I find that most timeshare owners do not realize that they have alternatives to RCI.

Brent Jex

As weeks members of RCI we DO NOT support the proposal of "weeks deposited more than one year in advance of the starting date of the week shall, for a period of 31 days from the date of deposit, be available exclusively for exchange, and not for any purpose including rentals."

The weeks deposited should be held exclusively for exchange up until at least 2 months prior to check-in date. We want to be able to exchange our week; we are NOT looking for cheap rentals (cash payments) of weeks – we have NEVER rented (cash payment) a week through RCI & never will.

Leslie & Tim Bashforth

I believe RCI should hold them for exchange up for 31 days or up until 120 days from vacation, which ever comes later. This would allow greater access for exchanges and would still allow RCI 4 months in which to gain a use for the week. While people may put their units up for exchange early, others that would be interested in the unit may not be able to plan their trips as early.

Larry Atwell

I don't believe RCI should be renting banked weeks at any time. This is obviously a money maker for RCI, but is not serving the best interests of those who rely on RCI for a trade. Renting dilutes the availability of choicer exchanges greatly. We haven't had a desirable exchange for a number of years.

Sincerely, Glen N. Peterson

No rentals of deposited weeks should be allowed under the resolution of this matter.

Charles Kaplan

I agree with the editorial in TimeSharing Today. If RCI is supposed to be honest and fair moving forward, it should do so for as long as they are in business, not only for 2 years. If I was only fair and honest with my clients for a small percentage of

the time, they would not come back to me when they buy their next house or when they to refinance again.

Brad Cloud

Concerns: After two years what regulation will stop RCI from returning to previous practices? The court should direct the timeshare industry or monitoring regulatory group that they have two years to put a standard in place.

What independent agency is going to monitor these rulings? Otherwise, RCI is self-reporting and hasn't been open with it's customers in the past.

I'd much prefer a period of six months in advance, even nine months.

Also, 31 days - these are our deposits - that we pay dearly to deposit. Why not 6 months?

Will automatic searches pick up on these 31 day availability? If not, will subscribers haunt the web pages and help lines daily just to try to 'catch' a deposit?

The timeshare owners 'owns' the week and pays RCI dearly for a trading service, membership plus a transaction fee for everything equates to a pretty steep expense just for servicing a trade. If no trade is made, why shouldn't the owner also benefit financially for the use of the deposited week, for example if it is rented or otherwise used by RCI for profit? RCI is charging for a service on both the deposit and the rental. Why should they also get 100% of the rental revenue?

Whatever the court does - just make it fair and lasting.

And what about Interval World (or II)? When will they get regulated?

Dave Leader

I believe a deposited week with RCI should be available to RCI exchangers for up to 3 months until "use date." RCI should only have the use of the week as a rental at that point. Also, 70% of whatever rent is collected should be given to banked week depositor in the event RCI is not able to provide the week depositor with a suitable exchange!

Rod Goebel

Broker

1. I do not believe that RCI should be able to rent deposited weeks. When the weeks were originally sold, the logic was that deposited weeks created the basic inventory for trading. Every RCI rental depletes the available inventory for owners to conduct a trade, disadvantaging the owner and creating revenue for RCI. RCI does not own the week and should not be entitled to rent what they do not own.

2. As a compromise, RCI might offer to rent deposited weeks within 90 days of lapsing under a revenue sharing agreement with the owner.

3. The two year term is a joke. It is a clear indication of insincere bargaining.

Nick Prestera

I do not approve of the settlement, in that I feel the holding period should be indefinitely, and I do not think that RCI should be able to rent ANY of the weeks deposited by members. When RCI takes units off the exchange program, and puts them in their

own rental department, we owners have less to choose from and are actually supplying RCI with rental properties at no commission or compensation. Thank you tstday for looking out for the owners.

Charles Hartbauer,

Dear TS Today - I don't think RCI should rent weeks deposited for exchange at all. When I deposit my week, I should be guaranteed someone else's week. If RCI rents weeks deposited for exchange, there won't be enough weeks in RCI's hands for those who want to exchange. In effect, RCI is running a Ponzi scheme with our deposited weeks. The proposed settlement is not acceptable.

Donna Clontz and Norm Howard

I strongly agree with your opinion on RCI's policy- If RCI can rent the early week deposits after only 31 days, this defeats the purpose of the exchange program that all owners believed to be one of the primary values of their purchase.

If RCI argues that weeks are going unused; well let them wait until 3 or 4 months before the use period and then put them on the rental market. This would allow them to capture the last minute traveler, but still protect the time share owner who counts on being able to make an exchange at a resort of his choice and within an reasonable time period. The RCI agents have always encouraged me to deposit my weeks early to get greater "trading power". I have always suspected that it made little difference for me, but provided RCI with more rental inventory.

My wife & I have been time share owners since the late 1970's. In the early years, we have exchanged numerous times without undue problems. In last 10 years however, the opportunity to make the exchange that you want is extremely limited.

I support your efforts to rally support and commend your excellent publication

Larry Nelson

This should continue indefinitely and not just for two years. Why let them go back to their old take advantage of the timeshare owner ways after two years.

J Rottle

I have concerns with the settlement regarding the 2-year limit. It appears that 2 years from 8/2010 that RCI can return to any system it would like with regard to making exchanges available to its members. It wouldn't seem a productive outcome of the class action to only have a policy change for 2 years. Will there need to be another lawsuit in 2012 to force RCI to act in a responsible manner toward its members?

My second concern is in regards to the 31 days that an exchange will be made available as an exchange. I believe the purpose of RCI was to provide its members with a method by which they can trade vacations. Holding exchanges for only 31 days from the date of deposit, before making them available to non-exchangers as rentals, makes the whole mission of RCI very different. Making rentals available to non-exchangers after they have been on the system for many months, and maybe 2-4 months before the start date of the week would provide RCI exchangers first pick at the vacations they wanted and deposited

their weeks for in the first place. That seems an appropriate mission for RCI.

Rebecca Maldonado

I am a timeshare owner, and I paid thousands of dollars for use of my timeshare week. I also pay high yearly maintenance fees to keep the property up to acceptable standards. It hardly seems fair that even though I have invested in my timeshare, RCI can take this same commodity and rent it to some other individual who has contributed nothing to keeping this timeshare resort in business over the past years. The only thing that renter is contributing, is some cash to rent one single week. They come. They go. The timeshare owners however, are committed to that timeshare for the rest of their ownership.

I can understand that RCI wants to make some extra money by renting unused timeshares. But the owners of these timeshares should have a say in this decision. And why is RCI making all the money? Why isn't some of that rental money going back to the owners or back to the timeshare resort?

As far as the 31 day period...I think this may be a step in the right direction, but I think 31 days is too short of a period of time. I think perhaps at least 3 months would be a better amount of time. The owners should have first priority to decide on whether they want to trade for a recently deposited week. Sometimes a month is not enough for planning a vacation, especially if several families are involved. Arrangements such as getting off from work, purchasing airfare, saving money, etc... must be made before one can finalize their vacation plans. Why shouldn't the rightful owners be allotted more time before the free-for-all begins?

geneticblend@comcast.net

It is a very negative solution for RCI members who desire to trade within the RCI system. RCI is supposed to be an "exchange" program. The fact that they also make units available for rent is to increase their profit margin not to assist RCI members in exchanging vacation locations.

I can understand the argument that it's better to rent an unused timeshare condo that to let it remain empty. However, the 31 day from deposit if deposited more than a year in advance is a ridiculously short time. I would support the proposed settlement if it were to hold the week for exchange and only make it available for rent if it has not been used for an exchange by 90 days of the start of the vacation week.

I also am concerned that the settlement is to remain in effect for only two years. Why should it not be a permanent business practice?

Maggie Gardner

It's academic to me what RCI does with our deposited week, it's the week I'm trying to exchange for that has been the problem for us. We've been with RCI for over 20 years, and had excellent exchange experiences with them before they added the points weeks -- we are letting our RCI membership expire with our old deposits, and have started depositing our non-Marriott weeks with TPI instead.

The problem with the proposed settlement as I see it is that when I deposit a week a year or more in advance, I'm looking

for an exchange that will start before the start date of my deposit, but many of the owners of prime resort units don't deposit a week they aren't going to use until shortly before the 60-day limit for unrestricted terms for the deposit imposed by RCI.

To be meaningful, the exclusivity for exchange should last until the start date of the deposited vacation week, and this feature should not be allowed to expire.

Dick Young

If a member cannot request a trade one year before the check in date of a deposited week and RCI allows the week to be deposited two years before check in, then the ability to request this week is only available to a small amount of the membership base if the 31 day approach is used.

The best approach would be to not make any weeks available for rental unless established data proved that the weeks would not be occupied and then only a percentage of those weeks released to the rental pool and that be done no sooner than 45 days before check in.

RCI used to have an "Instant Exchange" which allowed a member to access late deposited weeks, cancellations, excess week inventory from resorts and late week deposits by resorts.

This was explained in RCI materials as the ability of a member to exchange into a larger size unit and/or higher trading value week (then the lesser week being traded) into whatever was available within 45 days of check in.

This information disappeared from RCI materials a few years back.

The current directory does not include the Red, White and Blue weeks rating we have used for over thirty years with no explanation as to why or how it affects us.

This late exchange is still available through RCI's competitor Interval International and is called Flexchange and can be accessed within 60 days before check in.

RCI has virtually eliminated last minute availability. You used to be able to book last minute opportunities on line within two days. Now you have to go four days away from the day you are searching using the RCI website.

Interval International has last minute cancellations available up until the day of check in using their on line website.

I have watched the last minute "Instant Exchange" inventory to become virtually non existent in the last three years yet I find RCI inventory used by many on line associates/vendors of the RCI GROUP including a premium used in the industry called "Suite Weeks".

(name withheld by request)

This change seems to me to barely begin to address the problem of having access to exchange possibilities thru RCI. We are seriously considering not renewing our membership to RCI this year given the difficulties in finding available exchanges, even in "shoulder" seasons.

Diane L Ritsher

I don't see why each week deposited more than one year in advance of the starting date of the week shall, for a period of 31 days from the date of deposit, be available exclusively for exchange, and not for any purpose including rentals. Does

that mean that after 31 days they can rent out a unit that won't be available for at least a year? I don't like that idea if it minimizes my opportunities to get an exchange for units after the 31 days. If I put in a request, say, 9 months before my desired date to travel this would limit availability for me because the unit I need could have already been rented out and not even be in the exchange pool.

Bobbi Chase

The ruling that the weeks should be available for exchange for 31 days (why not 90 days or more) should go on indefinitely. If that is obviously the right thing to do, why limit it to two years? Why not play fair with your members--who are the ones paying the fees and keeping you in business--on a permanent basis?

Linda Brown

As a multiple timeshare owner and RCI client, my opinion regarding the Timeshare Owners vs. RCI is:

1) The 31 day holding period should begin on the "start date" of the deposited week,

2) If RCI's policies which inspired the law-suit was deemed by the agreement as "not in the best interest" of RCI's clients, which can be inferred, then the changes under consideration should be PERMANENT!

3) RCI should only make available units "For Rent" when their owner clients have had every possible reasonable opportunity to trade for the deposited week (perhaps 30-60 days prior to the start date of the vacation week). Even then, RCI should share a percentage of rent received with the owner who deposited the week...or stop renting period.

Donald Shepard

In regard to the Subject; It would be better if the time frame was greater than 31 days or even an option to withdraw. Although I don't suppose it would make much difference if it were 45, 60 or even 90 days.

I have downloaded the Claim Form and it looks like Option 1, Request First, may be the most useful since the other options are monetarily insignificant. I do not qualify for Claim Option A and have never lost a week under those conditions.

Is there any obligation for the Court to notify all RCI members? The article In "TimeSharing Today" can't be missed but no doubt there are many RCI members (non TST subscribers) who may miss the Notification in the current issue of "Endless Vacations." There is no other reference to the proposed settlement any where I could see in "EV." Also, the same holds true for the RCI web site where it is unlikely that many will see the tag at the bottom of the web page.

Thanks for this opportunity to comment on the subject.
Fred B. Paxton

Since RCI is an exchange company, I fail to understand why RCI should be able to take ANY week deposited for exchange and rent it out, instead of placing in the spacebank for other exchangers to use.

I can understand that if someone uses a week to exchange for cruise, that RCI should have the right to rent out the week, in order to recoup funds expended to book the cruise. This would

not, however, be a "deposited week." It would be a week exchanged for a cruise.

I also understand that RCI Points, under the original program which allowed unlimited use of RCI Points for airfare, hotels, rental cars, etc., might have found it necessary to rent out timeshare space deposited into the POINTS program to generate cash, or to give away inventory to airlines, etc., in order to fund the airline tickets it provided Points members. However, the proposed settlement is an RCI WEEKS issue, not a Points issue. (Besides that, RCI Points has now severely limited the number of Points that can be exchanged with partners such as airlines, hotels, and rental cars, anyway, so even that reasoning is suspect.)

RCI has always maintained its right to sell off "excess inventory" as rental time or "getaway vacations." I do not dispute that there is, in fact excess time, especially off-season, and RCI used to rent this out at very inexpensive rates. However, the rental and "getaway" time is no longer confined to excess inventory, as it once was, and the prices have gone up very considerably. RCI in some cases has more inventory in its rental program than in its exchange program, at the same resorts. Some of the rental time available is the most attractive time and space, and was NOT rented to RCI by the resort.

A look at the inventory available in Hawaii shows that there are over 600 potential exchanges using a 4BR Gold Crown unit in Hawaii during week 52, deposited 23 months in advance of the start date -- in other words, a week which should command the highest possible trading power. However, at the same time, there are over 900 units available in Hawaii for rent, including very desirable time such as week 52.

This is NOT "excess inventory."

Why on earth should RCI (or any exchange company) be allowed to take weeks deposited for exchange in good faith, and sell them (or rent them) off, or make them available to subsidiary companies which sell them off?

Where is the justification? It's theft, plain and simple, no matter what legal terminology is used.

No settlement which allows this practice to continue should be accepted by the Court.

Susan Collins, Esq.

I read your letter to the court in the new issue and totally agree with your suggested changes to the settlement. I think RCI should be able to rent out weeks that aren't being picked up on exchanges, but the ones spacebanking weeks should have a reasonable time to lock in our exchanges before the weeks disappear into the rental side. It is patently unfair to deny those that are depositing weeks a chance to exchange. I would go a step further and ask that if you can't obtain an exchange and the week is available through the rental program, you should be able to have it transferred back to cover the exchange. I realize this may need to be dependent on your trading power, but there should be a process in place to evaluate that possibility.

I banked my 2 bedroom Kona Hawaiian Village week with RCI one year and using on-line exchange was unable to find anything that my Tahoe white week studio couldn't get me. I use either Trading Places or direct exchanges for that week now.

Bruce Johnson

Dear Timesharing Today;

I have been a member of RCI for as long as we owned timeshare weeks (since the 1980's). RCI should not be renting any deposited weeks because they belong to the members for exchanging only. No wonder it has become more difficult to get exchanges. The only time I would think they could rent weeks out would be a month before the start date and that if no one has exchanged for the week and it would go unused. It just doesn't seem right to rent them earlier. One great selling point for weeks ownership is trading 'anywhere you want to go.'

Betty Huizinga

Settlements are the results of negotiation, and this may have been a result. I would like to see the rationale RCI uses to support the current system or to measure potential impact of this change. However, it seems fair to me that

1. RCI implement this element of the settlement earlier than proscribed and continue it, perhaps indefinitely. It seems that exchanges are their primary business, that this change is helpful to 'members' of RCI, and, therefore, this makes good business sense.

2. a longer period of time than 31 days be available for exchanges.

I go on the assumption that RCI is there, in large part, to service its membership by facilitating exchanges. Rentals should be a supplemental part of operations, since it also a supplemental part of my use of my RCI membership and why I bought a timeshare.

Tom Campbell

I feel very strongly that RCI is not in the rental business. They are an exchange company and should only be servicing timeshare owners. If they want to be in the rental business, they should become the rental agent for Members who deposit their weeks for Rental rather than Exchange. The proceeds of the rental should go directly to the owner minus RCI's commission.

I have been unable to get exchange requests for the past 5 years. As a result, I have lost 4 weeks or more. This amounts to well over \$3000 in maintenance fees. In my opinion, RCI has a racket going and should be fined for false representation and theft. I do not feel that this settlement is harsh enough.

Vicki Righetti

The entire proposal to have a 31 day period for "exclusive" opportunity for exchanges (and not rentals) is an elaborate diversion away from the real problem with RCI (and to a lesser extent II). The RCI, as I understand it, was originally created to facilitate exchanges between owners of timeshares for a processing fee. I suppose it was painful to see unused inventory dry up and blow away when no-one wanted to exchange for it. And then some genius from accounting probably recommended that instead of letting it go unused, RCI should market a percentage of booked weeks as rentals, 'cause exchangers weren't going to use them anyway. And now, even with outrageous exchange fees, the real money is in selling rentals. After all, RCI didn't pay anything for them and probably gets a very handsome split with the timeshare property. Now timeshare owners are mad

because there is almost no inventory to trade into, and property owners are stuck with the RCI agreement they signed years ago and can't get out of.

It seems to me that this is a basic betrayal of duty on RCI's part to the timeshare owners who support them and the resort owners who fulfill them. This settlement will not be just and fair unless exchangers have a much longer priority window to exchange, and RCI diverts a smaller percentage of deposited weeks into rentals.

Gordon Bowman

As far as I am concerned, RCI is a total rip-off and nothing they will do will make them better. If they were truly looking out for subscribers, they wouldn't make the settlement for only two years but continue the new practice for ever

Barry Emeson

This proposal is totally unreasonable because members deposit these weeks so that others members deposit theirs and, in return, all members have the right and opportunity to use these weeks. If the policy of RCI having the right to rent deposited weeks 32 days after deposited, I will never deposit another week into RCI's system. I will also make sure that every RCI member and timeshare sales persons I come in contact is aware of this policy. I will send my business to other trading organizations.

The major reason many of us bought timeshare property was the ability to trade with others for new places to go. If the only opportunities that are going to be available are properties that RCI cannot rent, I want no part of it.

Also, I believe that, if RCI is going to rent a property deposited by one of its members, RCI should have to pay a reasonable rental fee to the depositor (owner) of that property.

What RCI is doing is the epitome of greed and fraud.

Thomas Tennant

I am opposed to RCI renting deposited weeks. There needs to be a much longer lock out period where such weeks are available for exchange only.

Francis A. Korwek,

As far as I am concerned deposited weeks should be held for exchanges only. If there were to be any rentals of such a week, it should only be available for rental one month before the date of the week. In other words at the last minute if no one has been interested in an exchange.

It is hard enough now to get the exchanges one wants with weeks being rented out often to non-timeshare owners. The proposed change is not a satisfactory solution.

Pat & Larry Durr

I am against the proposal to limit RCI's ability to rent units for only the 31 day period beyond the date on which the unit is deposited. Any spacebanked unit should be available for use by an RCI member who has spacebanked their unit.

Those who deposit their weeks in The RCI Spacebank system do so with the expectation that they will be able to select a vacation location from a selection of resorts representing all units that have been spacebanked by others. By removing units from

the Spacebank system for rental, these people are being short-changed on their vacation availability. RCI charges a significant fee to search for a resort when called for an exchange. If they utilize the Spacebanked unit in their rental program, they realize a significant profit from the rental as well as from the exchange fee. A more equitable proposal, if RCI must utilize Spacebanked units in their rental program, would be to compensate the owners of the rental units with a major portion of the rental fee.

In summary, I am against the use by RCI of any unit for rental purposes once the unit is spacebanked.

A. Joseph Buerk

I think it's a lousy settlement. I think RCI should be allowed to rent the weeks but the time period for doing that should be limited to about 60 or at most 90 days prior to the start date. I don't think it's to anybody's benefit that these weeks go unused, but to make OUR weeks available for rent after only 31 days in the bank when there could be a year or more away from the start date seems to favor RCI and severely limit our possibility of getting good exchanges.

killerbee2@aol.com

This looks like a "roll out the big guns" move to me. In effect they are saying: "OK you've been right all along...we've been awarding or renting your full week out a few days at a time thus leaving almost no full weeks available for exchange. We're very, very sorry we got caught doing that so to make amends we're going to promise to not do that for 31 days after you deposit, but then we're going to do whatever we damn well please."

That's why we are now in the "former RCI members" column!

C. N. Joyce

I do not like RCI renting out the deposited weeks at all.

If RCI does rent out deposited weeks, it should rent them out much closer to the start date, not further out than 6 months before the start date. To begin renting 1 month after the week has been deposited is not enough time for timeshare owners.

Carmen Brining

My first take is that the 31-day holding period on an exchange deposit which will prevent RCI from renting it out is hardly a deterrent to RCI's current theft of exchange pool intervals renting program. And it is NOT that big a benefit to the membership. For example, if an interval is deposited 12 months in advance, a seeker of an exchange-available week has to hit that 31-day window in order to find this recently deposited week, otherwise for the next eleven months it would not be guaranteed to be in the exchange pool. One can argue that the 31 day hold is more favorable to the exchanging public than RCI's current practice, but it's not enough to make me want to renew my RCI membership.

However, the transition from no shopping until after deposit to shop, then deposit is a MAJOR improvement - it brings RCI into the same operating mode as the rest of the timeshare interval exchange organizations. HTSE and Platinum Interchange are two other exchange services I've used that have always made their current inventory available for browsing on line before requiring a deposit. I hasten to point out that these two organizations

do not use the psycho-babble of "trading power" - instead you can trade your interval size for size for the standard exchange fee, and if you want to get a larger unit, then there is an upgrade fee. If you, the vacationer, can't figure out whether it's winter or summer or that there's nothing to do in the mountains of New Mexico except look at the trees and go fishing, I guess you need somebody to label the interval season red, white or blue - myself, I can figure these things out.

In defense of RCI a bit, there is a very large expense in the maintenance of their "red, white, blue" and the Gold Crown rating system. (Of course the same can be said for II.) But as many exchangers have found out, these ratings are not always accurate and RCI will not guarantee them to the point of refunding their fees if a resort doesn't meet your expectations. At least a cruise line will give you a credit against a future sailing if your cruise was impacted negatively for many reasons - mechanical breakdown, health embargoes, or some other disruptions.

Actually the \$15 check for "former members" looks pretty good to me - except I can't get a definition of "former" from the Consulting Service employed by the lawyers. Is that "former" by the date of the preliminary agreement, or by the date I sign the claim form (I terminate my RCI membership today and sign the claim form tomorrow as a "former" member), or by the date of the final settlement - I couldn't get a straight answer.

Henry Jeffries

I dropped RCI & II several years ago, after I concluded that they were no longer HONESTLY serving their Timeshare Owner members. "Other" avenues present themselves as needs arise. CASE CLOSED.....Howard Sharpell

I gave up my RCI membership 2 or 3 years ago because of their unfair policies.

I would not trust RCI to offer any changes that would benefit any member.

R. Cave

In my view, the proposal is window dressing. It is only for 2 years. I looks like there is only a 31 day window for exchanges commencing from the date of desposit - which is unrealistic in my view.

More importantly it doesn't really address rentals. If for example, a person has one year to make an exchange from time of deposit, and has not made that exchange by 45 days left of that year, then it could be released to rent.

Warren Banks

I don't think 31 days is long enough to hold for RCI exchangers before RCI can rent. I think exchangers should have at least 90 days before RCI could rent.

an RCI weeks member

I find it difficult to get an exchange to places that I could have formerly gotten.

W Mastin

why does rci get to rent them anyway? should not the income be shared with the resort you are leaving(you own here)

to one we are going(not owner). rci providers a convienance for owners to use a middle man. otherwise i can get on the phone and call any resort i wanted to go and see if they had any openings? rci gets enough for the bookkeeping service they charge. who is going to accept damage to the resort if there is any--rci or the owner? who si going to check up on rci to see if they are not cheating. the idea they can make rent money off something i own is a joke. if they want to rent my unit and act like a broker maybe we can work something out.

tony giordano

I'm not certain that I agree with any of this. Here is why; when I deposit my week with RCI I want it to be used specifically for trading...not only my trade, but I want my unit available for someone else to trade into it. If RCI wants to use my unit as a rental, then I think they should ask me in advance and pay me an agreed percentage prior to the rental.

Jerry Nisker

I think deposited weeks should not be rented at all until the exchange expiration date. After that RCI could have an arrangement with the resort to be able to rent them.

Phil Hill

If I understand it correctly, this settlement is a joke. The period should be a minimum of 90 days and it should be written into the rules to be permanant. The reason RCI has units to exchange or rent is due to owners wanting to exchange their units.

Peter Kranenburg

Even this is to short a period. If one year deposit in advance it should be much longer, like 6 months before they can rent. RCI will take advantage no matter what. That is the reason I am no longer an RCI member.

Earl Richards

It is ridiculous that RCI controls our weeks (like they own it) after we pay them fees to exchange, RCI is paid for their services and they should do what we want as a group. They are effectively working for us and they are destroying timeshares instead of making them prosper.

RCI is extremely out of control and greedy effectively stealing what we own by preventing us from using existing inventory for their own profit and giving our weeks/points away for profit to people not even a member or renting out units for they exclusive profit and therefore we often get limited use to NO use. Since they have not acted in good faith perhaps they should pay the annual fees the owner paid for weeks they have effectively taken and not given us an exchange. Or a future exchange in lieu only if we want it.

RCI should NOT be able to rent out unless they have owner permission (owners should share in the profits of rentals) or 60 to 90 days before only if they have excess inventory which must be defined to more than 10 available unless in 30 day time period.

Timeshares exchanges should be the exclusive exchange access inventory for our weeks and points owners who pay the fee OR we can choice to rent then owners should share in the profits.

Once owners exchange weeks/points that time belongs to them to give away or rent or go themselves.

There should only be ONE inventory that includes points and weeks. Owners should be asked if they want to deposit weeks or points (as long as the timeshare company purchased has both available whether the timeshare company likes it or not). This option has been offered to some groups who have made a special deal. If this can be offered to some it can be done for all, especially since this tends to be going in that direction the industry is going in.

Many of the timeshare companies are also out of control and they should not be able to keep collecting fees so they can convert to points. Once you buy it is your to use it in days or weeks as long as company has both available. The excessive conversion fees are outrageous and believe they are also bordering on fraudulent acts by some of these timeshare companies. Which also needs a class action suit. Administrative transfer fees is reasonable.

RCI, should be Timeshare owners leader/advocate given we have given them the opportunity to make money on our investment instead they have become an abusive partner. Until that is changed it will always be an uphill battle.

I have told RCI, I not give any more weeks until they make good on the weeks I have already deposited. If all owners do this they will have to change. Timeshare owners groups could help this movement if RCI and II... do not change their unfair practices. RCI has continually dropped my searches so what good does it do to call back. So, having searches being a basis for compensation when they manipulate the inventory has limited value.

A better incentive..... RCI should pay members for weeks they could not give us an exchange and the annual costs to resort (the owner) when exchange not provided. This effectively demonstrates the owners loss. Since they rented our weeks or made them available to non owners instead. RCI did not act in good faith and since they acted as owners they should pay the expenses of the owners. Since RCI benefited they should pay the associated expenses. RCI should be fined and we should be compensated for their intentional disregard to exchange in good faith/fraud. RCI must have an incentive to give us a fair exchanges or they Will NOT change because of their ability to manipulate the facts. Only one out of 4 were successful in the last two years. WHAT about our time lost to constantly deal with these problems? Tough words. I have paid thousands of dollars for annual fees alone and it is not acceptable for it to be for the exclusive control and profit of RCI.

Money stolen out of the bank is considered fraudulent. RCI is intentionally not giving us an exchange opportunity for their own profit for many deposits from what I have heard and experienced. They do not care if we do not get an exchange and unless there is some payback to owners for unmatched deposits or refund of fees they Will NOT Change. It is just common sense with a partner like RCI. II is also not providing exchanges. Isn't this effectively a Ponzi scam? The cover is to allow some exchanges. Or to allow errors and exchange problems to occur to their benefit. I have found many staff who drop searches and who do not know how to firm up exchanges and not knowing how to reinstate them. This certainly plays to RCI advantage. There is so much of this, it is hard to believe it is not somehow part of

the cover to give them more deposits for their profit line.

There should be a law that is applicable to all exchange timeshare companies. They must exchange 98% direct to owners or payback, unless direct permission to rent is from owner with shared profit. I have lost weeks to II as well they are not much better.

Yes, I am angry. Timeshare is a great concept and when the exchange process works I enjoy traveling to different parts of the country. I welcome RCI to become a positive partner or a replacement company take it over. I do not exchange to II because they also they not care if exchanges do not occur.

Thanks for asking, Sorry for the strong words but I am really frustrated and angry dealing with RCI and II. I do appreciate and a very special thank you to those who did go forward with this class action for positive change and accountability to RCI for time share owners. it is a great concept if it were not for the abusive partners.

T Dress

I disapprove of this provision in the settlement with RCI. The provision is inadequate in at least two ways:

1. The unit should be exclusively available for exchange for much longer than one week, depending on how far in advance it is deposited.

As your magazine has noted, many people don't anticipate their next vacation until after they complete the previous one. Units deposited at least one year in advance should be available exclusively for exchanges up until one year before the deposited week ends (the ending date). If deposited less than one year in advance, but more than nine months, the unit should be available exclusively for exchanges for a period of not less than seven calendar days from the date it was deposited.

2. This provision, however worded, should be permanent, not for two year duration.

If this provision is in effect for only two years, after that RCI can revert to its former practices. There doesn't appear to be any incentive for RCI to abide by the provision indefinitely. If RCI does resume its old practices, weeks owners will soon be, once again, in the very same exact situation that goaded them to bring the class action suit in the first place? Will they have to sue all over again?

You could make this same case for some of the other provisions in the settlement as well – that they should be made permanent.

RCI is in the business of making money. But it costs them very little to have weeks on deposit for a little while longer, and they should acknowledge that without the weeks owners, RCI would never have existed in the first place to become the huge corporation they are today.

Joan Burke

Since people PAY RCI in order to deposit their weeks and trade their weeks, a rental should only occur within a VERY SHORT time frame of the actual week use period, perhaps no sooner than 2 weeks before the rental period is supposed to start.

Anything other than that is not living up to the deal that RCI members PAID to have!

It would amount to paying for a service of giving and getting exchanges, and not getting the service you paid for!

Henry Pabian

My wife and I agree that the settlement should not be for two years only, but should be the new policy.

Edward+Catherine Lowery

These weeks that are put in should be for the use of us members as exchanges and not used for anything else.

Bart and Iris Gach

We think the settlement does not go far enough. Why should it lapse in two years? Renting timeshares deposited by owners should NOT be allowed, period. Those should be available for exchanges to owners who deposited weeks in RCI. As soon as the two-year period is up, the same problems will recur. If there is any way to get the terms of the settlement reconsidered, we hope this will be done.

James & Sharilynn Aucoin

We are in favor of this because the more desirable exchanges will be picked up in the 31 days -- it certainly is better than it had been in the past.

Bruce and Cathy Broker

I am really angry to learn that RCI is renting exchange weeks so quickly. I have questioned RCI counselors about this and they always say that rental inventory is different from exchange inventory. Now I find out that they were lying. Whether they were also lied to is beside the point. This also explains why I have had such a difficult time exchanging weeks to desirable destinations no matter how far ahead I deposit or begin a search. So my opinion is that RCI should not rent weeks until they are within the last 90 days before start date. The resolution you are asking us about is a technicality and misses the point that they are stealing our inventory for financial gain.

Sally Mizerak

Only giving the people 31 days before RCI can move in and start renting it out is a JOKE! If it wasn't for the members RCI would not exist. It took us how long to expose their crooked ways. All these years they said they weren't doing anything wrong and now finally they got brought to court on this thing and they want to get out of it by giving the owners 31 days. What a bunch of BS! We should give them only 31 days before the start of the vacation for them to rent it out. If the court lets them get by with this one they are as crooked as RCI. Thank you for your time.

Jim Swedzinski

RCI is an EXCHANGE company.

They should not be allowed to rent or sell ANY deposited week.

I can never get anything remotely close to what I request.

I believe that this is because RCI rents and sells the weeks that are deposited for exchange, leaving nothing for the exchanges.

RCI is the pits!!

Cathy Waters

This resolution sounds like a band-aid fix when major surgery on the policies of RCI is what's needed. I own three timeshares and exchange them all. But in the last few years have been phasing out RCI due to their exchange practices that benefit them and leave timeshare owners/exchangers with what's left over... usually not much. I will continue to exchange my timeshares... but not with RCI.

Sam Weaver

I am not real time share savvy, especially when trading I find it a confusing chore. I don't believe they should be able to rent them out until 15 days before they expire. Many times I'm trying to find somewhere to trade 3 or 4 weeks before I want to travel. Weeks should be available to the owners, even at short notice.

Vicki Black

The proposed settlement between RCI and its members is flawed. The 2 year agreement should be extended indefinitely! There will be no long term satisfaction in knowing that the rug will again be pulled from underneath our feet by the same treatment that we are now receiving from RCI!

Mark Ulrey

RCI should be doing this and more all the time for the people who bought timeshares and joined their organization. They lied to us and broke the terms of their agreements. RCI should be forced to live up to the agreements they made when they were enticing all of us to join. I don't believe the settlement went far enough in restricting their ability to rent out timeshares that have been deposited. Those should be held only for exchange till 30-60 days before they expire and only then be listed for rent to others. I'm incensed at the money grubbing deceitful way they conduct business. Not only are the exchanges difficult to get, the fees for said exchanges are outrageous.

The settlement should be forever, not just 2 years. What is the court thinking? I have been in RCI for many years and have seen the many corrupt changes designed specifically to increase the amount of money they get, rather than service the customers with exchanges.

I own 11 timeshares and have much experience in dealing with RCI on both the weeks and points sides. The last 8 years have not been very pleasant. It is my guess that if the court doesn't force them to change their behavior, that they will revert right back to the illegal way of doing business as soon as the 2 years is up.

Barbara Beasley

When I bank my weeks with RCI, I want them to be used ONLY for exchanges - NEVER for rentals, unless there's a case of extraordinary circumstances. With the RCI secrecy of how they handle priorities, etc., we never know what circumstances RCI uses to move banked weeks to their rental pool. Every year it gets harder for us to find desirable exchanges, while the exchange fees go up, and we see more and more units listed for Extra and Last Call Vacations.

Philip Wingrove

I don't know why they should rent any weeks that are not their's. Deposited weeks are not given to RCI but placed there for trade.

It sounds like the proposed settlement is a nonstarter!
Charles Walworth

Weeks deposited should be held for exchange only up until 31 days before the start of the week. Rental of weeks should be a last resort. If you think getting an exchange is difficult now, securing one under this proposal would be impossible. Much like a snowball's chance in hell.

Better yet, let's not deposit our weeks at all. List them on your resort's bulletin board or some other medium. Even if rented out for maintenance only, you will still come out ahead in the end.

As it is, RCI rarely has anything available for week owners and if your are fortune to get one, you're stuck with having to pay the exchange. Thus RCI makes money renting your week and again makes more money (exchange fee) for allowing you to avail yourself of that vacation time you saved yourself. I think one can call it double dipping.

Elizabeth G

The RCI settlement stinks. Thankfully, I am not a member of RCI and never will be. The whole points program is some type of scam so that RCI can make more money. There is no way that it is in the best interests of its longtime (read weeks) members. RCI should be in the exchange business or the rental business, but not both.

To hold the week for 31 days two years in advance is ridiculous. I could never see myself requesting a trade two years in advance. And this "special" program only lasts for two years. It should at least last forever.

Marc Goldstein

To RCI, I disapprove of "the above".

Most deposits are not made MORE THAN ONE YEAR IN ADVANCE.

This in effect leaves RCI to continue to rent most weeks with no consequences.

Since RCI members deposit weeks hoping to make an exchange, RCI should never rent out a week.

But at the least, if it is rented, the depositing member should receive an amount equal to the maintenance fee that the member paid in order to give (bank) that week with RCI.

In all cases there should be a bold disclaimer explaining either verbally or in writing or both, stating that the depositing member may not receive any exchange at all because RCI rents out the weeks, thereby making desposited weeks unavailable to RCI members.

Larry Hayden, President
Timeshare Resales Worldwide

I think the week should be held longer than 31 days. I think it should be 90 days. Why should RCI be allowed to rent then at all. We bought timeshare to trade not to rent. You can never get a timeshare in some places but if you look on the internet you

see the places for rent. It's not fair.

Joanne Dagato

I can't believe RCI members would agree to this proposal. I totally disagree. It should be a permanent factor, not just for 2 years. In fact, I think 31 days is way too short. I think it should be held up until 14 days from the beginning date of the reservation. Why should be it be available for anything else up til that time????

Margie Jones

I am an avid timeshare owner and member of several trading companies, including RCI. When a unit (week) or points are placed into the trading pool they were for trade only and never intended for the trading company to rent them. An owner can place a unit for rent in a rental program or rent it themselves. When it is placed in a trading program it should never be rented.

James D. Poulos

I find the proposed change to RCI's procedures to be balanced and fair. I am in support.

K.C. Schwarz

I would think this is Why RCI got into trouble in the first place. A suggestion was posted in your newsletter, that rentals should be postponed until one year before the date of the deposited week. For example, if a person deposits their week two years in advance, no one is able to rent it until one year or maybe 8 months prior. It should remain available for users to trade. OR go back to giving equal weight no matter when the week is deposited. Currently, owners were penalized if they didn't deposit at least one year in advance....not for others to trade, but for RCI to rent and therefore not having anything left.

I always thought I planned well in advance, but RCI's requirements are almost unnormal for trading purposes. If they are "renting" deposited weeks, then they should allow members to trade when Getaway weeks are available. The money RCI makes off the rental should be utilized to pay for the rental fee for a getaway if the member needs a trade.

Linda

For a number of years now it has become increasingly difficult to secure an exchange timeshare condo. I have deeded two weeks, two bedroom, gold crown and when I call for an exchange somewhere say out west, north, south, or in the east they never seem to be able to accommodate me with a two bedroom, gold crown condo. However they continue to offer me an efficiency or one bedroom non gold crown condo OR after searching for some time, they ask if I would be willing to rent because there are quite a few rentals available.

Exchanging has almost become passe and there does not seem to be an advantage to own. They keep telling me to deposit my weeks earlier and earlier because this will help me secure other exchange possibilities. So far this theory does not seem to be working to my advantage.

I do not wish to see renting take precedence over exchanging!

Virginia Fischer

I oppose the settlement. It in effect cancels any benefit, since I might deposit two years in advance, but won't know my family's vacation schedule until about one year in advance. The deposited weeks should not be available for rental until shortly before the date. Reservation states show most owners don't make their reservations this far in advance. Under this agreement, the deposited weeks would not be available to most members. This is in reality no change in current practices.

Dr. Nelson H. de Jesus

In my view, there are few benefits to dealing exclusively with RCI and I do not expect to renew my RCI membership when it expires in December 2011. I believe RCI should target all deposits for the primary purpose of exchange, to RCI dues-paying members only. (RCI has maintained the practice of awarding gratuitous membership numbers to persons in the armed forces and other civil service professionals for many years.) If a banked week is NOT picked up for a trade within 60 days of the fixed or reserved vacation week, I would reluctantly consider allowing RCI to rent the week to anyone interested (as well as offering weekly discounts, up to the usage time, with no guest certificate fees as a special benefit just for RCI members). Until RCI changes their blatant abuse of members, I will continue to deposit my weeks with other trading companies, including Interval International, Trading Places, San Francisco Exchange Company and Dial An Exchange.

Arline Vitale,

They have got to be kidding!!! This proposal is not far from RCI's practices already in effect!

1. Not many folks that we know deposit their weeks more than one year in advance of the starting date of their week. (The yearly maintenance fees aren't even billed that far in advance... can you deposit your time without paying the yearly fee first? We were told no. Were we mislead?) And what about those owners who can't make vacation plans that far in advance?

2. For a period of one month, the deposited week is to be available only for exchange and not for rent...??? Deposited time should ALWAYS retain it's character as time that's available only for exchange if that's why the owners are depositing it. Deposited units should never be available for rent by RCI unless the owner so desires --- how did that practice ever gain traction in the first place? Written permission of the owner should be required to rent out a deposited unit... and then RCI should reimburse the owner's yearly fees since without the owner's pre-paid unit, RCI would not have made any profit. What if RCI can't rent the unit for more than the maintenance fee? Too bad. The owner is still out the maintenance fee, the same as always.

3. Why is RCI not bound to this settlement indefinitely? This proposal is only set to run for only two years, which is ridiculous... except that the owners are gaining nothing more/less than they already have. What we currently have is an exchange company that rents out time that was deposited to exchange... what we'll have if this agreement is ratified is exactly the same thing. We need an agreement in which a deposited week is designated by the owner/depositor as either available for exchange (if that's why the week is being deposited) or for rent (if the week will be unused by its owner). To reiterate: Deposited time should

ALWAYS retain it's character as time that's available only for exchange if that's why the owners are depositing it.

We strongly disapprove of the settlement as written because we see it having little effect on our principal complaint against RCI --that RCI rents out units that were originally deposited to be available for exchange.

Earl & Karen Selmer

We have been RCI members for over 20 years and have watched the original exchange program steadily erode and the fee structure continuously rise. Initially RCI provided a clearinghouse whereby owners could bank their weeks and later exchange them with other OWNERS for a modest fee. Over the past 5-6 years, RCI realized they could optimize their income by renting unused banked weeks to non-owners/non-members and to members. This was so successful that they seemingly began to withhold weeks and locations from the exchange bank and made them directly available as rentals to non-owners/non-members and members. As owners of numerous (8) timeshare weeks (we have not responded to RCI's points program which just gives them more money), we strongly resent RCI's gross undermining of their exchange program for weeks owners.

The settlement proposal offered by RCI is simply a two-year "pacifier" in response to ongoing misrepresentation of the exchange program. Once again, the RCI scheme motivates weeks owners to bank their timeshare more than a year in advance so RCI has more time/opportunity to use that week in whatever manner optimizes their income—including assigning to owners of points (but not vice versa) weeks banked by weeks-owners. Weeks banked should be available ONLY to other weeks' owners!!

Since RCI does not pay either the purchase price or the annual maintenance fee, they have no right to generate income from an unused week.

Twice in the last year when we wanted to exchange into another resort that was not a part of the points program we were told there were no weeks available but we could rent a week at that location! We do not pay for maintenance and an RCI membership fee with the expectation that we will have to pay an additional \$1200 (the last time we got a quote) to rent!

RCI is supposed to be an exchange program for owners and not a rental program for anyone who will pay the price! They deserve the class action suit and their response shows that the suit should go forward aggressively.

We hope the RCI Class Action Suit will go forward and bring about equity to weeks owners—something we have definitely lost in recent years.

Name withheld by request

RCI has been forced to hold deposits 31 days before renting them? That isn't very long at all. This policy assumes that there is already a long waiting line for any incoming deposit. This may not be the case. RCI should hold deposits without renting them until perhaps 30 to 45 days before the start of the week. I am not sure it is wise for them to rent the weeks, even then, but it would be more fair than their present policy. Offering cheap rentals, for less than owner's maintenance fees, devalues the entire timeshare product. Why should anyone buy a week, or multiple weeks, if

they can rent a timeshare for less than the cost of ownership? It may be better in the long run for the exchange companies to have unused deposits, than to devalue the entire timeshare industry by dumping cheap weeks on the market.

Kay Ling

First, I am opposed to any settlement that enables RCI to rent weeks deposited to the exchange pool to be rented instead of going to other RCI subscribers as an exchange, until the last 60 days prior to the use date of the deposit, but only then if it is simultaneously being offered as an exchange.

An exchange company renting weeks is a conflict of interest, a breach of faith with its subscribers. In the case of RCI, and the company it descends from, Cendant, there is a history of deception so that one cannot rely on the word of the company.

In the event that rentals are allowed, there should be accurate reporting and disinterested third party verification of how deposits are used.

James L. Beasley

I have been an owner at the Sugarloaf Mountain Hotel for almost 20 years. I have reviewed the proposed RCI class action settlement and intend to file an objection.

I do not believe RCI should be allowed to put any weeks into their rental program. The system is supposed to be for swapping weeks, not renting them. It was never my understanding, when we joined RCI, that weeks we deposited, or might want to get in exchange, could end up in a rental pool, or that the value of our weeks would be diluted by skimming off the best weeks deposited by others and putting them into a rental pool. Members whose weeks are rented out do not receive any rent or other benefit that I can see.

The settlement agreement proposal, which is limited to making the week available for a swap if there is already a request for that week pending, does not solve the problem. I deposit my weeks as early as I can so that I supposedly get the most trading power from that deposit. That does not mean that I (or most other people) plan vacations that far in advance.

The claim that the weeks in the rental program are weeks that are not otherwise in demand is bogus. For example, there is a ski resort in the Portes Du Soleil in Switzerland that my husband and I have gone to a few times. Right now, RCI has January, February and March 2010 weeks at two resorts in the Portes du Soleil, in the rental pool. February is the height of the ski season and January is at least shoulder season. March is also shoulder season. According to RCI, January, February and March at these resorts are red weeks.

I find it hard to believe that no-one will request or has requested an exchange for those ski resorts for next February. Yet, if I put in a request against my spacebanked week, those resorts do not come up. Our resort's rating (based on the designations provided by RCI) is as good as the ratings of the two resorts in the Portes du Soleil, yet the exchange is not available.

In previous years, I have successfully exchanged red weeks at my resort (even though they were summer weeks at a ski resort) for January and February weeks at European ski resorts, including one of the Portes du Soleil resorts. I have asked RCI

if I would get better exchanges if I deposit ski season red weeks rather than summer red weeks and have been told it does not make any difference, the trading value should be the same. That, by the way, is contrary to advice I was given by RCA 10 or 15 years ago. So what goes on here?

Barbara Loughman

loughmax@yahoo.com

As members of RCI for more than 20 years (both weeks and points programs) we were appalled that RCI was using timeshare deposits for resale. When we entered into the contract with RCI we did so expecting that we would be able to trade time at our resort with someone unknown to us for their time at their home resort. It was understood that our desires to go to other destinations was only limited by the desires of owners to trade their weeks for their desired destinations.

At no time were we told by timeshare or RCI representatives that we would be competed with RCI's ability to rent deposit weeks. We feel fairly certain that had we or others been notified of this "trap" we would have had second thoughts about timeshare purchases. When we tried to exchange for high demand places, such as Cancun, Myrtle Beach, Ocean City (MD), etc. and could not get them, we just assumed that either too many people wanted the same thing or the owners in those places did not desire to go anywhere else. Now, we have to wonder if RCI did not fulfill our request because they saved those weeks to rent for their own greed. This may also explain why friends of ours with other timeshare exchanges, such as Interval International (II), had no problems trading into these areas.

As a resolution, we think that anyone that wants a refund for RCI membership fees paid in the past 5 years and prepayments for future years should receive them from RCI. And, for those that want to remain with RCI, RCI should not be able to rent any deposited weeks prior to 60 days before the unit is available for use.

We mainly wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for going to bat for us. We did not learn about TimeSharing Today until last year this time. We immediately joined. And, every timeshare visit we carry a copy of your magazine with us and show it to friends and acquaintances we see there. We spend 6-8 weeks at the Cancun Clipper Club, and three weeks at different timeshares in Florida; that adds up to a lot of timeshare people.

The Tennants of Delaware

I certainly disagree with the opinion of RCI to the fact that our deposited week is only good for 31 days from the day of deposit, and then it is used for rental.

Since I have learned of this practice, I have/will no longer deposit until I am ready to trade. For the last 25 years I have been depositing up to 2 years before time. I have always been told I have better trading power, but as usual, I still have great difficulty getting the units & weeks I want. This is especially true since the present owners took over RCI, with their new method of trading.

I certainly disagree with the practice that RCI is allowed to rent deposited weeks. These weeks should always be available to members until they expire. Members own them & pay the maintenance fees for them.

I wonder what would happen if a member, after depositing his/her week, decided to go to his/her resort in that time period in the actual unit/week they own. They then find out that the unit/week is rented to a non member, not even associated with RCI.

Desmond Irving

This proposed settlement is just a beginning. I think weeks deposits should be only available for members exchange until a period of 90 days from check-in. What right does RCI have to rent these weeks and profit from them when the members paid full maintenance fees on them. Secondly, why should any of these proposed changes expire in 2 years. This is a slap on the wrist for RCI. Any changes should be permanent just as a matter of good business ethics. It appears RCI is arrogant and defiant about changes. Don't they realize there are many other qualified exchange companies for owners to choose from? Let's level the playing field.

Jeff and Ellie Hawks- Swartz Creek, MI

The whole settlement seems designed to get RCI out of a lawsuit to no benefit of RCI members. All aspects of a deposit into the system should be based on the date of use for the week not on date deposited. Under no circumstances should RCI be able to rent out deposited units unless the rental is subject to cancellation if a member wishes to exchange his/her deposit for that week or only within 30 days of the use date for any week deposited. Any changes to RCI's system should be permanent not just for 2 years in order to benefit members to any great extent.

Roger Bieber

It is difficult to believe that RCI can rent the owners time at all. To grant us one month from the date of deposit is of very little value since I schedule for my 5 grown children and it takes them at least 6 months to make up their minds where and when they can go. I probably could not keep track of that time schedule hence would do it later than that, thus losing priority to renters. A large portion of the rent monies should be reimbursed to the owners of the weeks i.e. at least 2/3.

RCI has created a large rental program that has impacted negatively on the ability of weeks members to make a good exchange. The provision for the 31 day hold for exchange only on weeks that are deposited more than a year in advance of the week's starting date is a positive partial solution. It should not be discontinued after two years as the same problems will recur and weeks members will again have difficulty booking an exchange. RCI is not negatively impacted. The provision should be made permanent. Additionally, Section II-C should also require that weeks deposited more than one year ahead of the starting date can only be placed in the rental pool 11 months before the starting date.

Marie (Nina) Nelson

President, Roundhouse Resort Vacation Plan Owners Association

The use of weeks exchanged 1 year in advance is not an acceptable solution to RCI renting weeks at all. In today's work environment and changing economics, it is not possible to plan vacations a year in advance. I can't even request a vacation at

work a year prior. When I purchased my week it was not communicated that RCI would ever have rentals and I was not required to plan my vacations a year in advance to use other resorts. If RCI can not use my week for another time share owner it should be able to sell my week 45 days prior to actual week owned(not 1 year)to another company and they can rent it out. RCI does not have any way to show owners that their rental weeks are not weeks deposited for owners to use.

Georgett Kerkvliet

I am opposed to the settlement as it is now written. I thought RCI's contention in the past was that the weeks up for rental were weeks that they acquired in other ways, such as provided by developers, or last minute weeks for which they had no exchange requests.

Now it appears that they were renting deposited weeks all along. And the settlement still gives them the right to rent deposited weeks with very few restrictions. Why is that fair?? We deposit weeks expecting that they will be available to others for exchange, and that the weeks others deposit will be available for exchange to us. I wonder what percentage of deposited weeks are made before a year before the start of the week? To do requires payment of maintenance ahead of the due date, and the constant rise of maintenance costs is a problem for many. And even then under the settlement, the week is available without rental for only ONE MONTH. Who ever asked for this type of settlement??

The other aspect that is not addressed at all is that the deposited weeks are made available for points owners, but not vice-versa.

I think the settlement should specify that weeks deposited are available only for exchange to weeks owners until perhaps 3 months before the start date.

Currently I am looking for another exchange company with fairer rules.

Beverly B. Granger

After 20+ years of membership with RCI and traveling around the world, I've STOPPED depositing weeks with them. It makes NO difference what they claim they will do for you. They are deceitful liars which is all the rage with business in America these days. For the last few years I've used RCI only for the "last call" bargain's. TST has helped me to shift towards other companies who provide a list up front of what they can do for me, not just the hope of a possible exchange. Tina Danner in NC.

Strongly disagree. Timeshares were promoted and sold based in large part on the exclusive availability to deposit and trade. For several years this was a very satisfying and workable arrangement. Now it has become; Deposit but no trades available.

The RCI members are not being served by a 31 day window that has nothing to do with their vacation plans. A better arrangement would to maintain full availability of deposits at least until a reasonable time before the use date (30, 60 or 90 days).

The current situation with RCI is a complete opposite to their intended purpose and will lead to an RCI failure and collapse. I stopped depositing my weeks about 5 years ago and other

members will do the same. What's the benefit? I didn't buy my timeshares to give to RCI for a rental business. Robert Hunt

I think that RCI should hold deposited weeks even longer for exchange purposes. (much, much longer) As a property manager I frequently see the frustration of owners seeking available inventory.

Calder Smoot, 4 Seasons At Beech

I think it should be illegal for RCI to rent weeks that quickly (31 days from date of deposit). I know the company doesn't want a total loss on properties that don't exchange well but I believe they are abusing the owners that deposit with the expectation of getting something in return. If they have weeks that won't readily exchange, then they should give some incentive the owners first, to try to get unused inventory moved .

Dave Single

Not much of positive change with this new policy other than it demonstrates clearly that they are using deposited weeks for rental purposes.

That would be ok but only if they did it in the last 30 days before the date of the deposited week commences.

If they insist on using deposited weeks for their rental program, it would only be fair that all their rentable weeks, no matter from what source (developers etc.) ,should be available for exchange on the same basis that exchange weeks are available to their rental program . So under their proposed new policy any week they have listed to rent would be available to the exchange program unless it was deposited with them more than a year in advance and then it would be available exclusively to the rental program for only 31 days.

That would put everyone on the same footing and eliminate seeing weeks available for rent but not for exchange.

My first preference would still be for exchange weeks to stay exclusively in the exchange program until a month before the use date, however if they refuse that or a fair alternative, then we as exchangers have a number of options about where to deposit our weeks.

Peter Jackson

RCI is again playing games with the members. Their proposal means nothing. They have not addressed the real issue of never having suitable accommodations for the members. You are told there is nothing available at the time you want it, or you are forced to take some smaller, less attractive unit. In the 25 years I have paid for membership in RCI, I can count on one hand the number of times that I received a 2 bedroom unit. I was always forced to take a one bedroom.

Jane Brown, Oakland, CA

The time should be "31 weeks" NOT "31 days" for the holding period.

Ian White in Canada.

We also have been members of RCI for 25 years. We are appalled at this news that RCI nearly immediately puts our deposits

up for rent. We own weeks, not points, and have had a very difficult time obtaining locations we wish to go. Now we know why. What trading power did we ever have by "depositing early?"

Also then, what is the purpose of putting in a "search" for further travel? If a unit is only avail. for exchange for 31 days---I can not believe this. We all paid thousands for our timeshares; those who rent our units pay a hotel cost. Now, RCI has also raised the domestic and international exchange fees to the same:::\$189.00. This is outrageous, and we plan to bank with other companies listed in your magazine from now on.

So, it looks like renters are in units we wish to trade into. This is disgusting, and could even appear illegal, as our units are deeded property.

We are so thrilled a class action lawsuit was filed. We definitely want to voice our opinion, be included, and will send the letters.

Eugene and Kay Pask

The more I read about each of the RCI settlement issues the more angry I get! The whole thing is so one-sided in favor of RCI. Even this settlement is being turned into a farce. RCI should not be allowed, at any time, to take a deposited week and offer it for rent inside OR especially outside the timesharing community. The deposited weeks inventory should be used exclusively for others who have deposited their week into the pool. All the reasons RCI uses as an excuse for putting timeshare weeks up for rental is just a bunch of BS! If it wasn't you wouldn't have so many angry people out there who can't get an exchange week equal to the one(s) they deposited. There are times when we wish we had never heard about timesharing let alone buy into what we thought was a great vacation concept.

Carol & Ray Kindt

DEPOSITED WEEKS SHOULD ONLY BE FOR TRADING----NOT FOR RENTING!!!

Marion B. Harvey and Todd Alexander

While the proposed solution is a step forward, it does not fully address the problem. Suggest that deposited weeks be held for exchange until some time prior to the date the week starts, either 180 or 90 days. This would allow ample time for the unit to be picked up on an exchange and would also allow ample time for the unit to be rented by RCI to recoup their investment in the traded unit. It is unreasonable to expect these units to be held for exchange until just prior to the occupancy date, but most renters will not be looking for units until 180 to 90 days from the desired travel date. It seems like this is a reasonable compromise for the needs of the RCI clients and the company. I would also suggest that at the start of the rental period the units be kept in the exchange pool, allowing for a maximum opportunity for that unit to be used. As soon as a suggested rental or trade is indicated the unit would go in a hold status pending completion of the trade or rent.

Jim Hanzelka

I am opposed to the RCI change of how weeks are deposited into the system.

I do not believe exchanged weeks should be rented...the purpose is for exchanges only; I do not believe it creates a fair exchange market when a potential exchange owner is competing with potential paying renter. I also do not believe that there should be a two year time limit, it should continue indefinitely. Many timeshare holders have enjoyed that benefit for years and we should continue to have that ability. I understand that potentially the idea of these changes is to encourage owners to use exchanged weeks faster rather than "banking" them, however that is not how putting a time limit could potentially cause owners to lose out rather than gain and it could create hard feelings. Let's not forget who the owners are and the purpose of serving them.

Brea Coronado

Val Chatelle Property Owner and Board Member

Deposited weeks should only be available for exchanges with other RCI members. For them to rent a week at a resort when I have an active search that qualifies for that resort, is just plain theft. It is dishonorable, dishonest, unethical, greedy, unfair and should be punishable as a felony.

Charles Myers

I do not feel RCI should offer exchanges for rental until 30 days from date of exchange.

Don Terman

We think the RCI proposal is ridiculous! They are giving up nothing. While it is reasonable to allow them to rent out weeks that are not claimed by exchangers, this should be only on a last minute basis. We think a more reasonable policy would be this: Weeks that are deposited for exchange should be available ONLY for exchange until 60 days in advance of the start date. Then from 60 days to the start date, that time could be simultaneously available to renters or exchangers on a first come, first served basis.

Deposited weeks cost RCI nothing, and they should remain the property of the "exchanger" until it is evident that they are truly excess property. Since by definition, a deposit for exchange implies a transaction between two parties, RCI is only acting as an intermediary. Something is truly amiss if large numbers of condominium users give up their weeks without gaining a week in exchange. Siphoning off some of the most attractive units for rentals may explain why increasing numbers of would-be exchangers are frustrated by RCI's failure to provide satisfactory exchange units.

RCI should be able to have a reasonable number of rental units available by using only those provided by developers for promotional purposes.

It is very frustrating to hear from fellow teachers and retired teachers that they can rent units in our condo complexes at less cost than we pay in maintenance fees. We have been timeshare owners since 1986, and the promise of easy exchanges was a major factor for our original purchase. Thanks for bringing this to our attention.

Fred and Sharon Altman

I cannot believe that the Courts are demanding that RCI make these changes for only 2 years. These are logical changes

that should be made permanent. What is the thinking behind the 2-year ruling?

Barbara Federman

I am not impressed with the terms of the settlement. It seems to be a token concession when taken down to the individual owner level. A "guarantee" of 31 days of exchange status is only relevant at the time the exchange is sought, not when it is deposited. I rarely can use the weeks I have at their designated time (life changes since I bought them), so they are always deposited for exchange. While that gives someone else a shot at my weeks for the 31 days, success is contingent on when the weeks are sought or setting up an ongoing search with RCI (which you have to pay the exchange for at that point).

If I deposit my Memorial Day week in the preceding January, then one would have to attempt the exchange then in order to have a chance at that week. If you decide in March that you want a week at that time, it may already be in the rental pool (and rented).

Since most of my vacations are planned just 1-2 months ahead of the trip, I don't see any real gain in the terms of the RCI settlement. Just like RCI will not take deposits less than 30 days before the week begins, I think deposits should stay in the exchange pool until 30-60 days before the week begins so that weeks owners have a reasonable chance to make the exchange.

My own resort was purchased by Diamond Resorts and while I have managed an exchange for one week this June, there is nothing else in the RCI pool, yet there are rentals listed on the resort website aplenty--probably points owners since they are trying to get the weeks owners to roll over to points.

Lewis Woodard, Jr.

I do not think the settlement is fair. Under no circumstances should RCI be able to rent units that should be available to its members. If someone decides at the last minute to exchange, the inventory would no longer be available. It is nice that we are getting \$20 or \$30 back, but that is a mere pittance in relation to the fees we have paid over the years. I have been successful with getting what I want overall with RCI, and I like that you can book 2 years in advance. However, the practice of renting inventory and the termination of the proposed settlement in 2 years are not acceptable to me. Susan Lesick

I do object to RCI renting deposited weeks except during the last sixty days of availability.

I can understand why owners want to rent their own time shares because they would get the money rather than RCI. I also feel that there aren't as many time shares available now that you are renting out weeks in stead of having them used in the traditional exchange program.

Patricia Brown

Betty Jenkins

I have some major concerns about the proposed RCI class action lawsuit settlement:

1. The holding period of 31 days is way too short.
 2. The change of rule is only valid only for two years.
 3. The proposal still allows RCI to rent properties placed
-

for exchange, and thus limit what is available for members to exchange into.

This proposal is ridiculously inadequate and in no way addresses the owners' reasons for the lawsuit.

David R. Owen

Timeshare exchange basics explained to me more than 20 years ago indicated that the earlier you deposited your week the better your chance of getting an exchange that you want. The new proposed change is saying that the earlier we deposit our time the more chance it will be put in the rental bank. "The week shall be available for exchange and not for rentals for a period of 31 days". The policy I have been following is: to deposit-maintenance fees must be up to date. I usually don't deposit my week until the fees have been paid. This should give RCI 6 months to a year to use my week. RCI states that I can use this deposited time to choose a week up to 2 years from the date of the vacation week -not the date of the deposit. I was told when I joined, more than 20 years ago, that the earlier I deposit and request- the better chance I have to get the resort/resort area of my choice. I have been realistic also and know that some areas are in higher demand than others.

My understanding is that areas have been rented by RCI to the members that should have been allowed to exchange into same area. A member that is in good standing and requests properly should not be denied the exchange yet offered a rental. A time restraint should be nearer the day of use - if the time is not being used or asked for by 120-60 days then rent it. That gives 4 months for RCI to use the week as they want.

Lynda Pallone

Here are my thoughts on the proposed changes

1. I think any week deposited in the exchange system should remain in the exchange system. Possibly it could be placed in the rental system at a late date--45 days prior to starting date??? That way, RCI could still reap a potential profit from "unused" weeks. Most renters are looking late anyway. In addition, could it potentially be in both places until one or the other occurred? That way if an exchanger wanted a late "getaway" it would still be available for exchange, which is what it should be in as an exchange deposit anyway.

Many people do not or can not plan that far in advance. I believe that was the problem in the first place. Weeks placed in the exchange system were transferred to the rental system and nothing was left for exchange. So how is this new proposal any different than what RCI was doing in the first place that caused this suit?

2. This should be a permanent change. Otherwise, what punishment has RCI incurred? And what will keep this from happening in the future?

Denise Ward
