

July 8th, 2016

To: President: Gene Webb,
The Board of Directors of Timber Pines
Mark Nordman, General Manager

Subject: Land Acquisition & Pickleball

This letter is a follow up to our earlier June 2016 submission regarding the Board's position to defer its decision on improvements to the Lodge Courts for pickleball, which seems to have been driven by the land acquisition initiative.

Our past and current submissions as provided in writing, is the one way our Club members have a voice, as over the last six (6) years members would argue that "words in the air" have had little effect.

We have now had time to review the Board Work shops videos of both July 6th, and June 15th 2016 and would like to provide additional comments for the purpose of the July 20th 2016 special work shop meeting.

First and foremost the PB Club would like to commend the Board for the manner in which they conducted the information meeting of July which provided TP residents with insight as to the Board's intentions on land acquisitions, the individual Board members thoughts on various items and lastly inviting further community input, and questions.

In our opinion Board Member O'Connell hit the nail on the head in his observations on the Lagoon property acquisition, when referring about the "functionality of the property" being tied to what type of access can be established as a cart path only will vastly influence the uses that can be located on that property.

From our perspective, we would summarize the Board in delivering information on the Lagoon property has emphatically linked the Long Range Facility Planning (LRFP) initiative to the land acquisition particulars given the opportunity to address amenity and operational items of the community association.

Therein the PB Club is seeking a response on how a pickleball complex could be accommodated on the Lagoon property, if access is restricted to a cart path only, given the remoteness of the property and the likelihood to drive by car or golf cart.

We are surprised that comments in the videos made by Board members when speaking to the property purchase appear at odds with their comments relating to Long Term Facility Planning and what could be achieved, especially when speaking on access, noting the absence of a more public process on the LRFP details.

We mention this, as it translates to an uncertainty in timing to resolution of PB needs. It presents the possibility of a long drawn out process given the complexity of issues that may emerge in any discussion.

Also statements to noise from pickleball when referencing the framing examples for that part of the discussion on the LRFP link appears to be a factor serving to promote the isolation of a pickleball facility to the remote reaches of the community, even though the central activity areas of the Country Club, and the Lodge by their nature are noise generators due to the range of activities that they host.

In our previous submissions we noted that a noise attenuation feature could be integrated into PB improvements along residential boundaries (if warranted) as a means to respond to noise. We would note that daily noise generation from social events held at the Lodge and maintenance activities for TP properties such as the golf course and common grounds, and from residential properties is more prevalent on a regular basis than from a racquet sport.

During the June 15th meeting we were please to see that many tennis players stood up and supported efforts by the Board to create a PB facility and we are grateful for that. We wish to advise the Board that our Club is equally supportive to the efforts of the Tennis Club to have two replacement courts built at the Country Club location to concentrate tennis play in one location and to meet the demands of their Club as expressed to the Board at that meeting.

By consolidating tennis courts into a central location, the TP community can reduce and avoid duplication of facilities as it is a costly infrastructure approach to TP. Eliminating the duplication of infrastructure where possible should be one principle discussed and enshrined in the Long Term Facility Planning process.

Our intent in mentioning the foregoing is that it appears to the PB Club that this represents the real crux of the matter in examining solutions for pickleball improvements.

It is perfectly understandable based on a needs argument, that the Tennis Club would take a position to support delay of any pickleball improvements at the Lodge.

We don't believe it is the intent of the Tennis Club to encourage the Board to remove any consideration of the Lodge facility for pickleball as a means to facilitate the needs of one Club over another, but is a focus of concern that tennis needs will not be short changed.

The PB Club would support any initiative of the Board to advance the construction of the two new courts at the Country Club location. To do otherwise subscribes to a position which demands the Board to make decisions that appear to be based on "which club" may be more deserving, the size an active members list the number of sign ups, or a community usage (hours) argument. The reality is that both Clubs are in a similar position of need.

It can be perceived by cynics that the real issue lies not with PB, but is tied to a delay of the tennis money at the country club, and a deliberate effort to create an outcome to serve up PB as a sacrificial lamb for a relocate, based on \$300,000 being redirected to land acquisition outcomes.

Should the Board use the foregoing approach as a means to find a solution the result in our opinion is that someone's "ox will be gored" which is not a good basis to advance any Club's efforts that are supporting initiatives to make Timber Pines a better place.

From the foregoing we have concluded that there are two paths available for the Board, and they are:

1. Provide a timely solution for both clubs, or
2. Place one club at a disadvantage such that any positive traction that has been gained in creating continuity of a sport and membership unity is jeopardized.

There is real doubt within the PB Club that if the Board takes a path of "future promises" to build a PB complex other than at the Lodge, it will not materialize in a timely manner for justified reasons. Ultimately a variety of issues would creep into the process delaying any relief to an unforeseeable future as evidenced in the many delays on other TP projects by unknown variables and forces.

In this regard the PB Club puts forward the following proposition as a means to move forward and facilitate solutions that we see as eventually benefiting the PB Club in establishing itself at the Lodge.

1. The TP Board redirect the \$95,000 that was approved for PB improvements at the Lodge to assist in advancing money for the construction of 2 new tennis courts at the Country Club location, with a commitment to renew that money for PB in the 2017/2018 budget
2. The TP Board advance its decision on Tennis Club to 2016/2017 to add two new courts at the Country club as a means to consolidate tennis activities in one location therein avoiding duplication of facilities in Timber Pines as an approach to Long Term Facility planning.

3. In the interim during 2016/2017, the TP Board authorize the General Manager to complete the March 2016 requested remedial improvements by the PB Club to create six (6) pickleball courts at the Lodge location in concert with use by the Tennis Club until completion of new tennis courts at the Country Club and then dedicate the Lodge for PB with expansion to eight (8) courts and necessary amenities.

We would be pleased to discuss further the details of this letter with the Board and answer any questions arising from its contents.

Respectfully submitted by the TPPB Club Board

President - Tom Asbel
Vice President - Gino D'Ambrosio
Treasurer - Bruce MacLean
Secretary – Bill Schneider