SURFRIDER
FOUNDATION

October 14, 2010

Phil Ginsburg, General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

RE: Sharp Park

Dear Mr. Ginsburg:

On behalf of the San Mateo County Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation, I urge the City and County of San Francisco to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposal to move forward with an all-golf alternative at Sharp Park.

The San Mateo County Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation instead supports the alternative vision of restoration and conservation for the public lands at Sharp Park, as being consistent with our national organization's stated mission of "dedication to the protection and enjoyment of the world's oceans, waves and beaches for all people, through conservation, activism, research and education." Furthermore, the first guiding principle adopted by the entire Surfrider Foundation organization (represented by over 50,000 members and 60+ local chapters in the U.S., including over 1000+ members of the San Francisco chapter), clearly represents our position on conservation and restoration efforts by stating that:

SURFRIDER recognizes the biodiversity and ecological integrity of the planet's coasts are necessary and irreplaceable. SURFRIDER is committed to preserving natural living and non-living diversity and ecological integrity of the coastal environment.

In this specific instance, we feel that the proposed all-golf option for Sharp Park does not adequately address the issues of preserving biodiversity, and protecting the ecological integrity of the coastal environment.

Our chapter is a nonprofit, volunteer organization that supports a mix of recreational opportunities that could complement conservation and restoration efforts at Sharp Park. However, the current Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report recommendation of an all-golf option that is quite similar to the existing, current golf use of Sharp Park, does not adequately address the pressing financial, endangered species protection and conservation issues faced by the current golf course. Furthermore, it does not allow for a wider range of coastal focused recreational and educational opportunities, which we know from first-hand experience are in high demand from a wide range of San Francisco residents.

For these reasons, we do not believe it is in San Francisco's interest to proceed with the report's recommendations, and we ask that other alternatives for Sharp Park be given consideration instead – alternatives which include restoration, conservation and a wider mix of recreation and educational opportunities.

Sincerely,

Edmundo Larenas
Chapter Chairman,
Surfrider Foundation, San Mateo County Chapter