

What does the Sharp Park legislation do?

The legislation directs the Recreation & Park Department to partner and create a long-term management agreement with the National Park Service including a finance roadmap. The goal is to address urgent environmental and infrastructure needs. This is accomplished by transitioning recreation at Sharp Park from golf to a new public park emphasizing trail-based recreation, managed by the National Park Service.

Does this legislation create new and improved recreation opportunities for San Francisco?

Yes, it will help develop new hiking and biking trails at Sharp Park, while redirecting resources spent at this San Mateo County golf course back into San Francisco's city parks, recreation centers and golf courses. Pacifica may access all San Francisco managed golf courses at San Francisco resident rates for 5 years.

Does the legislation preserve existing jobs at Sharp Park?

Yes, the Avalos legislation offers jobs within the park system to all existing Recreation and Park Department employees assigned to Sharp Park (currently 9.8 full-time equivalent jobs).

Why is this legislation needed?

San Francisco is liable for the immense financial investments needed at Sharp Park to reconfigure the golf course to address chronic flooding and comply with legally-required wildlife protection. The Recreation and Park Department does not have the endangered species protection expertise or the financial resources to make the necessary changes.

What is the financial impact of closing the golf course?

Park Department records show that Sharp Park golf course has lost between \$30,000 and \$300,000 each year over the past 6 years, and lost roughly \$126,000 last year. Overhead for Sharp Park is roughly \$225,000 annually. Closing the course will save additional millions of dollars by eliminating the need for expensive infrastructure projects to protect the course against sea level rise and come into compliance with federal environmental laws. According to the City Controller's office, if only 25% of current Sharp Park golfers played at other city-operated courses, about \$350,000 would be generated, more than covering the Park Department overhead costs currently assigned to Sharp Park.

What about historic nature of the golf course?

Though Sharp Park golf course was designed by a famous architect, Alister McKenzie, the course predictably floods every year. Several links from the original design were built upon leveled sand dunes and they were washed away by storm surges. The City of San Francisco stated in a 2009 letter to the City of Pacifica that it is "inappropriate and unnecessary" to designate Sharp Park as a historical landmark due to these factors.

Couldn't San Mateo County or the City of Pacifica partner with San Francisco to assume partial or full responsibilities for the golf course operations and associated liabilities?

In early 2010, Pacifica and San Mateo County informed Supervisor Ross Mirkarimi that by June 2010 they would put forward a proposal for joint or full management of the golf course. Nearly two years later, no public proposal exists.

What is the current Recreation and Parks Department plan?

The Department proposes dredging the main lagoon at Sharp Park and physically raising several golf holes. The plan would cost San Francisco millions and does not have the approval of regulatory agencies. The Park Department is hoping to attract funding from San Mateo County, the State of California, federal grants, and philanthropy or by privatizing the course.

Is the National Park Service interested in managing Sharp Park and transforming the course to a new public park with more public access and recreation?

The National Park Service has stated that they will assume the responsibilities of creating a new public park at Sharp Park that provides trail-based recreation, a public serving use for the Clubhouse such as a visitor center, habitat restoration and managing for sea-level rise. Sharp Park is within the legislative boundary of the GGNRA and adjacent to several properties managed by the GGNRA. The GGNRA released a statement in July 2010 confirming their interest due to Sharp Park having habitat and recreation values consistent with those of the GGNRA and being adjacent to Mori Point and Sweeney Ridge, where NPS has restored habitat for the red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake.

Does the Park Service have the expertise, experience and funding needed to create a new public park and assume responsibilities of endangered species protection?

Yes, the Park Service has a 95 year track record of preserving and protecting America's premier natural, historic, and cultural sites while making these sites available for a wide range of recreational activities and visitor services. The Crissy Field and Mori Point restoration projects demonstrate the ability for local, meaningful restoration projects to attract philanthropy, volunteerism, community engagement, and various sources of funding not available to other land-management agencies.

How does this ordinance relate to the pending lawsuit against the City for killing endangered species?

This ordinance is not related to the lawsuit, which only deals with claims that the City of San Francisco is violating the Endangered Species Act by harming federally protected species without a permit.

Which groups support science-based restoration and the ordinance?

A broad coalition of community and conservation groups support the restoration of the native ecology and changing the golf course use at Sharp Park, including the Center for Biological Diversity, Golden Gate Audubon Society, National Parks Conservation Association, Nature in the City, Neighborhood Parks Council, Pacifica Shorebird Alliance, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, San Francisco Tomorrow, San Francisco's Youth Commission, Sequoia Audubon Society, Sierra Club, Surfrider Foundation, Transportation for a Livable City, and the Wild Equity Institute.