

**From:** Jacques Royer <[jacques.royer@gmail.com](mailto:jacques.royer@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Feedback on proposed plan  
**Date:** October 15, 2022 at 08:41:06 EDT  
**To:** [plandirecteurparcours@golymbcc.com](mailto:plandirecteurparcours@golymbcc.com)  
**Resent-From:** <[coursemasterplan@golymbcc.com](mailto:coursemasterplan@golymbcc.com)>

Greetings,

I wanted to send my comments regarding the proposed plan and hope it is not too late given the meeting is this afternoon. First I would like to thank the club for finally deciding to put this plan to a vote given its materiality.

I am **firmly against** the plan in its current form and here are a non-exhaustive list of why in case they are helpful for your next steps (list here in random order):

- I see no need to upgrade the course in its current form. **MBCC is already a great course and I fail to see how the proposed plan would change that.** If anything it might be the opposite;
- The ambition and the cost of this plan are excessive both from a total cost perspective as well as the member additional charges it would represent; **The scope of the project is too big, has too many nice to have, and has all the recipes for failure**
- With an inflationary economy going into a recession it is **irresponsible to ask members a monetary contribution of such a significant amount.** Even in normal time I find this not-acceptable.
- A good example of a nice to have is the money to be invested in the practice area which should not be a priority IMO.
- The total **cost of the projects are underestimated.** I don't know of any construction project that meets their budget with only a 10% contingency! in current market conditions, most construction projects often show cost overrun between 30-50% - in case you are wondering, my company oversaw over \$400M worth of construction projects in the last 18 months alone...
- **Closure of 9 holes for severals years** - and this project would take longer then plan is also a no go;
- **Again aiming to cut trees** (i know this is not the costly part but we stop cutting trees on our beautiful course just because a very small number of members prefers a links look for our club!);
- Some clubs in Quebec which has invested in removing the very type of grass we are trying to remove on our greens. However they have done so, only to realise that unwanted grass came back after a few years...

The committee should reconsider their plan and truly assess if we need any investment at all. If we do, the following guiding principles should be observed:

- **The scope should be contained to the affordability of the club** without any special contribution from member;
- No closure of holes for a whole season;
- Prioritize what is truly required (maybe have a vote) within affordability
- If minimum scope and affordability do not intersect for some reason, then plan for it a few years in advance instead of forcing a big investment like the current plan.
- To increase our affordability for example, we could increase annual contribution by \$1k to \$2k per member per year for a few years, but not by a one time over \$20k per member! If member wish to make a voluntary donation that could also be an option but the committee cannot impose this on all its members.

Even after all that, I fail to see why we need to invest at this time.

Warm regards and thanks in advance for all considerations,

**Jacques Royer**  
(514) 917-2558