|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **RE: Questions For You** | | | Brad Sears [bsears@remsinc.com] | | |  | | | **Sent:** | Tuesday, August 04, 2015 4:41 PM | | **To:** | [Rob Crawley](https://remote.cedarhills.org/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAABCWWeL8%2fRUQ74YLlRf%2b79BBwBSBGxKi2KrS4QWz6E7SjF8AAAAC1z4AABSBGxKi2KrS4QWz6E7SjF8AAAA7Vj8AAAJ) | | **Attachments:** |  | |
| |  | | --- | |  | |
| Rob  Unfortunately your questions appear to be more hearsay, personal opinions and rhetoric than actual questions.  Based on this and what I consider a very untimely and flawed proposal to close the golf course, IMO you lack the ability to be objective.  If you were you would have sent this email long ago and certainly before you already posted your “facts” about me and the golf course contract on Facebook.    As a result, I will address your actual questions on the forum when I have time and so that they can be public without being edited.  Regards,  Brad        -----Original Message----- From: Rob Crawley [mailto:rcrawley@cedarhills.org]  Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2015 7:38 AM To: Brad Sears <bsears@remsinc.com> Subject: Questions For You    Brad,    I appreciate that you called me.  I also appreciate that you said you are willing to answer my questions.  I want you to know that I am not one to be unforgiving or hold grudges.  I do like knowing facts.  If I ever feel like facts are being withheld, I do get a bit more determined and stern.  I don't think this will be the case in this instance.  Most is water under the bridge, but for the record I think it is important to know these things.  Some of what I will ask may have some bearing on future decisions, such as how to deal with Lone Peak Links.    1)  With a development centered around a golf course, the developer is able to sell the homes for a premium theoretically.  However, the premium received is offset by the cost of maintaining the golf course and taking the risk of loss.  When we purchased the golf course from the developer, we took on the entire risk and allowed them to benefit from all the upside on the sale price of their homes.  This contract appears to be very one-sided to me.  My question is, on such a one-sided agreement, why would we feel obligated to give 50 years of 30 rounds per week in free golf to the developer as part of the contract?    2)  Golf employees have informed me that you have used lone peak links free golf.  It would seem to some that as you were the one that negotiated with Lone Peak Links and signed the contract that you receiving these free golf benefits is very self serving.  Please explain why those skeptics are wrong.    3)  I was told by city employees that in addition to using Lone Peak Links free golf that you have over the years golfed for free many times.  With a lot of the city concerned about the profitability of the golf course why wouldn't you pay the rates that the rest of the city pays?  I have a neighbor that told me this week that he won't even take the city discount because he wants the golf course to be successful.  I know that some said that you were acting as a consultant and fixing divots, but that doesn't fly with me.  All responsible golfers fix their divots and anyone could say they are consulting the golf course.  Again it seems very self serving to some that while the residents are all paying higher property taxes to subsidize the golf course, you continued to golf for free.  Please explain.    I may have more questions later, but this is all I have time to ask this morning before work.    Rob Crawley  City Council Member |