

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2022 10:38 AM  
**To:** Sean Sullivan <sean.sullivan@ashland.or.us>  
**Subject:** Public Testimony for Golf Subcommittee

It is clear to me that the proposed motion is a motion to close the golf course forever. All the proposed "actions" don't address the pending drought issues substantively.

Where is an estimate for the cost of just watering the greens, not the practice facility? From the current condition of the greens, it looks like the Michael Black has already given up on the course. With a drought, less course maintenance will be required. Was this decreased cost factored in?

As I said before, no movement toward permanently closing the course should be taken unless the "subsidies" for all segments of the Parks Department endeavors are evaluated in the same way. I have suggested using units like subsidy dollars per user-day or subsidy dollars per acre of green space.

Losing key personnel is not a reason for closing a parks activity or for doing a shoddy job of maintaining a parks facility. These are problems of poor management not acts of nature.

Keep the course open. Maintain the greens minimally. Plan for summer and fall dry conditions. Work on course resilience. Work on using less water in the future.

Thanks, Jim Hatton