

FOLLOW-UP/COMMENT on COURSE RENOVATION PLAN PROJECT by Diane Henri

This summary represents the views of many other members

PROBLEMS

1. **Plan is all set and determined without prior consulting all the members and no other options offered.**
Plan has grown into a grand redesign that does not reflect the needs or priorities of the members. Members were never consulted on what their priorities were or what was important to them. We never started this process a few years ago saying we need to completely redo the entire course, cut down all the trees, make the fairways bigger, change the design...

After discussing with all the members, I know personally (at least 25 people), no one agrees with this plan for many varied reasons (not necessary, not an emergency, too long, too risky, or too expensive, too ambitious, too disruptive, object to redesign, cutting down all the trees, etc.).

Individual opinions vary on what really needs to be done: bunkers, greens, fairways, trees, range, poa versus bent, tees for men, tees for women? Some would do nothing. Some would do the range some would not, etc. Of course, it is impossible to please everyone but not a reason to do everything now as this plan proposes. Individual opinions are too easily disregarded. They must be gathered in a collective perspective.

As it is now, this plan has been written by an architect with "carte blanche." As any designer, he will propose and want to redo everything ... to make a living and build up his reputation and resume.

2. **Information is not transmitted equally to all members.** As of today (Sept 26), some members know about the plan and some others do not. All members are not treated equally. Too much secrecy for too long. Members are afraid to speak at the Club and afraid to upset the CPC and Board who did that plan. Also, afraid to be considered outliers or being told not having the "club 's best interest" at heart. On Oct 15, everyone (showing up) will know the plan. But it is often difficult to speak out at a general assembly as presenter is controlling the stage and participants are often intimidated and not comfortable to talk to an audience.
3. **Presentations are biased** as plan is strongly supported by presenters (Trevor, Ian, Julie...). There is no consultation. No one is being asked what they think. The presentation does not transparently delineate how the members are going to fund this plan...how can we consider a plan of \$11.4M without knowing what it is going to cost each of us?
4. **No knowledge as to what % of vote** is needed for the plan to be approved. This is a CRITICAL number that must be transparent and reflect overwhelming member support as per traditional Bruno culture. When will we have it?
5. **The Bruno culture will be destroyed.** Because plan involves two major problems (cost and interruption of use), some members will leave. Trying to figure out beforehand how many will leave is difficult and puts a lot of risk on the project and Club. Members may also leave because 1) if this is pushed through it will create a bad feeling in the club which does not reflect Bruno's values of transparency and consultation, and 2) the course will not be the Bruno we know and love. It will be a completely different course.

SUGGESTIONS

1. For a project of this amplitude, a proper **survey**, with unbiased questions, should have been done to assess users' needs and wishes. Not too late to do. Instead of asking who would stay and who would leave if this plan would go through, Board and CPC should start by asking what **the actual membership really wants**. From that information, a plan reflecting the majority's wishes, could be developed. This could avoid destroying the Bruno culture.
2. Plan could also be **subdivided**, and vote taken separately on each different component of the plan: bunkers, greens, fairways, range, trees, tees.
3. The % level for plan (or part of plan) to be accepted must be **set and communicated now**. The vote must be **secret ballot vote** (not a simple show of hands).
4. Need to find a way to communicate to membership now that this plan is just a proposal and plan can be modified i.e., suggestions and discussions are still welcome without judgement. Process needs to be more consultative. Rather than presenting to small groups and not asking what we think, should be **discussions** in small groups. Also, feedback should be on an **online forum** where we can all see the comments and join in the discussion – i.e., everyone can see what another member says and add to it. That is the only way to make the process transparent. Otherwise, the board is just reacting to each individual email and there is no discussion.