

Carey Certo

From: Alan Chan <alanchan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Community Development Email
Cc: Colleen
Subject: Tennis bubble at CHS

WARNING: This message originated outside the City of Camas Mail system. **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and are expecting the content. If you recognize the sender as a city employee and you see this message this email is a phishing email. If you are unsure, click the Phish Alert button to redirect the email for ITD review.

Hi - my name is Alan Chan and I'm a resident at 3839 Nw 9th Loop, Camas, WA 98607. My son is also a CHS student and played on the tennis team this past fall. I was sent the video of the hearing about the tennis bubble from the Camas Athletic Boosters Club and because I'm a lawyer and have an interest (I like to play tennis and my son was on the team), I watched the whole thing.

I will say that I was in support of this project up until the last 10 minutes of that video. Up until the last 10 minutes, it seemed like a great public/private partnership where the kids get a beautiful facility and the public also gets usage. I think there are some concerns about the assumptions on traffic (the expert kept saying it's the same or less due to the elimination of the pickleball courts - but I think when you host pro tournaments/give lessons and have an attraction of an indoor facility, you have to assume some sort of uptick).

But in the last 10 minutes, the question came out about the courts available for usage by the public due to lessons and any fees for the public to use the courts. This is what changed my mind. I think you can work around lessons by reserving court times. But the access fees to the public are what solidly put me into the NO category for this project.

As stated by one of the other respondents, this land is public land paid by public tax dollars. The USTA PNW would be getting "free" land usage (and I didn't hear anything regarding terms on the leasehold) to build their facility. I think it's a false statement to say that their "contribution" would be the \$2M to build the bubble. The USTA would have to spend money to build any tennis facility. The actual exchange here is (assuming \$3M total construction costs and 2/3 borne by USTA and 1/3 borne by Camas):

Camas: \$1M towards construction of a facility that CHS students would have use for.

- AND "donation" of land to the USTA to build their facility to charge memberships and run lessons. If this is a perpetual agreement without lease payments or a return right to the school/Camas, it essentially amounts to selling this piece of land to another entity with an easement for the CHS tennis team.

USTA: \$2M towards construction.

I would argue that the \$1M Camas is planning to put towards this project is enough of a fee for access to this facility for CHS tennis. I wouldn't even begin to have a guess as to the value of the land given up to the USTA here. And as already mentioned, \$2M is not a contribution towards a school construction project when the USTA controls all other hours and access to the facility.

The biggest loser in this is the public that paid for this land with its tax dollars. Without free access to these courts (which it currently has), you will have essentially sold off this property and privatized a public use facility. And for that reason, I object to this proposal. There would be some conditions that I believe would make this more of a fair deal I would support:

- a limited lease term for the USTA to have for this land (akin to cities providing land to sports teams to build stadiums). Potentially a return of the land and facility to CHS after the term or a renewal with new lease terms.
- Free access to the public to the courts (court times for lessons and tournaments can be managed via a reservation system and can/should be published ensuring enough court time is available for the public).
- Depending on the term and the level of access to the public, a lease fee to CHS or Camas.

If the USTA wanted to do this project on their own, they would have to buy/lease land, spend \$3M building the structure and then hope to recoup their costs on memberships and leasing of the facility (e.g., to schools). Their capital costs would be many multiples compared to this project. And their return on investment would be many more years into the future.

There is one other thought that could mitigate this land grab. If the fee to the public is nominal, then I can see a potential compromise (but still would need a limited term on the land lease). If they were to charge minimal fees to ensure that actual tennis players sign up to use the facility (\$50?), that would be important to understand.

I haven't dug into this in detail, but those are just some of my thoughts based on what I heard in the public hearing.

Best,

Alan