

Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

I was impressed with your discussion on this topic last meeting. I thought it gentle, thoughtful and wise and I also appreciated Commissioner Landt's recent editorial in the Tribune. And yet you passed a motion to not do something which is a little weird. Somehow you have been convinced that the golf course is separate from the other endeavors of the Parks Commission. The course is park-like and facilitates multigenerational physical activity which strikes me as the sweet spot of a parks commission's goals. You could have instead included the course in your list of irrigation priorities and Commissioner Landt could have included it in his list of parks activities.

What if the Commission had spent the money and attention, they are now expending on the design of the new park, on improving the golfer's experience at Oak Knoll? And applied the energy you used up in attempting to change your funding model?

What if you had, say, fertilized and aerated the greens this spring, so that they would be more responsive to watering? What if you had not allowed parts of two greens to die, well before the raining season ceased? Do you have a plan to address the weeds beginning to invade some of the greens? (Is it really true, you lost half your pond to a leak – Another in a long list of mistakes, half-measures and negligence)

I am saddened that you have allowed a substantial capital asset to deteriorate. Commissioner Landt's editorial expressed well the difficulties you are working under. I feel it, but please consider the golf course as an equal partner with all the other endeavors of the Parks system. Thank you.