

Summary/Interpretation GLA Road & Weed Committee Meeting 5-4-2016

Glastonbury Landowners For Positive Change

This Summary/Interpretation of the GLA Road and Weed Committee Meeting May 4, 2016 is offered as a volunteer service by the GLFPC

Your suggestions are welcome, should there be oversights or errors.

Key Points:

- The GLA may be spending an unprecedented amount of our money on roads this season.
- If the Board decides to use an estimated \$40,000 in unallocated savings, in addition to the already allocated amount for annual road maintenance, then the committee will spend a total of \$100,000 on both South Glastonbury (SG) and North Glastonbury (NG) roads.
- According to inconclusive verbal estimates, the basic cost to grade roads, purchase, haul and distribute three inches of gravel, and roll it, totals at least \$17,500/mile.
- There was a move to vote to hire Paul Rantallos choice of road contractors. The vote did not take place.
- One landowner presented a detailed maintenance plan for SG roads. Board members in attendance requested that this landowner design a similar plan for NG roads.
- The Board is considering levying road impact assessments on community businesses.
- The committee did not act on Ed Dobrowski's proposal to create road districts.
- A single board member is drafting a new Road Policy.
- Park County is scheduled this summer to chip seal Dry Creek Road.

Summary and Interpretation

The Road and Weed Committee held a follow-up meeting on the evening of May 4, 2016, just nine days after the previous one. In attendance were eight of the board

members out of a committee of eleven, along with the Board president, treasurer, and numerous landowners.

Our Covenants mandate that the GLA Board maintain all roads. To finance this requirement, there is about \$62,500 in the 2016 Road Budget. Additionally, the board expects to tap the last of GLA's unallocated savings, which is approximately \$40,000. Due to a landowner's advice to pay off the road loan last year, surplus road money is now available. The Board aims to spend nearly \$50,000 on NG and \$50,000 on SG roads.

This committee still has not prioritized repairs or formulated a comprehensive Road Plan to take care of the 18.5 actual miles of our deteriorating road network. Which of our roads will be tended to first? What are the needs most critical? On the roster: Annual spring grading and gravel work, washboard blading, brand new ditches cut, current ones cleared, culverts cleaned out, missing signs replaced, and more snow posts counted, purchased, and installed. What about the sinking guardrail on Hercules near Suicide Curve? Lower Gemini Hill needs a guardrail to curtail a series of accidents. Last year's crack sealing of the NG Loop has failed, yet again, enabling more water saturation to further damage the roads. Patchwork repairs are required, potholes must be filled in, and boulders need be removed from our gravel roadbeds. Dust control to prevent erosion on our gravel roads, perhaps? A backup snowplow truck?

By consensus, the committee expects to hire local road contractor, Gene Lembcke, of Emigrant. Paul Rantallo, one of the three co-chairs on the Road Committee, reported that Lembcke has the appropriate equipment to carve and clean ditches fairly quickly. Lembcke uses a road mix from Durgan Rock Pile, a neighborhood quarry. This more expensive mixture is comprised of crushed angular gravel and basalt clay, which packs better and is less prone to washboarding, it was claimed.

Quoting numbers from Lembcke, the cost to grade, roll, and gravel a three-inch layer on one mile of dirt road is at least \$17,500, Rantallo guesstimated. Lembcke's rate is \$135/hr., although equipment and gravel charges bring the total up to about \$555/hour. Using the water truck, cleaning culverts, and digging ditches demand additional associated fees. In conclusion, Rantallo revised his final calculations to indicate, "That probably only one mile in NG and one mile in SG could be completed for the \$62,500 in this year's Road Budget." Because the committee discussion focused on verbal reports from Rantallo, meeting attendees were left to conclude that Lembcke's estimated costs and claims were also verbal. Documentation was not available.

Further discussion included fixing the sinking guardrail on Hercules, replacing missing snow posts and signs in SG, and controlling the dust on gravel roads. In NG, topics were: bids for the sump pump on Capricorn, repairing the damaged section at the top of the north hill, replacing missing signs, and determining the most cost-effective and/or best solution for the accident-prone hill on lower Gemini. If there is any new guardrail installation it will have to be piggybacked onto the next local job to secure a price reduction. Mountain West Holdings Company in Billings is the outfit of choice. The final topic of discussion was the failing 3.20 miles of asphalt road on the NG Loop. Board

Secretary and committee member Charlene Murphy brought up the need to start saving money for future chip sealing. Years ago, landowners paid \$120,000 for the process. A landowner stated, "The NG loop could very well prove to be the most expensive project of all, if you really look at." Murphy replied, "Oh, definitely."

It was decided that, in the next couple of days, the board would vote by email for use of the \$40,000 in unallocated savings towards road maintenance. It was noted that \$12,000 needs to be set aside for fall "touch-up" grading and that more assessments should be coming in. The committee is counting on future payments of uncollected monies from delinquent accounts.

Questioning followed about the lack of due process concerning bidding and written job specifications for such a "huge amount of money." GLA Vice-President and committee co-chair Dennis Riley, one other co-chair, and present landowners addressed this concern. Murphy said, "It is not practical to gather (other) bids." She explained that there are basically only two road contractors in this area and that contractors from outside the area are not interested in working on GLA roads. The board loosely agreed to let Lembcke begin before the May 18th Board meeting, even though Murphy repeatedly pushed for a phone or email vote.

Next, a landowner presented his "South Glastonbury Road Maintenance Request for 2016," listing the maintenance needs for both the high and low sections of South Glastonbury. He prioritized the whole spectrum in great detail, allocating the \$31,250 for SG roads in the 2016 GLA Budget. With his plan, everybody gets some maintenance and gravel over time, while preserving their investment. An attendee requested that this landowner also devise a plan for NG. He agreed, stating that it would be ready the next day.

GLFPC Note: You may view both of his Road Maintenance Requests here:

South Glastonbury:

<http://glastonbury.freeforums.net/thread/280/south-glastonbury-road-maintenance-request>

North Glastonbury:

<http://glastonbury.freeforums.net/thread/281/north-glastonbury-road-maintenance-request>

The committee proceeded to open its very first public discussion on levying road impact assessments for businesses operating within Glastonbury. One committee member claimed that businesses impact GLA roads more than residential traffic. Landowners raised various concerns: year-round damage from all kinds of heavy equipment, increased traffic generated by clientele of private practitioners, non-landowners accessing their properties that border Glastonbury or just going to work. What about future commercial and subdivision development surrounding private lands not bound by our Covenants, and thus, exempt from paying assessments?

Riley questioned, "How are you going to structure something like this? On what are you going to base assessing businesses?" Some reasoned that road impact fees on businesses are for the Finance Committee to manage, but others said the Road Committee should. Others suggested the implementation of road-use agreements for non-members who drive on GLA roads. Then committee member Gerald Dubiel asserted, "If you ever open them up to the county, you will have one hell of a mess! Do not allow those roads to be public. Believe me!" One knowledgeable landowner elaborated on how to keep our roads private by withdrawing previously granted easements. Another landowner pointed out, "You need to have a whole discussion, a special meeting. You have not explored this yet. You do not have a context in which to start planning this out. You need a big discussion, first with the Board."

Meantime, Dobrowski, pushing for the additional new business assessment, focused on one particular business owner in attendance. He claimed that she is not paying her fair share for her employees' use of the roads. The landowner categorically and factually countered Dobrowski's accusations. There were no further comments.

Next, Dobrowski brought up his Road Districts Proposal that he had introduced at the previous week's Road and Weed Meeting. The discussion ceased when a landowner stated, "You must improve planning and landowner participation to decide where the money goes. There is still no cohesive long-range plan." End of conversation.

GLFPC Note: *The board continues to ignore landowners' requests to have an objective analysis done by a professional road engineer and a written long-term maintenance plan before proceeding with so costly an endeavor. From the previous committee meeting of 4/25/16: Co-chairman Dobrowski declared, "A civil engineer would cost us \$1500-\$1800 for a road analysis and that it would be \$300,000 a mile to redo the old asphalt. Assessments will never cover it." Following, numerous landowners insisted there is a definite need to have a professional objective analysis and maintenance plan before any money is poured into our roads.*

Moving on to the GLA Road Policy brought conflicting views to the surface. Board members hold different interpretations of both the policy, and the attorney's legal advice. A number of board members claim the policy is partially misaligned with our Covenants. Certain others think the criteria that have been followed are off base. Is the policy fair to all? Why is there an inclusion for Dry Creek Road? It belongs to Park County.

It was soon revealed that a single Board member, Dan Kehoe, is drafting a new Road Policy. Landowners commented: "What committee is Dan working under?" "We have heard nothing. How do landowners find out about this new proposal? I have never seen anything that I can relate to?" "There is no information to landowners." "Why is he acting independently? Why is he doing this and not the Road Committee Chairs?" "When is an answer going to be provided in writing?" Murphy jumped in, saying, "Dan is skilled at this and is tightening up the wording."

The final announcement of the meeting came from director and committee member Kevin Newby. Having spoken with a Park County official just that morning, Newby confirmed that Dry Creek Road is scheduled to be chip sealed this summer. Everyone applauded. He added that their patch crew would repair the pothole and clean out the culverts.

This two-hour plus meeting ended, thereafter.

***GLFPC Note:** During the deliberation of what roads would get what level of service and how, one landowner, then another, volunteered to donate a truckload or two, and even four loads of gravel. The committee invited others to follow suit. These are generous donations, especially when we have such a hefty amount of our budget going to admin/accounting services and legal expenditures. At the same time, the board is in a legally questionable process of forgiving a huge portion of accumulated interest and penalties on unpaid assessments, while inventing ways to add assessments to those landowners who do pay. Shame on these board members!*

[Glastonbury Landowners For Positive Change](#)