

GLASTONBURY LANDOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Road Committee Meeting Minutes

Date	Time	Location	Duration
March 3, 2026	6:00 PM – ~8:25 PM MT	Zoom (Virtual)	~2 hours 25 minutes

I. Attendees

Present:

- Walter Wunsch (Road Chair; presiding)
- Zane Curry (GLA President; committee member)
- Guy Gravert
- Scott Stomierowski (joined late, during the Steel Creek discussion)
- Jack Sutton (joined mid-meeting)
- Tyson Wright (joined during the road-policy discussion)

Landowners / guests:

- Kevin Newby (telephone, calling from Bozeman; departed after opening comments)
- Jaylyn Jensen (joined late; had been listening)
- James and Leslie Everett were acknowledged as on the call; limited recorded remarks

Noted absent from this portion: Debbie Newby was referenced (signs; draft road policy not yet received) but did not speak. Randy Traucht (High Country Excavation) had hoped to attend and could not, due to a daughter's volleyball commitment in Bozeman / Livingston.

Quorum: Yes. Motions were taken with multiple committee members present..

II. Call to Order and Landowner Comment

Walter opened the meeting after a short wait for attendance and invited Kevin Newby to give landowner comment. Kevin confirmed he could be heard (calling by telephone, not Zoom) and offered two comments.

Speed-limit sign placement (Arcturus).

Kevin said two 15 mph speed-limit signs on Arcturus, placed by a previous board on the downhill (northern) side of the hill approaching the right-hand 90-degree turn about four-tenths of a mile up from Dry Creek Road, are on the wrong side of the hill. He asked that they be moved to the southern side of the hill, between that turn and Dry Creek Road — one warning of the turn about 160 feet out, and the other for traffic leaving the turn uphill. He said earlier messages to the previous vice president were not returned. Walter agreed to note the request and said the committee would take care of it.

Road policy / tier system.

Kevin said the prior board replaced the tier system with a standard based on the number of homes, residents, or dwellings on a road, then used landowner funds — the maximum that could be spent without a landowner vote, which he stated as \$29,000 for North and \$29,000 for South — to improve two roads where board members lived. He contrasted that with the Ericsons on High South, who during his board tenure paid for their own Tier 4 road improvement (Walter interjected that they paid \$250,000) to GLA standards. He asked that the road policy

be returned to the tier system. Walter told him the draft to be discussed later in the meeting returns to the tier system and simplifies it. Kevin thanked the committee and left the call.

No other opening comments were offered. Jack joined as the committee moved to the agenda.

III. Safety Signs

Walter reported that he had placed an order with Kate for an approved sample entrance sign, which he will pay for personally. When it arrives he will reconvene the committee on placement and on what works best. Entrance signs are intended for each main entrance.

Other road signs.

Debbie Newby had suggested reviewing where a sign is actually needed and removing superfluous signs. Walter volunteered to take signs down, with help from Zane and, if in town, Jack.

Zane asked that removal not proceed on opinion alone. He proposed asking Lance Rushmeyer, a career state trooper, to drive the roadways and advise which signs stay, which go, and why. Walter and Guy supported the idea. Guy offered to ride along if Zane could not, and flagged the sign below Polaris (described as a “Squigley” road sign that points the wrong direction and is more hazard than help) and a North Glastonbury sign toward Story Road that residents have already marked up because it does not make sense. Zane will coordinate a weekend drive with Lance and Guy, photograph the signs, and bring notes back before the next road committee meeting. Walter will also contact Lance. Lance’s full-time work limits him to Saturday or Sunday.

Stop sign.

Debbie had flagged a badly aged stop sign. The committee had already discussed, at length, the stop sign at the bottom of Hercules as the most reasonable swap. Walter noted that stop sign could be moved to Debbie’s location.

After adjournment, Tyson asked about the entry-sign order. Walter confirmed the sample is being placed and that he is paying for it. Tyson asked to add a replacement Capricorn Way West sign that has been missing, which he will pay for, and offered to email Kate a photo and dimensions. Walter will ask Kate whether it can be added to the same order and invoiced to Tyson.

IV. Open Contract with Steel Creek Construction

Walter reported a site meeting and tour of roads that need repair before spring grading. On a later inspection, the only visible work was on Taurus. The contractor claimed Venus was done; Walter said Venus was as bad as before. Gemini, which had been discussed, was not done — the contractor said he had forgotten it. The contractor did not call Walter for on-site sign-off after the work, as instructed, and did not provide the requested daily record of what was done on which road. Equipment had been removed except a roller still at the North Glastonbury soccer field.

Walter recommended canceling the contract and not paying, on the ground that fall work was overpaid: an invoice of about \$19,000 was paid for work he estimated at no more than 30 percent of that amount. He had at one point been willing to authorize 50 percent to help the transition, before realizing payment had already been made. He preferred to fold remaining repair into spring grading by a competent contractor.

Guy asked whether the association could legally withhold payment, and suggested a partial payment for work actually done, then cancellation. Zane agreed the fall invoice is closed — oversight should have been better, and that payment cannot practically be recovered. He recommended: ask for an invoice limited to work actually

performed (Taurus; nothing for Venus); do not restart work; and give written notice that the North Glastonbury fall / winter contract is closed and that no further work under it will be paid. A lawsuit over nonpayment would also cost the association.

MOTION #1 — Cancel Steel Creek Contract

PASSED

"I make a motion that you, as Road Chair, contact Steel Creek Construction to cancel any further work under any contracts outstanding, of which there is only one, North Glastonbury fall / winter maintenance, and that we request, as soon as possible, any invoices that Steel Creek Construction believes are forthcoming and related to that work."

Moved by: Zane **Seconded by:** Guy Gravert

Votes: Guy — Aye; Jack — Aye; Scott — Aye. Walter called the question; no opposition was recorded. Motion carries.

Walter will email Steel Creek, copy Zane, offer a partial invoice only for Taurus, refuse payment for Venus, and state that the contract is canceled and that future work will be by a new request only.

V. High Country Excavation Contract — Randy Traucht

Walter asked whether members had received the High Country Excavation contract (Randy Traucht), previously discussed and raised again at the GLA board meeting. Randy could not attend. Walter had reviewed the contract; minor corrections are in the write-up he distributed. Snow plowing and sanding are listed separately from other work, with stated rates. He is a backup plow for North Glastonbury; Mike Durker holds the North plow contract. Walter described Randy as responsible, with high standards, and said Randy would charge only for segments he actually plowed.

Zane's requested revisions (he committed to drafting them):

- Separate maintenance / grading from snow plowing in defined sections, even if kept in one document. Maintenance terms may be exclusive. Snow plowing must stay non-exclusive so the association, or a landowner already driving the road, can add help in a large storm (Guy's example: a resident clearing Sagittarius Skyway while the contractor is on Hercules).
- A multi-year deal should not depend on who holds this year's plow contracts.
- Daily log with more specificity: hours worked and roads or sections worked.
- Inspection by the Road Chair or the Road Chair's designee, so a future chair who is not on site year-round can appoint an inspector.
- Term: Zane prefers 3 years to start rather than the 5 years allowed, with a bilateral 6-month out (60 days' notice) after two rounds of north and south maintenance, so neither party is locked in before the work is proven. Guy agreed. Walter supported the change and noted he would work closely with Randy.
- Clearer language on annual rate adjustments for inflation, fuel, equipment, maintenance, and insurance: notice period and a fixed metric (fuel prices or CPI). No rate change without that process. Dollar amounts stay tied to the available budget and the BOD/Road Chair's direction rather than fixed multi-year totals, because the budget changes year to year.

Zane framed the edits as a template for how GLA contracts should read, not as a reservation about Randy or about Walter as the point of contact. Walter asked Zane to fine-tune the write-up. No vote was taken on the contract at this meeting.

VI. Spring Grading and Gravel

Spring grading will be based on available budget. The contractor must work inside that budget. Walter will work with the contractor daily so the work meets expectations. Bringing every road up to the written standard is not affordable; gravel will be placed selectively. Many sections are down to bedrock.

Walter will again run a gravel-donation campaign, starting with Hercules and that area and extendable to other sections. His company will give at least \$5,000 to start, in funds or gravel. Zane, who had already discussed the idea with Guy, asked each committee member to start landowner conversations on their own roads so labor hours buy more material — Scott on Arcturus, Tyson in North, and James and Leslie Everett if they are willing. Donations would supplement, not replace, assessment-funded work. Tyson agreed it is fair to ask.

Unspent plow funds. Tyson asked whether unused snow-plow funds can be transferred after a hard winter. Zane said the snow reserve is at zero and that reallocation belongs on the March board agenda: both restock the snow reserve and, with what is still rationally available, boost maintenance. He asked to be reminded if it is missing from that agenda.

VII. North Glastonbury Chip Seal

Walter said chip seal has not been actively pursued for about two years. The last push was by John Carp, who obtained quotes. North Glastonbury roads and Dry Creek both need chip seal. The last package was almost \$250,000 and would be an added assessment. The best pricing has come when a chip-seal contractor is already in the area (the prior good price coincided with chip seal on Highway 89). Walter will contact the county commissioners again; he does not expect funds to be available now. The item was treated as a long shot, not a current project.

VIII. Road Policy

Items 7 and 8 on the agenda were taken together. Walter had circulated a draft that returns to the tier system and simplifies the 2008 policy. Tyson holds the 2025 policy and agreed to circulate a modified version of that policy. The committee's intent, as Zane framed it, was to stop months of discussion and decide what to recommend to the board.

Scott's position.

Scott said road maintenance is the association's most important function and consumes the largest share of assessments. The road policy has historically been treated as part of the governing documents. The 2025 change drew the strongest landowner turnout he could remember; people asked for time to review and for a landowner vote, comparable to a covenant change. He called Walter's draft a constructive simplification of the 2008 policy and had no reservation about that text. He argued that fund allocation should stay tiered by density of residents and users, and that a prior GLA attorney review supported that approach. Changing policy without landowner review, he said, is what made landowners mistrustful. He wanted the policy left in a state that always requires a landowner vote, and he did not want it flip-flopped every year.

Direction of the discussion.

Guy wanted the committee to take a plan to the membership rather than only arguing about reverting or keeping the current text. Jack did not want a simple reversion, because a reversion could itself be reversed every year or two; he wanted the community engaged, and he was trying to separate winter maintenance from summer maintenance and to set priority by tier, arterial, or feeder. He had looked at the covenants and bylaws and did not find the road policy listed as a governing document, so he thought the 2025 change was technically legal. He asked whether Governing Documents should make the road policy a governing document, and whether Road Committee or Governing Documents should draft it. Walter said the road committee would create it and submit it to Governing Documents. Scott noted the 2008 policy was what bound buyers through 2025.

Tyson did not support reversion. He preferred the committee agree on one policy — updating the version already in place, or starting from either text — then send that single text to the board and the community. He warned that two versions would produce conflicting comments. Zane said he liked neither text as-is, but would vote yes so the committee would move, and that only two versions should go out for comment: the existing 2025 policy, and whatever this committee recommends. He said the group was not ready for a landowner meeting on the policy and should return to the April meeting with a clear recommendation for the board.

Jaylyn Jensen reported that a landowner had come to an earlier Governing Documents meeting fired up about the road policy, expecting that committee to change it. Governing Documents told him it was with the Road Committee. She thought his momentum dropped when he heard changes were not being made there, and she urged either a separate landowner meeting or sending both drafts out for comment. Last year's road-policy meeting drew more than 25 people. Guy asked why that person was not at this meeting. Zane volunteered to call him if someone shares the name, and to report the concerns back.

MOTION #2 — Road Policy Recommendation to the Board

PASSED

Scott restated the motion, after an earlier version and amendment, and Walter seconded the restated motion:

“Revert to the 2008 road policy, with the explanation that the reversion is because the committee does not want the road policy changed without landowner input, and with the goal that a change will also require landowner feedback. The recommendation to the board is to revert to the 2008 policy and to complete, in less than 90 days, a cycle that puts a draft road policy up against the current road policy, for landowner comment and a BOD vote.”

Moved by: Scott **Seconded by:** Walter Wunsch

Votes: Scott — Aye; Walter — Aye; Zane — Aye; Guy — Aye.

Tyson did not vote yes; he opposed reversion and asked that no motion be taken until the committee agreed on one text. Jack did not cast a clear yes; he wanted community engagement and had asked that reversion and a new landowner draft be split into two motions. Walter declared the motion carried.

Zane's accompanying statement, which he asked be in the minutes: his yes is so the committee moves forward. Only two versions should go out for landowner comment — the existing 2025 policy, and the revision this committee recommends to the board. The April meeting should produce that recommendation. The group is not ready for a landowner meeting on this yet.

IX. Fire Season and Emergency Exits (not on the agenda)

Before closing, Zane asked every member to come to the first Tuesday in April ready to discuss fire season: what resources the GLA has, how those resources are tracked, and how prepared the community is to assist local responders.

Jack recalled a second exit from South Glastonbury. Walter said the Story family has given permission to pass through after they are notified first. A gate is already there. Scott asked whether that is temporary or a permanent emergency-only gate; Walter confirmed the current gate. A second exit at the end of Scorpio leaves a private driveway, borders Mountain Sky property, and is barricaded by trees that fell in the fire. Walter had verbal permission at one time and believes it should be renewed. Erosion also has to be addressed. He wants Randy to assess it; opening it could cost a couple of thousand dollars. It would reach the upper portion of Dry Creek Road. Walter used to drive it. Scott asked for a committee tour. No vote was taken.

X. Summary of Motions and Votes

#	Motion	Moved / Seconded	Result
1	Road Chair to cancel the Steel Creek North Glastonbury fall/winter contract and request any related invoice.	Zane / Guy	Passed
2	Recommend the board revert to the 2008 road policy pending a landowner comment-and-vote cycle, completed in under 90 days, comparing a draft to the current policy.	Scott / Walter	Passed

XI. Action Items

Action Item	Responsible	Due
Email Steel Creek: contract closed; no further work; invoice only for Taurus work actually done; copy Zane.	Walter	Promptly
Coordinate a weekend sign assessment with Lance Rushmeyer and Guy; photos and keep/remove notes.	Zane (Walter also to call Lance)	Before next road meeting
Relocate Arcturus speed-limit signs to the south side of the hill, as requested by Kevin Newby.	Walter / sign crew	With sign work
Review aged stop sign; Hercules bottom stop sign as the likely swap for Debbie's location.	Walter	With sign work
When the sample entrance sign arrives, meet on look and placement. Ask Kate to add Tyson's Capricorn Way West sign to the order, invoiced to Tyson.	Walter / Kate / Tyson	On delivery of sample
Revise High Country contract: split plow vs. maintenance, non-exclusive plow, log detail, chair-or-designee inspection, 3-year term, bilateral 6-month out, rate-adjustment metric.	Zane	Before board action
Start gravel-donation conversations on committee members' roads; Walter's company commitment of at least \$5,000.	All members; Walter	Before spring grading
March board agenda: unused plow funds — restock snow reserve and any remainder to maintenance.	Zane	March board meeting
Contact county commissioners on North chip seal / Dry Creek; no expectation of current funding.	Walter	Ongoing
Tyson to send a modified version of the current road policy. Committee to return in April with one recommended revision.	Tyson; all members	First Tuesday in April

Action Item	Responsible	Due
If the Governing Documents attendee's name is shared, call him and report his road-policy concerns.	Zane	When name is provided
April agenda: fire-season resources, tracking, and readiness to assist responders.	All members	First Tuesday in April
Ask Randy to assess the Scorpio / Mountain Sky emergency exit (trees, erosion, permission).	Walter	Before April meeting

XII. Adjournment

Zane left the call after the fire-season note and the emergency-exit discussion. Walter closed the meeting. Tyson remained briefly to ask about the entrance-sign order (see Section III). The meeting ended at approximately 8:25 PM Mountain Time.

Next road committee meeting: first Tuesday in April. Members were asked to come prepared on fire season and on a clear road-policy recommendation to the board.

Glastonbury Landowners Association — Road Committee Meeting Minutes — March 3, 2026

Minutes prepared from the Zoom recording transcript (recording start 00:58 UTC, March 4, 2026, which is 5:58 PM MST on March 3, 2026). Some remarks were unclear on the recording; votes are reported only as they were spoken.