

[Return to Today's Anthem View](#)

[Why Votes for Roz Berman and Jack Troia are Votes for Deceit](#)

## Sorry, Al.

Responding to Al Glickman on his OP-ED Commentary

Al Glickman Gives Up, facetiously, I expect. In an OP-ED piece posted on 11 April on the SCA View titled "I give up," Al Glickman writes as follows.

*"I give up.*

*I guess it's true that Roz Berman, Jack Troia and everyone else except Bob Frank who have had anything to do with running SCA or handling our finances over the past three years are just bad people. I'll just forget the facts, such as that our dues are still ridiculously low for everything that we have here in SCA and that despite the lousy economy and the puny investment return rates out there, SCA is still presently in excellent financial condition with substantial cash on hand and more than adequate reserves.*

*It is far more important to concentrate on purging the board of those who have created such financial*

*mismanagement.*

*Yes, SCA may have been shorted somewhat by the developer, but surely, given our current financial situation, this is making a mountain out of a molehill. The idea that everyone here has been screwed, blued and tattooed to a point where we have all been irrevocably hurt is just a bunch of hogwash.*

*I hope that Ron Johnson is correct when he states that the Attorney General's office is completing an investigation on what happened during the transition period and that the results will be forthcoming soon. My question is that if such an investigation concludes that things were not quite as bad as some seem to think they are, will the crusade end at that time?"*

Sadly, Glickman misstates the facts and then proceeds to distort the issues I have raised as a ploy to make my allegations more assailable (the traditional straw man tactic), or as AI might prefer to claim, this was merely his tongue-in-cheek commentary on [my earlier revelation](#), but the issues and AI's retort are hardly a joking matter.

I think we can say that those who set out to falsify the record on a material budgetary matter did so either out of ignorance or with the intent to deceive. The effect of that deceit, however, would show up as increased assessments for roughly 300 Neighborhood homeowners and only later as an unsupported board declaration that there was no shortfall in Neighborhood reserves at transition. Later board officers would tinker away until they were able to achieve their desired goal of making those acknowledged shortfall in Neighborhood reserves literally disappear as if they never

existed. The board's self-serving acts would eventually buttress past board decisions that had increased Neighborhood assessments. The irony was not lost on our Neighborhood homeowners. The increased assessments were needed to make up for the shortfall in reserves that the board would later demonstrate through their tinkering efforts never existed. How's that again? Allegedly, at least according to the board, there was no shortfall in reserves at transition. However, soon thereafter, the Neighborhood reserves problem became so critical that the board felt the pressing need to substantially increase homeowner assessments to remedy the shortfall that later they would claim never had existed at transition. Had the board sought to actually remedy transition reserves in an equitable manner rather than engaging in outright fraud, this issue would never have arisen.

Unfortunately, there were also some good people serving on the board that were too easily influenced into going along with the board's well crafted but very bad deed. Was that the price we paid for voting in the Unity slate of candidates? More relevant today, is that the price we will continue to pay for continuing to support the so called Unity candidates who are running for election today. Are they expected to support Berman's past wrongdoing practices?

As to Glickman's understanding of the facts, it is immaterial and besides the point that dues are low and the association is in excellent financial condition. It seems that Al would like us to attribute by implication the low dues and present financial condition to the actions of the very people who did the dirty deeds on Neighborhood homeowners and their reserves. Sorry Al.

If anyone is entitled to receive credit for those desirable financial conditions, that would be Del Webb and later Pulte. By raising assessments in 2001 by \$80 a year to \$940, over time as the community grew, that brought from \$250,000 to over \$500,000

annually in additional revenue that was no longer needed for the primary purpose originally intended. The need for that assessment increase in 2001 was subsequently eliminated the following year by the new owner, Pulte, who then owned and decided to sell the Revere Golf Clubhouse and two golf courses to Troon Golf. As Favil West has reminded me, Del Webb's original plans called for a total of 4 golf courses in Sun City. Few had reason to doubt that Del Webb planned to turn over the operations of those courses to Sun City as they had done at Summerlin and McDonald Ranch. Funding those amenities is known to be very costly. Without the need to fund those future golfing related operations in 2002 and later years, the association would eventually continue to accumulate excess income that would no longer be needed. Pulte could have but failed to mandate lower annual assessments. The obvious result was excess income for the association.

Facetiously, I imagine, Al suggests the need to purge board members who have mismanaged our finances—that is, “mismanaged” by keeping dues low and maintaining the association in an excellent financial condition. Having done such a great job in holding dues down, etc., how bad can these wrongdoing board members really be? Mismanagement is a misnomer to describe what took place here. While mismanagement connotes to manage badly or carelessly, what we have witnessed here is far different and more criminal in nature. The board's actions were deliberate and constituted outright fraud. The fraud was committed against the interests of a select group of homeowners for no other reason than to protect the self interest and past actions of the board. There is simply no easy or convenient way to explain away their actions.

Glickman complains that someone is making a mountain out of a molehill and that presumably everyone in Sun City has as a result been screwed, right Al? Glickman is again using straw man

tactics. No one here is making a mountain out of a molehill, only Glickman was doing so by making outrageous assertions. For the record, I have never claimed that everyone had been screwed. Mislead, yes. What I have written is that the board committed self serving acts that were wrong and deceitful and were lodged against a specific group of roughly 300 homeowners who happen to reside in a Neighborhood that is separately budgeted for and partially maintained by the association.

As to whether the real victims of the board's action on Neighborhood reserves have been irrevocably hurt is an interesting question. As to whether they were financially harmed as a result of the board's actions, there should be no doubt. The board made those homeowners pay for the reserves shortfall the board had artificially created. As to whether the actions are irrevocable is another matter. Actually, the board has the power to correct their intentional wrongs and do the right thing and make those homeowners whole with respect to their respective reserves accounts. According to one scenario, the board is legally liable to fund that Neighborhood reserves shortfall, while on the other hand, their failure to acknowledge their responsibility and do the right thing should speak volumes to all homeowners.

And, finally, Glickman asked whether the crusade against the wrongdoers will end with this investigation. I do not know. According to one theory, it all depends on the outcome of efforts to hold the association accountable for their wrongdoing acts committed against the Neighborhood reserves fund accounts. My guess is that if the board prefers to continue to stonewall and drag its feet on taking action to redress the issues which brought us to this point, the crusade (Glickman's term) will likely continue as the ongoing investigation is but one, albeit initial, step on a ladder to seek redress and accountability for our fellow Neighborhood homeowners.

Ronald Johnson, 12 April 2009