

# LA PAZ DISPOSAL, LLC

---

C. RICHARD OLDHAM  
1555 Dome Rock Road PMB 619  
Post Office Box 619  
Quartzsite, Arizona 85346-0619  
Phone (928) 916.3333  
Fax (888) 853.4772  
MYDOCUMENTATION@YAHOO.COM

June 24, 2010

Mr. Gene Fisher  
Post Office Box 696  
Parker, Arizona 85344

Dear Mr. Fisher:

Thank you for your letter of reply of 11 June 2010.

I appreciate your having taken the time to provide such thorough representation of your thoughts and feelings pertinent to my proposal regarding the Yakima issue.

I would like to take this opportunity to correct and to clarify some of the points as you have outlined them in your letter -- and present a possible solution to the La Paz County judgment as currently owing to Yakima.

While I was not nearly as close to all the facts as you were during the period that Yakima and the county became adversaries -- the fact remains that the jury awarded \$ 9.2 million against the County of La Paz: a debt which is currently growing at an alarming rate.

I am only following the current situation as the records reflect and hoping for a solution soon. I did not indicate to you that I have an opinion regarding the jury's award, or whether it was right or wrong -- only that the debt is now rapidly increasing at the rate of about \$100,000.00 per month -- along with very large attorney fees on both sides.

I was in the audience at a recent conference at which Jim Willett spoke, immediately followed by a commentary provided by La Paz County Administrator Dan Field. Mr. Willett, at that time and since, has indicated that he is receptive to finding a workable solution.

In your letter, you indicated that were the county to win this appeal of the jury's verdict and award, an entirely new set of facts will emerge.

Perhaps that is so -- I did not say in our conversation that I supported Jim Willett's position.

I did indicate that I am doing my best as a 65 year resident and taxpayer of this county to negotiate a settlement between the county and Jim Willett.

I would also like to clarify that I did not indicate that 'the plan,' as you call it, would take Willett 'out of the picture' at no cost to the county.

What I did say was that if the current proposal being negotiated works out, Willett has indicated his interest in obtaining \$ 6.5 million plus the negotiated \$ 1.5 million in attorney fees of which I understand one half million [ \$ 500,000.00 ] has already been advanced by the county.

The \$ 6.5 million would be cash or the equivalent thereof to Willett, plus \$ 1 million balance in income from the landfill over the next few years.

Once the debt to the Yakima business partners is paid, the county would then receive this income monthly, going forward from that point. The county would receive a negotiated 'tipping fee' from the start of our management, leaving the Allied contract in place for the time being.

I am not sure how the title to the landfill is held, but that would need to be discovered. Our intention is to allow whatever obligations or agreements the county currently has in place [pertinent to ownership or lease with the BLM] stand.

I did mention that the Court of Appeals can do almost anything in their ruling. Partial relief -- perhaps a reversal -- they may even uphold the jury's verdict -- any of these are possible, of course.

My point, however, was that in almost any case, all parties will incur large attorney fees and our county must set aside ever more funds to deal with a situation that has already been a source of consternation and confusion.

This situation has been going on now for several years and -- whatever the outcome of the appeal -- we have but two choices: continue to battle or work out a settlement.

My proposal is, I am sure, not the only conceivable one. If considered, though, we can put up the \$ 6.5 million and obtain a release from Jim Willett as we take over the landfill in a negotiated settlement.

I mentioned my communication with Mary Scott to you in our conversation because I thought you should know I was requesting input from those people familiar with the issue and willing to share their thoughts and ideas.

I agree that this idea could very well be portrayed as a 'concept,' but I feel there should be an effort to bring this to a conclusion before it becomes a matter so large that it is virtually impossible to handle.

I could continue -- but I believe I have touched on most of your points and will do my best to effectively address whatever questions our Supervisors may have pertinent to these issues.

As I portrayed to you, this option could allow all those concerned to move ahead with a workable solution at nominal cost to La Paz County.

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify some of the points we discussed in our initial telephone conversation.

I have taken this opportunity to include our La Paz County Supervisors in our communication -- including, again, Mary Scott -- concerning this possible solution to the dilemma currently facing our county and our elected officials.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

C. Richard Oldham

CRO/mk

CC: Ms. Mary Scott  
Ms. Holly Irwin  
Ms. Sandy Pierce  
Mr. John Drum  
Mr. Cliff Edey