

GRHA Rebuttal to the Concerned Citizens' June Bulletin



The Concerned Citizens' Association recently published its latest newsletter, the Concerned Citizens' Bulletin. The newsletter advertises: "***Just the facts. You decide.***" We read the newsletter and we ***decided*** that certain ***facts*** were in error. Additionally, it appears from its tone, that the newsletter is aggressively slanted toward the opinions of its publishers. While everyone is entitled to their opinions, we believe newsletters should be factual and void of personal bias.

We'd like to start by congratulating the creators of the CCB. Their latest four page newsletter is very focused. Three of the four pages appear to be dedicated to proving that the members of the "GRHA Road Committee;" Tom Parsons, Art Reichsfeld and Bob Waldo, are inept at best and deceptive at worst. Apparently, we have hatched a plan to pave the roads without anyone's permission, input or vote, all with Don Kile's blessing. The culmination of the plan is that we, the "road committee" bilk our neighbors and friends out of \$250/acre, pave the roads in a sub-standard fashion, wait for the pavement to begin breaking up so we can all have a good laugh.

How ludicrous to assume that was our plan. In actuality, our plan is to solve the dust and maintenance issues on our roads, create a more livable and useable community while simultaneously increasing our property values.

The best way to achieve these objectives would be to create a road system within our community that would have minimal impact on the environment, as well as our pocketbooks, and last 15-20 years. We would want the road system to encourage drivers to behave responsibly and encourage equestrians and pedestrians alike to utilize it.

The creators of the Concerned Citizens' Bulletin imply that they far surpass us in intellect and education. Accordingly, in order for us to bumble through life, we've had to develop certain compensatory skills. One of our favorites is the "reasonable test." Here's how it works: You take a question or a phrase and you ask "is it reasonable?" We'll use questions and statements from the latest issue of the CCB to illustrate more clearly.

The first item in question from the CCB: (paraphrased) "***there are nine missing pages from Mr. Stansel's report.***"

Is it reasonable that the road committee, part of the GRHA, would try to deceive their friends and neighbors by hiding the true findings of the ACS report? (Mr. Stansel's final report is attached)

The answer is: of course not. We know that the full scope of work that Mr. Stansel completed resulted in a report of 10 pages. We asked Mr. Stansel to create the report. We also know, from talking at length to friends and neighbors and looking in the mirror every morning, that it would be very difficult to secure a lot of support for a project of 12 to 14 million dollars (about \$2500/acre). We're personally pushing for paved roads and we would have a hard time supporting a project of that size. So, per our request, Mr. Stansel provided us with an alternative, a plan that we felt was more in keeping with the rural nature of the community and the nature of our pocketbooks. His recommendation was to "pave over existing grade...." The roads would be tested, prepped and paved. The cost for "pavement only" is approximately \$1.2 million (With the price of oil, we're certain that estimate hasn't gone down any since the proposal date of March 27, 2008) or roughly \$250 per acre (\$1.2 million divided by 5000 acres). We realize that additional work is going to have to be done to some of the roads. Boot Hill, for example, is cursed with sloppy clay on the north end and sand on the south end. That will have to be fixed. Eighty loads of stabilizing soil were blended with the sandy soil on Vista del Oro last year to help mitigate the sand and washboards there. We are confident that we can get the problem roads in shape for a modest amount of money. What's modest? We don't know exactly, but we do know that with the help

of a geotechnical firm and good contractors we will be able to get reliable numbers. Whether we like the final numbers or whether we don't, we can't guarantee. Our sense is we will, but we won't know until we have them in hand. And if we don't like the numbers, guess what? We all get to vote no!

The CCB states very correctly that "***Failure to grade the roads before paving would increase the likelihood of potholing and washboards.***"

Is it reasonable to expect that the roads would be paved without grading?

The way to address this question is to simply ask: is it reasonable to eat an ice cream cone without first opening your mouth? Mr. Stansel's recommendation includes using the services of a geotechnical engineer whose job it is to ensure that our roadbed will perform as necessary. The places that need to be fixed, will be fixed. There is no mystery there.

This next quote from the Concerned Citizens' Bulletin is our favorite quote. The setup is this: the publishers of the CCB, are asking: "***who thinks an adequate paving job can be done for \$1.1 million?***"

They then ask: "***Is it Mr. Kile, who merely wants some pavement to last a year until he can bail out of his bad investment?***"

We're curious. What metrics did they use to determine that the Preserve is a bad investment for Mr. Kile? Secondly, is it important that the quality of Mr. Kile's investments meet a standard before we proceed with any paving project? We say, of course not.

The second part of the quote, and this is the good part: "***Or is it the Homeowner Club's 'road committee,' the same amateurs who brought us the failed test strip.***"

First, calling your neighbors "amateurs" in a public newsletter is bad form and bad manners. It's also unwise in the sense that at some point you may require aid from these same neighbors. Secondly, these "amateurs" that comprise the road committee are two licensed contractors and one owner-builder. Together they have over 55 years in the construction industry. We're fairly certain that 55 years of experience doesn't make an "amateur" anymore than chip sealing your driveway makes you an expert. Further, the road committee has spent literally hundreds

of hours over the last couple of years researching dust control products from polymers and soybean oil to lignin. The road committee secured a water source for scheduled road grading which is something that had never been done. We encouraged the GPOA to scuttle relationships with grading contractors who weren't providing us with the service that we needed. We then found and had the GPOA hire the best grading contractor in the Valley. We've made countless field trips and telephone calls, not to mention emails. All of this was done with one goal in mind, to make our road system as workable as possible. The GCCA's contribution to the roads, as far as we can see, has been a poisoned pen and uninformed criticism.

Because there seems to be some misunderstanding from the editorial staff at the CCB about the test strip process, we will clarify the procedures that were used to conduct the lignin test strip. The lignin test strip was designed to fail; it was destructive testing. The strip was done in four separate sections, and each section's performance was monitored until it was no longer effective in controlling dust. By marking the point in time, of failure, we could calculate the materials that would be required to prepare a mile of road, the expected longevity as well as re-treatment costs. Cost is always a major driver. As has been stated before, at the beginning of the test strip project, the cost of lignin was about \$0.60/gallon; at the completion of the test strip (about 18 months) the cost had risen to about \$2.00/gallon. At a cost of \$2.00/gallon, coupled with the time performance, lignin had become an economic non-starter. To quote one of the GCCA's own members who emailed us upon reading this illogical section of their latest newsletter: "What part of **TEST** don't they understand?"

"Reiner makes a more modest proposal---test strips." Doug Reiner, GCCA member is suggesting test strips. The stated purpose of the test strips is to determine, and we quote: **"Whether the width is sufficient to be safe and control the dust problem,...."**

The road committee is certainly not qualified to make a determination on minimum design widths of roads. It is similarly unlikely that the authors of the CCB newsletter possess those technical skills. For these reasons, the services of a civil engineer have been employed---an expert---it is our recommendation that we listen to him.

As far as the dust issue goes, as we have said, we're not engineers, but we would be willing to bet a month's wages that pavement will fix the dust problem. We don't think we need a test strip for that.

Something to consider, although we weren't responsible for putting it there, we have effectively had a test strip of asphalt on Vista del Oro by the mail boxes for about 4 years now.

The editorial staff at the CCB suggests chip seal as a possible solution for our road issues. From their newsletter: **"Chip seal is about half the cost of asphalt, is more esthetic than asphalt, and does not create the heat island effect."** We will quote Mr. Stansel from the first time that he addressed this issue, recommended from the same source a couple of months ago.

"Well all I can say is chip seal is just that, a seal coat, typically used to seal the existing pavement from further weather damage and provide a new skid resistant surface to older asphalt. Chip seal is not intended to be a structural driving surface.... I am going to pass on giving you a cost for chip seal because I as an engineer cannot recommend it."

The CCB insists: **"...neither Mr. Stansel, nor anyone else ever said the cost estimate for Mr. Stansel's proposal was \$250/acre."**

Is it reasonable to think that at the presentation on May 12, at the Fountain Hills Community Center, where Mr. Kile stated numerous times that the estimated cost for paving over existing grade was going to run about \$250/acre that the writers from the CCB never heard the \$250/acre figure?

The final item from their newsletter that we will comment on: **"Neither that committee nor Mr. Kile may have been here, or remember, the last time used asphalt was 'slapped' down on Vista del Oro with no preparation of the road bed. While the result was good for about a year, after that it was far worse...."**

The question is: Is it reasonable to compare taking used asphalt that was ground up, dumped on dirt roads, spread with a grader, inevitably mixing with dirt in the process, neither rolled nor stabilized to the process of building a new road? We won't say that this is an "amateurish" conclusion, that would be petty, but we will say it is misguided.

Finally, we would like to thank the highest ranking member of the Goldfield Concerned Citizens' Association, Vice President Jerry Sheridan, for his support of the paving project.

We believe that a healthy community should have many voices. We want to encourage the officers and the directors of the Concerned Citizens' Association to ensure that the words that are published in their newsletter are words that they would be comfortable using around their friends and family. For example, referring to the Goldfield Ranch Homeowners' Association, the largest organization representing the interests of residents, as the "Homeowners Club" some ten times in their latest publication is both divisive and petty. The GCCA can be a better organization than that.

If you have questions or comments please: Call, email or stop by any GRHA Road Committee member's home.

Thank you for your time.

The GRHA Road Committee: Tom Parsons, Art Reichsfeld and Bob Waldo