Dear Mayor Romero and Tucson City Council Members,

The Board of Directors and members of the Silverbell Golf Club are writing this letter to relay our concerns and to petition the Council to vote against the plan to install a walking path directly through the Randolph Golf complex.[1]

The Silverbell Golf Club (SGC) was reestablished in 2009 from what had been the long-standing Silverbell Men's Club. The mission of SGC, in part, is to "promote the sport of golf at Silverbell Golf Course as well as the other Tucson City golf courses…"

SGC has, since its inception, supported the city courses with over 2,300 rounds of golf annually, played on the five city courses. Currently SGC has nearly 100 members and plays twice a week. Many SGC members take advantage of one of the annual pass options available, use the driving range facilities and support food and beverage sales at the courses. In all, SGC members provide significant financial support to the city golf program. SGC also is proud to be able to support the First Tee of Tucson, through member support and donations.

Many of the SGC members are retired seniors who enjoy the game and the ability to play golf at reasonable rates. Interestingly, however, is the recent increase in younger members who enjoy being able to play on quality courses nearby. Bringing new golfers to the game is a part of the mission of SGC.

After hearing of the plans to redesign portions of Randolph and Del Urich courses in order to install a walking path through the complex, we have many concerns that we would like you to take into consideration prior to voting on this issue:

1. **Liability**
Installing a walking path through two courses creates a dangerous situation for those on the path and a liability for both the city and the individual golfers. Netting and fencing are imperfect safety solutions, and an errant shot can avoid the net and seriously injure a walking pedestrian. Remember, those playing your courses are amateur golfers who do have many errant shots. As evidence of this, council members should observe how many golf balls from the range end up on the Urich course number 1 fairway on a daily basis, avoiding nets and fencing. Yes, we do understand golfers are liable for their shots, but it is less likely if you are limited to just people playing on the course. The city, in our opinion, would be adding to the liability by inviting walkers onto the grounds.

2. **Cost**
The cost incurred to change the layout of four or more golf holes and to build fencing, netting and a path cannot be worth the benefit of this project. We are constantly reminded of the fiscal restraints of city government, and we are sure there are many more projects that could benefit the taxpayers of Tucson.

3. **Need**
What study qualified this as a need to the citizens of Tucson? Again, cost versus need should add up to benefit more than a few.

4.**Redundancy**
The entire Randolph complex is surrounded by a walk/run path that is functional and used daily. Adding the path seems redundant and wasteful.

5. **Safety and security**
The complex is now fenced and secured. Opening a path through the complex may be creating the possibility of vandalism. The courses already have limited budget that is stretched to take care of their maintenance needs.

6. **Staffing**
Costs will occur to maintain and secure the path. Does this come from the golf budget or parks and recreation?

7. **Aesthetics**
This golf complex is the only golf facility in the center of Tucson. The beauty of the course as well as nearby Randolph Park and the Zoo will be negatively affected by another monstrous fence and netting in place of turf and trees. The city has a jewel in its center and should appreciate its beauty.

The Board of Directors and the members of the Silverbell Golf Club are vehemently opposed to the walking path project and the modification of the two golf courses. We are asking the Mayor and Council to vote against this proposal and to keep our courses both safe and beautiful.

Thank you.

Board of Directors and members of Silverbell Golf Club

1. Letter modified with the permission of the author, Jim Sims