

To the Board of Directors, Long range Planning and Greens Committees

The presentation is pretty thorough and beautifully presented

It seems logical that Greens need to be rebuilt in the long term interest of the club – I will be interested to learn more about this from the architect.

I will defer to experts on the greenside bunkers- seems to be overwhelming support for that

The rest of it would all be in the "nice to have" category I would think

If money was no object I would say lets get it done - I'm sure the end result would be very attractive and well done. You have all done an excellent job putting this together. Having said that, we are in a very challenging time worldwide - is this a good time to take on such a commitment?

In the not so recent past we have avoided debt for the most part or paid it off very quickly. This proposal is quite a significant change which given higher inflation, interest rates and world wide issues makes one a bit nervous to say the least. It is also very much in conflict with the Boards policy in the 50 years I have been with the club. Comparing to what was done 75 or more years ago is of questionable logic, frankly.

Is there a scaled down version doing greens and greenside bunkers an option that could be considered? I'm not suggesting a vote choice by the way- I'm suggesting this option be seriously considered by the Board and either recommended or rejected- if rejected explain to the membership why it is being rejected. I am aware of other scaled down versions are being suggested as well.

It looks like the club picks up an extra 1 million from spouses - 45 k approximately for a couple versus half that for seniors- I fear you will have serious push back on this. I must be honest and say that it seems unfair frankly. If fees need to be changed I suggest doing that first and let the capital fall where it may. Senior men's fees would go down while the capital assessment would go up. Be interesting to see were the total cost ends up to be the same. (I.e. Fee reduction times X years = extra capital assessment. I would suggest this issue be dealt with on its own first and then deal with the project separately.

Other comments to consider

I'm not sure where value added tax fits in - I presume project itself is tax in but I'm not sure that the fees are -does the the capital 22679 include tax?

Fescue really worries me- a lot more is in play - our existing fescue is very difficult to play out of - can we maintain a thin playable fescue going forward when we appear unable to do so now? Finally how will this affect our future maintenance costs?

It is difficult to tell what trees are being removed - just wondering if some savings could not be achieved- eg back of number 10 green really necessary?

The comment that course is too long appears to be directed to membership at large. I presume this is just women as I don't know any male member who plays anything shorter than the green tees now. Could we consider just adding one new tee?

Can some of the cost savings in ongoing maintenance help pay for the project?

Can we increase initiation fees to pay for some of this? Spouses are nil at the moment I believe

I expect none of my comments are ones you have not already considered but thought I would pass them on nevertheless

Let me know if I can help in anyway.

Regards

Steve Hurlburt