



July 6, 2011

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE

- 1. QUESTION: DOES SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE "LOSE MONEY"?**
ANSWER: NO. IN FACT, IT SUBSIDIZES OTHER REC & PARK DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS.

The annual number of rounds, and hence revenue, varies from year to year, principally due to weather. But the most recent available figures (for fiscal years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010) show an annual average of 50,099 rounds played at Sharp Park (54,073 in 2008-2009, and 46,124 in 2009-2010). In 2008-2009 Sharp Park had positive operating income of \$99,142, even after Rec & Park bookkeepers assessed "overhead" charges of \$245,816. In 2009-2010, Sharp Park had a small operating loss of \$43,946; but this was after the Rec & Park Department assessed an "overhead" charge of \$274,583. The "overhead" is an intra-departmental transfer payment which subsidize the general administrative expenses of the Rec & Park Department, Mayor's Office, and other city-wide services.¹ There have been substantial "**overhead**" payments every fiscal year since 2005, when course-specific figures first became available.² Even in years where the "overhead" results in a small paper "loss," such losses would be eliminated by a modest increase in greens fees. Sharp Park's fees are

¹ Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials presented to PROSAC public meeting, November 4, 2009 (first page): <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43298>

² San Francisco Controller Ben Rosenfeld's Memorandum to Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, et al., regarding Golf Fund, etc., December 17, 2008, at pp. 2-3: <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=40189>

among the very lowest in the Bay Area³; a fee increase of \$1 per round would generate on average an additional \$50,000 income annually, while still leaving Sharp Park's greens fees among the Bay Area's lowest.

SHARP PARK IS A POSITIVE REVENUE-SOURCE FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND IT HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED REVENUE. SO TO CLOSE THE GOLF COURSE WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE AWAY MONEY FROM THE REC & PARK DEPARTMENT AND ITS OTHER PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES.⁴

2. QUESTION: WILL SIGNIFICANT NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BE REQUIRED AT SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE?
ANSWER: NOT AS IT IS BEING OPERATED TODAY.

There are two possible new capital projects that are being discussed, individually and together, for Sharp Park: (1) habitat recovery for frogs and snakes; and (2) restoration of the historic Alister MacKenzie-designed golf course. However, both of them are optional, neither appears in the proposed 2011-2012 Rec & Park Department budget, and neither is immediately needed to continue operating the golf course. Both of these possible capital projects would have funding sources and benefits extending beyond the golf course and the City and County of San Francisco. Details of planning, permitting, cost-sharing, and financing for these projects are currently under discussion.

³ Rec & Park Department, Sharp Park Financials (supra, fn. 1), chart captioned "Regional Golf Course Comparison," at page 5.

⁴ San Francisco Rec and Park General Manager Phil Ginsburg, public testimony at hearing of the Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Gov. TV, at 3:35:20-3:38:55: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

3. QUESTION: DOES SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE BENEFIT THE ENVIRONMENT?

ANSWER: YES: RECYCLED WATER; ORGANIC MANAGEMENT; AND PROTECTION FOR ENDANGERED SPECIES.

An \$8.8 Million tertiary-treated wastewater irrigation Project, approved jointly by San Francisco and Pacifica in October, 2008⁵, is currently under construction at Sharp Park Golf Course.^{6,7} Upon completion, scheduled for in/about December, 2011, the project will mean that treated wastewater from Pacifica's Calera Creek sewage plant will be used on the golf fairways, instead of being dumped into the ocean. It is a joint project of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the North Coast County Water District (Pacifica's water utility).

In or about April, 2009, organic maintenance practices have been in place at Sharp Park Golf Course, pursuant to an Endangered Species Compliance Plan⁸, which among other things restricts golf cart usage and prohibits inorganic fertilizers.

The Recreation and Park Department's consulting biologist Karen Swaim, who is also consultant to the Golden Gate

⁵ See minutes of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission public meeting October 28, 2008, at which the PUC adopted Resolution 08-0194, authorizing the joint agreement with Pacifica:

http://sfwater.org/detail.cfm/MC_ID/18/MSD_ID/113/MTO_ID/369/C_ID/4228

The minutes reflect, at Agenda Item No. 11, that the only public comment was testimony in support of the project from Jennifer Cleary, representing Clean Water Action, a national water advocacy organization.

⁶ Construction is well under way as of June 17, 2010 on all phases of the project: pipeline, pump, and storage tank. Construction status updates are posted on the North Coast County Water District website:

http://www.nccwd.com/RW_Pump%20Station%20Update_060111.pdf

⁷ Published meeting minutes of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the Recreation and Park Department reflect that the Pacifica Recycled Water Project was re-approved at public hearings of the PUC on November 9, 2010 (Agenda Items Nos. 11 and 12):

http://sfwater.org/detail.cfm/MC_ID/18/MSD_ID/113/MTO_ID/369/C_ID/5403; and by the Rec & Park Commission on January 20, 2011 (Resolution 1101-009): <http://sfrecpark.org/documents/012011minutes.pdf>.

⁸ Endangered Species Compliance Plan for Sharp Park Golf Course, April 9, 2009, updated December 23, 2009: http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/wcm_recpark/Planning/FinalCompliancePlan121809.pdf

National Recreation Area's San Francisco Garter Snake restoration project at the neighboring Mori Point property, testified to the Recreation and Park Commission that the golf course protects the endangered San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog from small mammal predators, including cats, dogs, raccoons, possum, and rats. (See summary of Ms. Swaim's testimony below, at Question 5.)

4. **QUESTION: WOULD A SNAKE-AND-FROG HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECT BE MORE EXPENSIVE—OR LESS, IF THE 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE IS KEPT OPEN?**
- ANSWER: IF HABITAT IS RESTORED FOR THE FROG AND SNAKE AT SHARP PARK, IT WOULD BE FAR MORE EXPENSIVE TO CLOSE THE GOLF COURSE THAN TO KEEP IT OPEN.**

This was a key finding of the Rec & Park Department's 6-month study in 2009, authored by the Department's principal consultant, TetraTech, Inc. Earthmoving and other costs to substantially repurpose the site for a no-golf solution would significantly exceed the expense of leaving the golf course generally as it is (with relatively minor modification), and restoring frog/snake habitat in the area of the lagoons at the western side of the property.⁹

A significant driver of the high expense of destroying the golf course would be the earthmoving expense for digging up the golf fairways, which are composed of the highly invasive and extremely competitive kikuyu grass, explained environmental scientist David Munro, the lead author of the Rec and Park Department's November, 2009 Sharp Park Report. If not removed, this invasive grass would outcompete and preclude native plants and habitat from establishing in the area currently occupied by the golf course. Munro explained this at length at the December 16, 2009 public hearing of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Governmental Audits and Oversight Committee.¹⁰

⁹ *Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report*, November, 2009, Tetra Tech, Inc., at pp. 3-5, 52-55, and Tables 4 and 5:
http://www.sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/wcm_recpark/SharpParkGC/Tetrattechfinalrpt110609.pdf

¹⁰ Testimony of David Munro at Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, on videotape at San Francisco Government TV, at 0:39.40-0:55:
http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

The Laguna Salada "Conceptual Ecosystem Restoration Plan," published February 9, 2011 by consultants retained by Wild Equity Institute and Center for Biological Diversity,¹¹ ignores the exorbitant earthmoving expense required to remove the golf fairways. Moreover, the report's authors admit that Highway One—which bisects the golf course—is a "migration barrier" for the frogs and snakes, and state that removal of that barrier by a freeway overpass or tunnel is an "essential concept" to their restoration vision for Sharp Park; "otherwise the existing populations at Sharp Park and Mori Point will remain isolated."¹² While acknowledging that moving Highway One is critical to the success of their proposal, CBD's report writers do not provide a design or a time-line or a cost-estimate or funding source for what would obviously be an extravagantly expensive engineering and construction project, other than comparing the project to the current Doyle Drive elevated freeway reconstruction at the San Francisco approaches to the Golden Gate Bridge.¹³ Cost estimates for the Doyle Drive project exceed \$1 Billion.¹⁴

5. QUESTION: DO GOLF COURSE OPERATIONS "KILL SNAKES" AT SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: SNAKES DIE FROM MANY CAUSES AT SHARP PARK: BIRDS; REPTILE-COLLECTORS; DOGS AND CATS; SMALL PREDATORS SUCH AS RATS AND RACCOONS. THERE HAS BEEN ONLY ONE REPORTED INCIDENT OF A GOLF-RELATED SNAKE KILL IN COURSE HISTORY. THE MOST RECENT REPORTED SNAKE KILL AT SHARP PARK WAS BY A DOMESTIC CAT FROM THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

Conservation biologist Karen Swaim, the frog and snake consultant for the Rec & Park Department, is also consultant to the GGNRA on its San Francisco Garter Snake habitat-restoration project at the adjoining Mori Point property. She testified at length to the Rec & Park Commission and to the Board of Supervisors' Government

¹¹ A copy of the report is linked to the Wild Equity website: <http://wildequity.org/entries/3146>

¹² *Id.*, at pages 26, 29-30

¹³ *Id.*, at pages 29-30.

¹⁴ Presidio Parkway, Re-envisioning Doyle Drive, Project Funding: <http://www.presidioparkway.org/about/funding.aspx>

Audit and Oversight Committee in November and December, 2009, that the golf course has a net beneficial effect on the snakes at Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond, because the golf course and the presence of golfers control wild and domestic cats and small mammal predators, and discourage bicycle traffic, dog recreation, and other more free-form park use activity in and around the ponds, which are known to jeopardize the frogs and snakes. By contrast, she said, golf is a relatively benign and easily-regulated activity, which explains why the snakes and frogs have survived on the golf course over the course's near-80-year life.^{15, 16}

6. **QUESTION: WHICH CAME FIRST AT SHARP PARK:
THE GOLF COURSE, OR THE FROGS AND SNAKES?**
**ANSWER: BEFORE THE GOLF COURSE WAS BUILT,
THE PROPERTY WAS AN ARTICHOKE FARM, AND
THE LAGOON WAS OPEN TO THE OCEAN.
BECAUSE THE FROGS AND SNAKES ARE FRESHWATER
SPECIES, SCIENTISTS SAY THAT THEY WERE
"UNLIKELY" TO HAVE BEEN AT LAGUNA SALADA
BEFORE THE GOLF COURSE.**

Historic photos show that before the golf course was built, the property was not pristine native habitat, but rather an artichoke farm, and the Laguna Salada was open to the sea. The saline nature of the lagoon is referenced in its historic name "Laguna Salada, which means "salty lake" in Spanish. The historic name of the valley on US Geological Survey maps going back at least to 1892 is "Salt Valley". The red-legged frog in its larval state is highly saltwater-intolerant. For these reasons, scientific studies say that the presence of the frog and snake at Sharp Park was "unlikely" before the golf course.¹⁷ The

¹⁵ Karen Swaim, public testimony (opening and concluding remarks) to San Francisco Rec & Park Commission public hearing, November 19, 2009: <http://sf-recpark.org/index.aspx?page=958>

¹⁶ Karen Swain, testimony at public hearing of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, on videotape at San Francisco Government TV at 0:57:10-1:31:54, and 3:30:40-3:31:10: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

¹⁷ Laguna Salada Resource Enhancement Plan, Philip Williams & Associates, June, 1992, at pp. 2-3, and Fig. 2: http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/restoring_sharp_park_california/pdfs/PWALagunaSaladaResourceEnhancementPlan.pdf

first scientific reports of the snake at Sharp Park are from the mid-1940s, after the original sea wall was built to separate the golf course from the ocean, and 15 years after the golf course was built.¹⁸

7. QUESTION: COULD SAN FRANCISCO OBTAIN INCOME FROM A WILDLIFE SANCTUARY AT SHARP PARK BY CREATING A "MITIGATION BANK" THERE?

ANSWER: NO.

Center for Biological Diversity spokesman Brent Plater told the PROSAC Advisory Committee at its July 7, 2009 public meeting that the city could expect to earn a profit of \$300 to \$600 Million by converting Sharp Park into a "mitigation bank".¹⁹ However, this claim is fanciful. The city's mitigation bank consultant, Westervelt Environmental Services, which consulted on the mitigation bank at the San Francisco Airport, said that a mitigation bank at Sharp Park would not have good prospects: the costs would be high, the benefits uncertain, and a mitigation bank would preclude all public recreational use of the property.^{20, 21}

¹⁸ Karen Swain, testimony at public hearing of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Government Audit and Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, at 1:13:25-1:15:28.

http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

¹⁹ Mr. Plater made a similar claim at about the same time to reporter Ben Terrall, who quoted Mr. Plater in an article published in the Fall, 2009 issue of *Terrain* magazine, as follows: "A restored Sharp Park could be funded by a wetlands mitigation bank. Credits were selling last year at \$3.5 Million per acre for wetlands restoration. There are 200 acres that could be restored at Sharp Park (out of about 400). That's \$700,000,000 in gross revenue. No golf model would ever provide that much money to City coffers."

<http://ecologycenter.org/terrain/issues/fall-2009/tee%E2%80%99d-off/>

²⁰ Westervelt Ecological Services, "Financial Viability and Analysis, Sharp Park Mitigation Bank", etc., November 6, 2009:

http://www.sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/wcm_recpark/SharpParkGC/Westerveltfinalrpt110609.pdf

²¹ Lucy Triffleman, public testimony at Rec & Park Commission public hearing, November 19, 2009:

<http://sf-recpark.org/index.aspx?page=958>

8. QUESTION: HAS THE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AGREED TO ACCEPT A TRANSFER OF SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: NO.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area ("GGNRA") will not accept a transfer of Sharp Park with its current environmental issues.²² According to Howard Levit, Chief of Communications and Partner Stewardship at GGNRA, it would not be reasonable to expect the GGNRA to assume responsibility for environmental remediation on its own.²³ And the Hon. Jackie Speier, the United States Congresswoman for the Twelfth District (including southwestern San Francisco and northern San Mateo counties), where the property is located, has publicly stated her opposition to closing the golf course.^{24, 25}

By a vote of 13-2 at its December 1, 2009 public meeting, the citizens' advisory committee to the Rec & Park Department, PROSAC, opposed GGNRA involvement at Sharp Park.²⁶

²² Testimony of Amy Meyer, People for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:48:10-2:49:0. http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

²³ Mr. Levit told this writer, in a June 11, 2010 phone conversation, that Levit's predecessor Christine Powell had been misquoted on this point in a news story that appeared in the June 2, 2010 *SF Weekly*.

²⁴ KQED Radio, "Forum" program, "The Future of Sharp Park," November 9, 2009, 10:00 a.m., at 13:00-15:12 and 20:57-21:32: <http://www.kqed.org/epArchive/R911091000>

²⁵ Congresswoman Jackie Speier, 12th U.S. Congressional District, Press Release, November 9, 2009: <http://www.sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=89222>

²⁶ PROSAC, Resolutions [Nos. 1 and 2], adopted Dec. 1, 2009, submitted to Rec & Park Commission on Dec. 3, 2009:

(a) <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44912>

(b) [http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/meetings/Park_Recreation_and_Open_Space_Advisory_Committee_\(PROSAC\)/minutes/2009/PROSAC_minutes_Dec1_2009.doc](http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/meetings/Park_Recreation_and_Open_Space_Advisory_Committee_(PROSAC)/minutes/2009/PROSAC_minutes_Dec1_2009.doc)

10. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE SIERRA CLUB'S POSITION ON SHARP PARK?

ANSWER: THE SIERRA CLUB'S POSITION IS CONFUSING.

The Sierra Club is one of the plaintiffs in a pending lawsuit against the City and County of San Francisco over Sharp Park.²⁷ However, a few days after the suit was filed, Sierra Club Deputy Executive Director Bruce Hamilton wrote a letter to the editor of the San Francisco Examiner, "clarifying" the club's position: Sierra Club favors protection of the frogs and snakes at Sharp Park, but takes no position on whether or not the golf course should be closed, according to Hamilton.²⁸ The Sierra Club's Loma Prieta Chapter, which includes Santa Clara, San Benito, and San Mateo County--where the golf course is located--has publicly stated its support for the Rec & Park Department's plan to simultaneously restore habitat and keep the 18-hole golf course at Sharp Park.²⁹

11. QUESTION: WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE LAWSUIT?

ANSWER: A LAWSUIT WAS FILED MARCH 2, 2011, AND IS NOW PENDING IN FEDERAL COURT.

On March 2, 2011, environmentalist groups led by Wild Equity Institute and Center for Biological Diversity filed suit in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California (San Francisco), against the City and County of San Francisco, claiming that golf operations at Sharp Park, including mowing, golf carts, use of fertilizers, rodent-control, and pumping of the ponds, cause "take" of San Francisco garter snakes and California red-legged frogs. The suit seeks an order barring golf operations. *Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, et al, vs. City and County of San Francisco*, U.S. Dist.Ct., N.D. California, No. C 11-00958 SI. The judge is the Honorable Susan Illston.

²⁷ *Wild Equity Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, et al, vs. City and County of San Francisco*, U.S. Dist.Ct., N.D. California, No. C 11-00958 SI, complaint filed March 2, 2011.

²⁸ Bruce Hamilton, letter to editor, San Francisco Examiner, March 5, 2011: <http://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/letters-editor/2011/03/sf-can-keep-golf-course-while-protecting-frog>

²⁹ Testimony of Merrill Bobele, co-chair, Coastal Issues Committee, Loma Prieta Chapter, Sierra Club, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 3:11:37: http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

On June 24, 2011, the Court granted the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance's Motion to Intervene in the lawsuit. A trial date has been set for July 16, 2012.

12. QUESTION: WHAT IS ORGANIZED LABOR'S POSITION?

ANSWER: THE GOLF COURSE IS SUPPORTED BY LABORERS LOCAL 261. NO LABOR ORGANIZATION HAS ANNOUNCED SUPPORT FOR CLOSING THE GOLF COURSE.

Laborers Local 261, whose members include the golf course gardeners, announced its support for keeping the 18-hole golf course at the Board of Supervisors' GAO Committee hearing in December, 2009.³⁰

13. QUESTION: WHAT WERE THE DETERMINATIONS OF SAN FRANCISCO'S PARK, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE REC & PARK COMMISSION?

ANSWER: AFTER A SIX-MONTH STUDY, AND BY OVERWHELMING VOTES, PROSAC AND THE REC & PARK COMMISSION VOTED IN FAVOR OF KEEPING THE GOLF COURSE.

San Francisco's Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, conducted a series of public hearings on all aspects of Sharp Park at monthly meetings July through December, 2009. On December 1, 2009, PROSAC voted, 15-1, in favor of the Rec & Park Department's plan to restore habitat, while keeping the Sharp Park Golf Course open; PROSAC also voted, 13-2, in favor of pursuing cooperation at Sharp Park with the City of Pacifica and San Mateo County--but not with the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.³¹

³⁰ Testimony of Zac Salem, Chair, Golf Committee, Laborers' Local 261, to Board of Supervisors' Govt. Audit & Oversight Committee, Dec. 16, 2009, S.F. Govt. TV, at 2:17:30:

http://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=11

³¹ PROSAC, Resolutions [Nos. 1 and 2], adopted Dec. 1, 2009, submitted to Rec & Park Commission on Dec. 3, 2009:

(a) <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=44912>

(b) [http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/meetings/Park_Recreation_and_Open_Space_Advisory_Committee_\(PROSAC\)/minutes/2009/PROSAC_minutes_Dec1_2009.doc](http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/meetings/Park_Recreation_and_Open_Space_Advisory_Committee_(PROSAC)/minutes/2009/PROSAC_minutes_Dec1_2009.doc)

After public hearing November 19, 2009, followed by a scientific round-table and additional public meetings, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission unanimously voted on December 17, 2009 to adopt the recommendations of the Sharp Park Report, that the 18-hole golf course should remain open and be renovated in conjunction with habitat recovery for the frog and snake in and around the lagoons.³²

14. QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE POSITIONS OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE PACIFICA CITY COUNCIL?

ANSWER: BOTH THE PACIFICA CITY COUNCIL³³ AND THE SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERVISORS³⁴ HAVE ADOPTED UNANIMOUS RESOLUTIONS TO KEEP SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE OPEN.

15. QUESTION: IS SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE JUDGED "INFERIOR" BY GOLF EXPERTS?

ANSWER: ABSOLUTELY NOT. SHARP PARK IS REVERED AS AN HISTORIC TREASURE OF GOLF.

Opened in 1932, Sharp Park was built by Dr. Alister MacKenzie, one of history's greatest golf architects. It is one of Dr. MacKenzie's few public courses. Local, state, national, and international golf organizations calling for its preservation include the World Golf Foundation³⁵, California Alliance for Golf (whose members include the Northern and Southern California Golf Associations and the Pacific Women's Golf Association)³⁶, and the Alister MacKenzie Society³⁷.

³² San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No. 0912-018, Agenda Item No. 11, adopted by unanimous 6-0 vote, December 17, 2009: <http://sf-recpark.org/index.aspx?page=965>

³³ City of Pacifica, Resolution of City Council, December 10, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/cop_res.pdf

³⁴ County of San Mateo, Resolution of Board of Supervisors, December 18, 2007: http://sharppark.savegolf.net/data/smbos_res.pdf

³⁵ World Golf Foundation, letter, July 23, 2009: <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43233>

³⁶ California Alliance for Golf, letter, September 28, 2009: <http://sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=43245>

³⁷ Alister MacKenzie Society letter, April 28, 2009: <http://www.pacificariptide.com/.a/6a00d8341c795b53ef01156f6f286c970c-pi>

Those who want to close Sharp Park Golf Course misleadingly cite golf author Daniel Wexler's book, *The Missing Links*, in support of their argument that Sharp Park is an inferior course. Mr. Wexler has publicly and in writing defended Sharp Park's historic value, called for restoration of the course, and accused Sharp Park's critics of misrepresenting both the spirit and intent of his work.³⁸

16. QUESTION: HAVE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORGANIZATIONS TAKEN A POSITION?

ANSWER: YES. SHARP PARK HAS BEEN DESIGNATED A NATIONALLY-SIGNIFICANT AT-RISK CULTURAL LANDSCAPE, BY THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE FOUNDATION, AND AN HISTORIC RESOURCE BY THE PACIFICA HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

The Washington D.C.-based Cultural Landscape Foundation has designated Sharp Park Golf Course as a nationally-significant, at-risk cultural landscape.³⁹

The Pacifica Historical Society, the official historian of the City of Pacifica, has recognized Sharp Park Golf Course as a Pacifica "historical and cultural resource," and has called for preservation of the 18-hole course.⁴⁰

17. QUESTION: IS GOLF A POPULAR RECREATION IN SAN FRANCISCO?

ANSWER: YES.

A 2004 "Recreational Assessment Report," conducted for the Rec & Park Department by PROS Consulting, found that when San Francisco residents were asked to designate the single most important recreational facility to their households

³⁸ Dan Wexler, letter, July 19, 2009:

<http://www.sfpublicgolf.com/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=65476>

³⁹ Cultural Landscape Foundation, Washington, D.C., July, 2009:

<http://www.tclf.org/landslides/sharp-park-golf-course-threatened-closure>

⁴⁰ Pacifica Historical Society, Resolution, June 14, 2011:

<http://www.sfpublicgolf.com/AnnouncementRetrieve.aspx?ID=73173>

(out of 19 different types of facilities), golf courses were tied with dog-play areas as the fourth-most important type of recreational facility, trailing only children's playgrounds, swimming pools, and walking and biking trails.⁴¹ This is consistent with consultant reports in 2007 and again in 2008 to the Rec & Park Department from the National Golf Foundation⁴² and Leon Younger and PROS Consulting⁴³, respectively, both of which found that the San Francisco/San Mateo County area has too few courses to serve the market demand for affordable public golf.

- 18. QUESTION: ARE SHARP PARK GOLFERS "ELITES"?**
ANSWER: NO. GOLF IS "THE PEOPLE'S SPORT" AT SHARP PARK, WHERE JUNIORS, SENIORS, WOMEN, AND ALL RACIAL, CULTURAL, AND ETHNIC GROUPS MAKE UP SHARP PARK'S CLIENTELE.

Sharp Park provides affordable public golf to students, working-class, and retired men and women, remarkable for their ethnic, gender, age, lifestyle, and socio-economic

diversity.^{44, 45} The editors of the San Francisco Chronicle⁴⁶

⁴¹ Leon Younger & PROS, LLC, *Recreation Assessment Report*, August, 2004, at p. 14, Figure 6: http://sf-recpark.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/wcm_recpark/Notice/SFRP_Summary_Report.pdf

⁴² National Golf Foundation, "Operational Review and Recommendations for City of San Francisco Golf Operations, February, 2007, at page 23: <http://www.sf-recpark.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=207>

⁴³ Leon Younger & PROS Consulting, "San Francisco Recreational Opportunities Study Summary Report," August, 2008, at pages 7-8: <http://www.sf-recpark.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=208>

⁴⁴ U-Tube, July, 2009, "Sharp Park Golfers Speak for Themselves": <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6roUnaxvKxY>

⁴⁵ Rochelle Metcalfe, "I Heard That," *Beyond Chron* (Tenderloin Housing Clinic), June 30, 2010: http://www.beyondchron.org/articles/_I_Heard_That_Riley_Jameison_Golf_Tournament_at_Sharp_Park_8275.html

⁴⁶ San Francisco Chronicle editorial, "Let Golfers Play Through on Sharp Park Course," September 3, 2009 (supporting the 18-hole golf course):

and the San Francisco Bay Guardian recognize Sharp Park as a regional resource "for people who aren't rich to play the game."⁴⁷

The Mabuhay Golf Club (Filipino), Mexican-American Golf Club, Golden Hill Golf Club (Chinese), San Francisco Chinatown YMCA, Sons in Retirement, Pacific Women's Golf Association, and Sharp Park Business Women's Golf Club are among the many minority, women's, and seniors organizations that have called on public officials to save Sharp Park Golf Course.

Respectfully submitted,

s/
Richard Harris
San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2009/09/03/EDN019GUJ6.DTL>

⁴⁷ San Francisco Bay Guardian, "Golfers and Garter Snakes," November 10, 2009, and on-line comment by Editor Tim Richmond:
<http://www.sfbg.com/politics/2009/11/10/golfers-and-garter-snakes>