

From: Adam Bresnick
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2021 8:44 PM
To: Alex Elvin
Subject: Fwd: MVRHS Athletic Campus

Good Evening,

I am aware that the High School Field Project is now before the MVC. As a resident of MV, a local business owner and a father of three sons that all graduated from MVRHS the project has my full support. It is long overdue and it is unfortunate that because of obstructionist, uncompromising and misleading opposition it has taken this long to (almost) become a reality. Please approve the project so the students of MV and the community can get the facilities and playing field they deserve.

Below is an email I wrote in support of the project as it overcame a previous hurdle on its way to the MVC review.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adam Bresnick

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Adam Bresnick
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2020 at 12:07 PM
Subject: MVRHS Athletic Campus
To: Ewell Hopkins <planningboard@oakbluffsma.gov>

Dear Planning Board Members,

I am writing as a resident of Martha's Vineyard to express my full support for the proposed plan to begin phase one of the Huntress Associates Master Plan for the High School athletic fields. Included below is a copy of the letter I wrote in support of the project to the School Committee before they (finally) voted to approve moving forward and solving this problem that has taken far too much time and energy to simply get to where we are today.

The proposed plan was accepted and passed by the school committee. The proposed plan addresses the issue of unsatisfactory and unsafe fields and does so in both environmentally and financially responsible ways. The Oak Bluffs planning board should approve the plan and refer the issue to the MVC, as it is an issue that effects all the towns of Martha's Vineyard

Our island and students deserve better than the current facility/fields and what island leadership has given them on that matter. Do the right thing, and follow the lead of the island school committee and approve the plan and let the MVC weigh in on the issue.

Your time and attention to the matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Adam Bresnick

Dear Committee Members, I wanted to take a moment of your time to give you my two cents on the current field situation.

It seems as though many people, on all sides, are being blinded by emotion and letting that get in the way of the committee and school moving forward to solve the problem.

The current condition of the fields is unacceptable and the situation with the track is inexcusable. The time to pick a plan and move forward, past long ago. Yet here everyone still sits, years later, making the same circular arguments. It seems everyone is entrenched in their positions, and no one is listening anymore. The sad part is, while everyone is busy yelling, nothing is getting done. That is an all too pervasive problem in today's society.

Most people simply want the situation remedied and don't care much for the endless debate regarding grass vs turf. It seems only one group has consistently stopped any plan from moving forward.

Two separate consultants evaluating the project arrived at the same conclusion; the best scenario when balancing, safety, economics, ongoing functionality, and environmental impact is a plan that involves both grass and turf. Why are individuals or groups choosing to disregard or refute the findings of two separate consultants? One of which was hired by the school. It seems counter intuitive, to not accept results just because one does not agree with them. Once again, that is an all too persuasive problem in today's society.

Most people would love an all grass campus, but it seems that idea is more romance than reality. The costs, space and chemicals necessary to go all grass seem to make that solution impractical for the school system and the taxpayers that support it. The grass group has had over two years to get a plan and money together. From the outside looking in, it seems they are more about stalling and fighting a solution rather than solving the problem. Linking their support to a promise the school will never use turf makes no sense. If they really believed grass worked and was feasible, no guarantee would be necessary, the results would ensure their goal of no turf. Their movement itself was born out of opposition. Perhaps the silver lining of their opposition is that in the past several years turf has become much more environmentally responsible. In fact, there are reasonable lines of thought in which certain aspects of turf are more environmentally friendly than properly cared for grass.

Personally, I do not care if the fields are all grass or a combination of surfaces. Both sides make compelling arguments. What I, and most people, do care about is that the problem gets addressed post-haste. It seems to me, the common sense approach is the one that keeps coming back to the table; a combination of both surfaces. Why not approve the plan that both consultants recommend as the best balance of cost, effectiveness, performance, ability to maintain, durability and environmental impact? Let the MVC, who is better equipped to weigh the positive and negative impacts of the project on the "fabric" of the island make the final determination on the consultants plan.

Either way, the committee needs to pick a path and go down it. The poor condition of the track and fields need to be addressed. It is the committee's job is to make responsible decisions in the best interest of the whole. Sometimes that means putting aside personal beliefs. The best solution for the whole, is almost always in the middle.

Sincerely,
Adam Bresnick