

GLA Road Committee Approves Fall Work, but Questions About Fairness and Accountability Remain

October 5, 2026 meeting reveals pressure to make decisions, uneven scrutiny of road priorities, and unfinished business involving road safety and public money.

Provided by the [Glastonbury Community Forum \[1\]](#)

Attendance

- Road Committee members present at the opening: Walter Wunsch (official chair), Zane Curry (GLA president), Scott Stomierowski, Jack Sutton, and Guy Gravert.
- Road Committee member who joined later: Tyson Wright. He initially experienced audio difficulties.
- Road Committee members absent for the entire meeting: None. [10]
- Other directors present: James Timmer, Debbie Newby, Jaylyn J. Jensen, Lance Rushmeyer, and Steve Anderson. Wunsch, Curry, Stomierowski, and Wright also serve on the Board.
- Visiting landowners: Tim Brockett, Claudette Dirkers, Caroline “Cappi” Schneider, and Joe Bezotsky.

Decisions Made—and Questions Left Open

The Glastonbury Landowners Association’s October 5, 2026, Road Committee meeting produced practical decisions: a North Glastonbury fall road maintenance plan, a recommendation for nearly \$51,000 in South Glastonbury work, and a recommended North snowplowing contractor. But it also exposed weaknesses in how the Association explains its priorities, checks the eligibility of roads receiving work, and preserves information about unfinished projects.

Walter Wunsch is the official Road Committee chair. In this meeting, however, Zane Curry acted as the de facto chair. He called the Zoom meeting to order at 6:34 pm., led much of the discussion, presented and revised the spending worksheet, handled motions and votes, announced results, assigned follow-up work, and brought the meeting to a close. The amount of discussion he led and the decisions he directed support that characterization; it is an assessment of his role in this meeting, not a claim that the committee formally changed its chair. Questions from Debbie Newby and former director and road chair Claudette Dirkers materially shaped the discussion.

Curry acknowledged that an agenda had not been distributed in time. He initially described one topic, then identified two: fall maintenance and winter snowplowing. The absence of an advance agenda mattered. Landowners were being asked to follow spending proposals, road classifications, and contractor estimates as Curry edited a spreadsheet during the meeting. A published agenda and final worksheet would have made those decisions easier to understand and review, while openly inviting more landowners.

The meeting was productive, but productivity alone does not establish that the resulting choices were fair or adequately supported.

North Glastonbury: Scope, Timing, and Oversight

North's available maintenance and reserve funds were presented as \$34,795.23. Curry said the Board had already authorized spending up to \$24,795.23, which would leave \$10,000 if the entire authorization were used. Proposed work included regrading and rolling previously treated roads, culvert work, and maintenance on additional roads.

Wunsch questioned whether Venus and Mercury needed the proposed four loads of gravel each. He favored grading and rolling without any additional material and wanted a secondary look at the roads. Curry emphasized the contractor's experience and the approaching October 17 or 19 start date. He opposed delaying for another meeting, said committee members had possessed the estimates for weeks, and stated that he would not be available for another meeting.

There was a reasonable scheduling concern behind his position. Fall weather and contractor availability impose real limits. Nevertheless, Curry's response can fairly be described as impatient and dismissive of further road inspection. A committee member's request to verify conditions was treated principally as an obstacle to reaching a decision that evening.

That distinction matters because the committee's job includes questioning proposals. Estimates supplied in advance are useful, but they do not eliminate the value of checking whether the proposed work is even necessary.

The committee eventually agreed to four loads of gravel overall, with contractor Randy Traucht given discretion to deposit them as he moved from primary to secondary to other roads. Curry announced unanimous approval. This compromise reduced the disputed gravel quantity, while placing considerable judgment in the contractor's hands.

Contractor judgment is valuable. It should still operate within clear limits: eligible road segments, agreed priorities, quantities, and a spending ceiling. Curry confirmed that the North spending amount had already been approved by the Board in September, leaving the Road Committee to finalize where and how to allocate it. The final adopted worksheet should accompany the minutes as they are made known.

South Glastonbury: Scrutiny Changes the Plan

South Glastonbury's figures presented a different problem. Its remaining maintenance budget was reported as zero (0.00), while its road reserve balance stood at \$60,791.94. The committee recommended \$50,791.94 in fall work, leaving \$10,000 in reserves, if approved and spent as proposed. Curry said a further Board email vote was necessary. The committee's vote was therefore a *recommendation* at the time of the meeting.

An initial South package of \$44,200 grew to include partial Sagittarius Skyway work. Then, Newby challenged the proposed \$9,600 allocation for the remaining approximately 0.6-mile Arcturus stretch. She pointed out that the policy's primary designation ended at Sunshine Place and said her regular walks did not support the full proposed expenditure.

Here Curry was receptive. Following discussion with Newby, Sutton, and Stomierowski, he reduced the Arcturus allocation to \$4,800 and redirected the difference to Skyway. The total recommendation stayed

at \$50,791.94. The South screenshot records the reduced \$4,800 Arcturus allocation and \$11,391.94 for partial Skyway work. It also retains a “10 loads of gravel” note beside Arcturus despite halving its dollar allocation; the final instructions should clarify whether that quantity remained intended. This was a useful example of scrutiny improving a spending proposal.

The following amounts are transcribed from the South screenshot.

South Glastonbury fall roadwork	Allocation
Regrade and roll spring work	\$7,800.00
Culvert work	\$3,000.00
Arcturus end beyond Hesperus/Sunshine	\$4,800.00
Aquila	\$1,800.00
Leo Drive	\$7,200.00
Upper Hercules from Goldmeyer to Skyway start	\$13,600.00
Virgo	\$1,200.00
Partial Sagittarius Skyway	\$11,391.94
Total	\$50,791.94

The screenshot lists the partial Skyway roadwork as starting at Skyway’s beginning and extending to the Kassing property, with Road Committee coordination involving High Country Excavation and Gravert’s recommendation. This maintenance allocation should be distinguished from the separate obligations for the unfinished road widening project discussed below.

It also showed why the original estimates needed scrutiny. A substantial allocation and the road’s classification changed after someone questioned them. Other proposals deserved the same willingness to reconsider.

Road Eligibility and Uneven Review

That willingness was less evident when Dirkers raised a question about Bradford Way after the North vote. She said it was not a platted road according to the Covenants and was not mentioned in the adopted 2026 GLA Road Policy, either. Curry explained that he had asked the contractor to inspect every road and included the resulting estimate. He acknowledged the possibility of spending the approximately \$1,000 elsewhere, including on platted Caspari Way East, but said the voted plan would proceed, regardless.

His explanation answered how Bradford entered the spreadsheet. It did not resolve whether limited Association funds should be spent there. The committee did not verify Bradford’s legal status or identify a separate basis for maintaining it during that exchange.

Dirkers raised the issue late, after an opportunity for North comments and a vote. That timing helps explain Curry’s reluctance to restart the discussion. Even so, the merits of an eligibility question do not

disappear because it arrives after a vote. His response was procedurally rigid and insufficiently responsive to the underlying concern. A brief check of the governing documents, maps, and Board authorization would have provided a stronger answer than simply relying on the decision already made.

Curry's treatment of participants was not uniformly dismissive. He invited committee and landowner comments, worked around Wright's audio difficulties, thanked Newby for her challenge, acknowledged interrupting Dirkers during the Skyway discussion, and accepted several follow-up suggestions. He also offered Caroline "Cappi" Schneider an opportunity to comment and made clear that she did not have to do so.

The overall impression is of a president who prepared the numbers and wanted results, but who sometimes let his determination to finish narrow the discussion. He was capable of listening and changing course. The concern is the uneven application of that openness: some objections changed the plan, while others were closed down before their substance was resolved.

Fairness, Funding, and Fiduciary Duties

The broader fairness question extends beyond any single exchange. The Forum's ["Road Maintenance Mileage Decreased Substantially"](#) [2] reports that spring work covered only a minority of the gravel-road network and argues that maintenance favored roads traveled by Curry and Wunsch. Those are the article's allegations and interpretations; the October 5 meeting does not independently establish favoritism.

Curry acknowledged living in upper South Glastonbury and argued that sections there were badly deteriorated. He also said his own road, Sagittarius Place, had received no Association spending because it served too few people. Gravert supported work on deteriorated lower sections of Hercules and Skyway, while discouraging extensive work farther uphill past his own residence.

Statements by committee members do not remove the need for consistent standards. Traffic, road condition, drainage, safety, and available funding should be categorically documented for each proposed project. Otherwise, the strongest advocate—or the person most familiar with a particular road—can have more influence than a comparable need elsewhere.

The governing documents recognize both responsibility and limits. Covenant §8.01(c) provides for a private road system serving the community's parcels and permits different maintenance levels according to terrain, weather, drainage, resources, and other conditions. Section 8.01(h) expressly limits the obligation by assessment funding. The Covenants do not promise identical work on every road every year.

But Covenant §11.05 makes road maintenance, repair, and snowplowing the first priority for annual assessment funds. It also requires responsible accounting and makes the Association a fiduciary in allocating and using those funds. Bylaws Article II.B. identifies road maintenance and control as Association purposes. [8, 9]

These provisions support prioritization within a limited budget. They also require a defensible explanation of how the wider road system is being served. Counting residences is one useful consideration; it does not, by itself, answer a safety or access problem on a lightly traveled road.

The Forum's ["North Glastonbury Shorted Thousands of Dollars"](#) [3] raises a related accounting issue. It calculates \$36,971 in unspent 2025 operating road funds after separating reportedly reserve-funded widening projects from maintenance expenditures. It asks where that money went and whether its road designation remained intact.

That calculation requires reconciliation with the underlying financial records. A reserve-funded expense can properly appear on a profit-and-loss report; its funding source does not automatically make its expense classification incorrect. Likewise, an unspent budget allocation is not necessarily a matching pot of restricted cash. The necessary explanation is how expenses, reserve transfers, available cash, and remaining designations fit together.

The meeting screenshots add a concrete reason to reconcile the records. North's spring figures—\$22,255.23 for road work and \$4,768.54 for magnesium chloride—match those supplied in the Forum maintenance article. South's screenshot instead lists \$42,670.84 and \$26,067.70, totaling \$68,738.54. However, the article reports \$51,670.84 and \$21,294.16, totaling \$72,965.00. The South totals differ by \$4,226.46, with larger differences within the two categories. Different reporting dates, corrections, or classifications may explain this. These are reported figures requiring reconciliation, not proof of lost money. [2]

The October 5 meeting did not provide that reconciliation or resolve the alleged movement of North funds for South's benefit. It presented current balances. Bylaws Article VI.B.13 requires businesslike financial records, and Covenant §11.05 supplies the standard for responsible use of assessment funds. Landowners deserve a clear account connecting the 2025 closing figures to the 2026 balances used to justify current choices. Neither the funding disparity nor the meeting alone establishes that money was missing or improperly diverted.

Drainage and Recurring Maintenance Risk

Drainage was another important subject. Gravert described rain running down the center of Hercules and washing gravel away. His recommendation emphasized crowning and directing water off the roadway. The proposed work included \$1,000 for North culverts and \$3,000 for South culverts—useful responses to drainage concerns raised in the Forum's maintenance article.

Yet the discussion did not establish a comprehensive inspection and culvert cleaning schedule. Replacing washed-away material without correcting the drainage that moved it risks paying repeatedly for the same problem.



Background photograph from the Forum's maintenance article, which attributes Hercules erosion to a clogged roadside ditch. It does not establish road conditions on October 5. [4]

Skyway Settlement and Contractor Coordination

Skyway's unfinished road widening project raises a particularly troubling question about Curry's judgment. Guy Gravert was not simply a knowledgeable volunteer offering to help. He was a plaintiff in the dispute over the Association's widening work beside his property. According to the background supplied to the Forum, he sued after GLA attempted to widen Sagittarius Skyway beyond his driveway along his property boundary.

The supplied settlement identifies Guy Gravert, Michelle Gravert, and the Michelle R. Hasken General Trust as plaintiffs, and Tim Brockett and GLA as defendants. It identifies the case as DV-34-2025-147 in Park County's Montana Sixth Judicial District Court. Its recitals say the case was filed October 8, 2025, a temporary restraining order was issued October 17, and mediation occurred November 24, 2025. [7]

The document sets out specific responsibilities. Under §1(A)(1), GLA is to hire Gaston Engineering Inc. to identify and mark construction disturbances outside the easement and to mark the easement boundaries of the remaining road segment, including discrepancies with the plaintiffs' markings. Section 1(A)(2) addresses preservation of one-foot-diameter trees unless removal is necessary for a 23-foot roadbed. Sections 1(A)(4)–(6) require remediation of identified disturbances outside the easement with topsoil and seed, as soon as reasonable.

Gravert has his own specified task: mark the easement boundary using the survey stakes, as soon as practical. The contractor is permitted to begin work once the plaintiffs mark that boundary and the temporary restraining order is dissolved. The plaintiffs also agree to request dissolution of the order and dismiss their complaint without prejudice.

Most importantly, relevant to the October 5 discussion, §1(B)(2) states: "Plaintiffs agree that they will not communicate verbally or in writing with the Association's contractor." [7]

Yet Curry asked Gravert to work with Randy Traucht on a plan for the same unfinished widening area, including timing and spending. Gravert accepted and offered to perform some work himself.

Immediately, Claudette Dirkers cited the court-ordered settlement agreement between the 2025 GLA Board and Mr. Gravert et al. Curry made that assignment while saying he had not obtained a copy of the court-ordered settlement agreement.

The Forum considers this an ill-advised arrangement. Asking a plaintiff to coordinate directly with the Association's contractor appears inconsistent with the agreement's express separation of those roles, unless a later written amendment or a materially different scope of work permits that arrangement. It also places an interested property owner in a position to influence the scope and timing of the project he challenged. This could be construed as a conflict of interest. Cooperation with that owner may be necessary, but cooperation should follow the agreement's process and preserve independent Association oversight.

The concern is reinforced by Gravert's statements at the meeting that the unfinished work did not need to be addressed that fall [2025] and that he wanted to avoid unnecessary spending by either GLA or himself. Those statements do not prove that he intends to prevent completion. They do show why relying on him to develop the next plan offers little assurance of prompt completion. In the Forum's view, Curry's assignment risks prolonging the delay rather than resolving it.

The document also says amendments must be in writing and executed by each party (§5). A committee conversation is therefore not the written amendment the document describes. Before any direct contractor coordination, the Board should establish the operative agreement, verify the restraining order's status and boundary-marking prerequisites, and obtain advice on how the proposed arrangement fits those terms.

The Forum confirms that all parties signed the legally-binding settlement and that the court accepted it. The court's acceptance does not make the contractor-communication provision disappear. Before proceeding, the Board should identify any later written amendment or court direction that would authorize a different arrangement.

Nor does the text set a calendar deadline to finish all road widening. Its express timing provisions include boundary marking as soon as practical, remediation as soon as reasonable, and commencement conditions for the contractor. The committee needed to distinguish those responsibilities from ordinary grading. *Routine Skyway maintenance cannot simply be counted toward settlement compliance without identifying which specific obligation it fulfills.*

The appropriate next step is a Board-controlled plan, informed by the engineering requirements, with a named responsible person, a schedule, and documented checks of completion. The Association should not allow responsibility for its unfinished project to drift back to the plaintiff whose lawsuit interrupted it.

The Forum's ["GLA Road Policy Raises Safety Concerns"](#) [5] places these issues alongside the March 14, 2025 Crowley Fleck law firm opinion. That opinion concluded that GLA bears sole responsibility for its private road system and faces potential liability for failing to reasonably address known dangerous conditions. It also cautioned against shifting Association safety obligations onto selected landowners, subject to exceptions and the opinion's stated assumptions. [6]

The October 5 committee did not reconsider stop-sign removals or conduct the network engineering review discussed in that article. Those remain background issues. They explain why safety should inform maintenance priorities rather than be treated as a separate concern to address later.

Winter Plowing and Remaining Follow-Up

Winter planning produced a recommendation to retain Mike Dirkers for North snowplowing at \$175 per hour. South's quoted rate from Randy Traucht was \$125 per hour under its existing contractor arrangement. Those rates alone do not establish unequal value; equipment, coverage, and operating conditions also matter.

The discussion included automatic dispatch at four plus inches of snow, discretionary dispatch below that amount, backup equipment, sanding, and insurance documentation. Claudette Dirkers asked whether the contract would align with the 2026 Road Policy? Curry was initially taken aback, but agreed to review it with Stomierowski before Board submission. The final contract should identify covered roads and service expectations. Covenant §11.05 gives snowplowing, maintenance, and repair joint first priority; it does not list snowplowing ahead of the others, as participants recalled.

The committee made progress toward fall repairs and winter access. It also left landowners needing a final spending worksheet, a reconciliation of disputed road funds, verified road eligibility, a documented drainage plan, and follow-through on the Skyway court-ordered settlement agreement from one year ago.

The strongest criticism of the meeting is not that nothing was accomplished. It is that urgency and confidence sometimes stood in for actual verification. Curry demonstrated that he could accept correction. Applying that same openness consistently would help the Association explain its choices to everyone whose assessments support the community roads—including those still waiting for service.

Endnotes

1. Glastonbury Community Forum — provider of this summary. <https://glastonbury.freeforums.net/>
2. Glastonbury Community Forum, "Road Maintenance Mileage Decreased Substantially." Text supplied for this review. <https://glastonbury.freeforums.net/thread/2885/road-maintenance-mileage-decreased-substantially>
3. Glastonbury Community Forum, "North Glastonbury Shorted Thousands of Dollars." Text supplied for this review. <https://glastonbury.freeforums.net/thread/2909/north-glastonbury-shorter-thousands-dollars>
4. Background roadway photograph reproduced from the Forum maintenance article. <https://www.timslife.com/Forum/2026/images/road01.png>
5. Glastonbury Community Forum, "GLA Road Policy Raises Safety Concerns." Text supplied for this review. <https://glastonbury.freeforums.net/thread/2903/gla-road-policy-raises-safety>
6. Crowley Fleck PLLP, March 14, 2025, "Road Liability Issues in Glastonbury." Opinion reviewed from the supplied source copy. Linked public copy: <https://www.glamontana.info/downloads/roadqanda.pdf>

7. "Settlement Agreement," Guy Gravert and others v. Tim Brockett and Glastonbury Landowners Association, DV-34-2025-147. Supplied file: "Gravert. Agreement. Client Signatures.pdf," six scanned pages, with two counterpart plaintiff-signature pages both numbered 4. Relevant terms: §§1(A)(1)–(6), 1(B)(1)–(3), and 5. The Forum confirms that the settlement was signed by all parties and accepted by the court.
8. Restated Bylaws of the Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc., amended 2025: Articles II.B and VI.B.13. Reviewed source: "[GLA Restated Bylaws 2025](#)."
9. Restated Declaration of Covenants for the Community of Glastonbury, 1997: §§8.01(c), 8.01(h), and 11.05. Reviewed source: "[GLA Restated Covenants 1997](#)."
10. Glastonbury Landowners Association, "Board and Committee Members," updated October 7, 2026; accessed October 9, 2026. Road Committee roster: Walter Wunsch (chair), Tyson Wright, Scott Stomierowski, Zane Curry, Jack Sutton, and Guy Gravert. <https://www.glamontana.info/govern01.php>