

File No. 110966

Committee Item No. 8
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee CITY OPERATIONS AND
NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Date 12/5/11

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget Analyst Report
- Legislative Analyst Report
- Introduction Form (for hearings)
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence *

OTHER

(Use back side if additional space is needed)

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Gail Johnson
Completed by: _____

Date 12/1/11
Date _____

* An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document is in the file.

1 [Park Code - Long Term Management Agreement with the National Park Service for Sharp
2 Park]

3 **Ordinance amending the San Francisco Park Code by amending Section 3.20 to: 1)**
4 **require the Recreation and Park Department to offer a long term management**
5 **agreement to the National Park Service for certain property under the jurisdiction of the**
6 **Recreation and Park Commission located in San Mateo County that is within the**
7 **Golden Gate National Recreation Area's legislative boundary (Sharp Park); and 2)**
8 **making environmental and other findings.**

9 NOTE: Additions are single-underline italics Times New Roman;
10 deletions are ~~strike-through italics Times New Roman~~.
11 Board amendment additions are double-underlined;
12 Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

12 Be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:
13 Section 1. Environmental Findings.

14 The following determination has been made under the California Environmental Quality
15 Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") with respect to adoption of this
16 ordinance: _____. Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board
17 of Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

18 Section 2. The San Francisco Park Code Section 3.20 is hereby repealed in its
19 entirety.

20 Section 3. The San Francisco Park Code Section 3.20 is hereby replaced, to read as
21 follows:

22 **SEC. 3.20. SHARP PARK LONG TERM MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT.**

23 **(a) Findings.**

24 **(1) Entering into a long-term management agreement with the National Park Service ("NPS")**
25 **to manage property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission located in San**

1 Mateo County that is within the legislative boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area
2 ("Sharp Park") could provide San Francisco with the opportunity to further the public purposes of:
3 providing recreation opportunities consistent with modern recreation demands, preserving and
4 allowing for the restoration of wildlife habitats, preserving historical resources, protecting coastal
5 resources, and preserving land for park purposes.

6 (2) All Bay Area residents deserve safe, well-maintained, and sustainable parks in which to
7 play, engage in nature exploration, relax, and build community.

8 (3) Moreover, San Franciscans deserve parks that supply, insofar as possible, recreation that is
9 consistent with modern recreation demands.

10 (4) The City and County of San Francisco must also ensure the equitable distribution of
11 recreation dollars among our neighborhoods. In the 2011-12 Recreation and Park Department
12 Operating Budget, the Open Space Fund contribution surpassed the General Fund subsidy for the first
13 time, and the General Fund subsidy has declined 25% over the last 5 years. The decrease in public
14 funding for parks puts pressure on the Recreation and Park Department to meet financial obligations
15 by other means.

16 (5) In 2004, the Recreation and Park Department conducted a Recreation Assessment and
17 released a Recreation Assessment Report detailing the recreational preferences of San Francisco
18 residents. The report found that the number one recreation demand in San Francisco is for more
19 walking and biking trails.

20 (6) In 2010, the Neighborhood Parks Council surveyed 1,443 San Francisco residents, asking
21 dozens of questions about San Francisco's parks. In one question, respondents were asked to list three
22 priorities for park funding. Of the nearly 100 different responses, sustainability came in fifth, behind
23 only general park maintenance, better athletic fields, more programming, and improved safety.

24 (7) Sharp Park is increasingly at risk as the climate warms and the sea level rises. San
25 Francisco can adapt to climate change by protecting viable migratory paths for wetlands, inland and

1 upland from the coast, and by prioritizing the creation and protection of habitat linkages that connect
2 natural areas and parks.

3 (8) San Francisco also has a responsibility to protect sensitive species and their habitats, and
4 encourage their recovery. At Sharp Park, San Francisco has a special opportunity to implement the
5 recovery goals and objectives for the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the threatened
6 California red-legged frog, as established by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's recovery
7 plans for each species.

8 (9) Experts on coastal wetlands restoration have declared that Sharp Park "represents one of
9 the best opportunities in the Central Coast region to improve and restore impaired lagoon wetland
10 habitats for endangered species." (PWA-ESA 2011). Because of the existence and potential for
11 significant restoration for endangered species, of which the "restoration of garter snake habitat at
12 Sharp Park has been identified as a key recovery goal by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service" (USFWS
13 1985), restoration and development of habitat-compatible recreation can attract federal and state
14 endangered species recovery and ecosystem restoration funding."

15 (10) Working in partnership with the NPS, San Francisco has an opportunity to: provide
16 recreational opportunities that are consistent with modern recreational demands, equitably distribute
17 scarce recreation resources in San Francisco, address land management challenges posed by climate
18 change and sea level rise, protect and recover endangered species and create a more sustainable and
19 resilient public park at Sharp Park.

20 (11) Approval of this ordinance is a preliminary step in the process of potentially entering into an
21 agreement with NPS for long-term management of Sharp Park. Approval of such an agreement is
22 contingent upon a number of subsequent steps, including but not limited to NPS agreeing to develop the
23 Agreement, as defined below, the successful development of the Agreement, approval of the Agreement,
24 following the completion of any required environmental analysis by the City and County of San
25 Francisco ("City") under CEQA and by NPS under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

1 Nothing in this Ordinance implements any approvals of the Agreement, or grants any entitlements to
2 the NPS, nor does adoption of this Ordinance foreclose the possibility of considering alternatives or
3 mitigation measures to the Agreement, including a no action alternative or an alternative that includes
4 retention of all or portions of Sharp Park Golf Course, and while this Ordinance sets forth many of the
5 potential terms of a proposed Agreement, it does not set forth all of the material terms and conditions
6 of a project proposal. A transaction of the type contemplated in this ordinance involves many terms
7 and conditions that have not yet been agreed upon, and it is expressly contemplated by the Board of
8 Supervisors that binding agreements will have to be negotiated, agreed and ultimately approved
9 through applicable public processes, including approval by the Board of Supervisors.

10 (12) Changes to the long-term management of Sharp Park that may occur under a proposed
11 agreement with the NPS shall not proceed unless and until the City and NPS negotiate, execute and
12 deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from any required CEQA
13 and NEPA environmental review processes, other public review and hearing processes, and subject to
14 all applicable governmental approvals. The City retains the absolute sole discretion to propose terms,
15 consistent with this ordinance, for inclusion in the Agreement, and as may be necessary to comply with
16 CEQA, if applicable. Approval of this ordinance grants NPS no vested rights, does not authorize or
17 require any construction or other physical alteration of Sharp Park, results in no approved
18 development plan for Sharp Park, and no legal obligations will exist unless and until the City and NPS
19 negotiate, execute and deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from
20 applicable environmental review processes, and on other public review and hearing processes, subject
21 to all applicable governmental approvals.

22 (b) In order to provide recreation benefits consistent with the modern recreational needs of all
23 San Franciscans, Bay Area residents, and visitors, no later than March 1, 2012, the General Manager
24 of the Recreation and Park Department ("General Manager") shall offer to close Sharp Park Golf
25 Course and offer to the NPS the opportunity to create a long-term management agreement

1 ("Agreement") with the City for Sharp Park in a manner that meets the policy objectives, findings, and
2 goals of the City as set forth in this ordinance and consistent with: (i) the National Park Service's
3 Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., and Management Policies; (ii) Golden Gate National Recreational
4 Area's ("GGNRA") enabling legislation, Public Law 92-589; and (iii) GGNRA's Mori Point, Sweeney
5 Ridge, and Milagra Ridge management plans. If the NPS is willing to consider the opportunity for
6 long-term management of Sharp Park, then the General Manager shall take all actions necessary to
7 negotiate the Agreement in partnership with the NPS consistent with the policy specified in subsection
8 (c) below. The General Manager is authorized to and shall discuss with the NPS, among other options
9 and terms, the closure of Sharp Park Golf Course. During the period between the NPS informing the
10 General Manager of its willingness to negotiate an agreement with the City and either (i) the approval
11 or denial of the Agreement or (ii) NPS informing the General Manager of its intent to cease
12 negotiations with the City, the City shall not enter into any new leases, contracts, or agreements for the
13 operation of the golf course, but may continue to operate existing golf amenities, so long as the City
14 complies with all applicable federal and state environmental regulations and permitting requirements,
15 including, but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq.

16 (c) The General Manager shall consult with the NPS and develop a collaborative policy that
17 achieves the following objectives and goals of the City: (i) ensures that Sharp Park remains secure, free
18 of vandalism and incompatible uses, and is properly maintained during the period of negotiations over
19 any Agreement; (ii) identifies actions the Department and NPS will take to propose an Agreement with
20 the City for Sharp Park, (iii) creates a schedule and financial road map, to be incorporated into any
21 Agreement, for each party to complete those actions specified in subsection (ii); (iv) discusses terms,
22 which may be incorporated into the Agreement, that ensure that the NPS utilizes existing facilities to
23 provide compatible and public-serving uses such as a community and visitor center with appropriate
24 and feasible recreation; (v) discusses terms, which may be incorporated into the Agreement, that
25 provide for trail-based recreation, support stewardship of park lands, enhance nature-based

1 educational opportunities, and provide other public recreation opportunities where appropriate and
2 feasible; (vi) establishes proposed dates, to be incorporated into the Agreement, to end existing uses
3 inconsistent with the Agreement, and to fully transition land management to the NPS as specified in
4 subsection (b) above; and (vii) discusses terms, which may be incorporated into the Agreement, that
5 ensure that the NPS provides public recreation opportunities consistent with the National Park
6 Service's Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. Sections 1 et seq., GGNRA's enabling legislation, Public Law 92-589,
7 NPS Management Policies, and GGNRA's Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge, and Milagra Ridge
8 management plans.

9 (d) In the course of exploring an agreement with NPS for the long-term management of Sharp
10 Park, the Board of Supervisors shall consider, in addition to the items listed in subsection (c) above,
11 affording all City of Pacifica residents the right to purchase San Francisco resident golf cards and to
12 play at all of San Francisco's municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates for a minimum of five
13 in order to reduce recreational impacts that could result from closure of Sharp Park Golf Course
14 should the Board of Supervisors approve an agreement with NPS which provides for the closure of
15 Sharp Park Golf Course. .

16 (e) In the event an agreement between the City and NPS for the long-term management of
17 Sharp Park is approved and Sharp Park Golf Course is closed as a result, the City shall offer positions
18 to all City employees employed at Sharp Park Golf Course, consistent with applicable civil service
19 rules and collective bargaining agreements.

20 (f) This ordinance shall not apply to Sharp Park lands currently operated for archery purposes
21 unless a Memorandum of Agreement is entered into between the organizations operating the archery
22 range and NPS.

23 //

24 //

25 //

1 (g) The General Manager shall provide a written report to the Board of Supervisors on the
2 status of negotiations with NPS regarding a potential agreement for the long-term management of
3 Sharp Park by June 1, 2012, and quarterly thereafter until such time as negotiations are complete.

4 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
5 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

6 By: 
7 VIRGINIA DARIO ELIZONDO
8 Deputy City Attorney

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Park Code – Long Term Management Agreement with the National Park Service for Sharp Park]

Ordinance amending the San Francisco Park Code by amending Section 3.20

1) requiring the Recreation and Park Department to offer a long term management agreement to the National Park Service for certain property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission located in San Mateo County that is within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's legislative boundary ("Sharp Park"); and 2) making environmental and other findings.

Existing Law

In May 2009, the Board enacted legislation requiring the Recreation and Park Department to: develop a plan, schedule, and budget for restoring the habitat for the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake in Sharp Park, and for transferring Sharp Park to, or developing a joint management agreement with, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the City of Pacifica and/or San Mateo County. The plan must comply with all regulatory requirements, including the federal Endangered Species Act, and be in accord with the deed granting Sharp Park to San Francisco, as well as with the San Francisco Administrative Code. The plan must include alternatives that retain or redesign the Sharp Park Golf Course and that eliminate it.

In November 2009, the Recreation and Park Department produced the *Sharp Park Conceptual Restoration Alternatives Report*.

Amendments to Current Law

Park Code section 3.20 is replaced in its entirety to:

- Require the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department offer to the National Park Service (NPS) to enter into a long term management agreement for Sharp Park, which: 1) provides trail-based recreation, 2) supports stewardship of the park, 3) enhances nature-based educational opportunities, all consistent with the NPS' and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area's enabling legislation and management policies, and 4) offers to terminate use of the golf course.
- Prohibit the City from entering into any new leases, contracts or agreements for the operation of the golf course.
- Offer City of Pacifica residents the right to purchase San Francisco resident golf cards and play all of S.F. municipal golf courses at S.F. resident rates for 5 years.
- Require the City to offer positions to all City employees at Sharp Park Golf Course consistent with applicable civil service rules and collective bargaining agreements.

FILE NO.

- Require the RPD GM to provide a report to the Board of Supervisors on the development of the transition plan with the NPS on June 1, 2012, and quarterly thereafter until the transition is complete.
- Changes to the long-term management of Sharp Park that may occur under a proposed agreement with the NPS shall not proceed unless and until the City and NPS negotiate, execute and deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from any required CEQA and NEPA environmental review processes, other public review and hearing processes, and subject to all applicable governmental approvals. The City retains the absolute sole discretion to propose terms, consistent with this ordinance, for inclusion in the Agreement, and as may be necessary to comply with CEQA, if applicable. Approval of this ordinance grants NPS no vested rights, does not authorize or require any construction or other physical alteration of Sharp Park, results in no approved development plan for Sharp Park, and no legal obligations will exist unless and until the City and NPS negotiate, execute and deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from applicable environmental review processes, and on other public review and hearing processes, subject to all applicable governmental approvals

Background Information

Sharp Park ("Park") was deeded to the City for public recreation purposes in 1917, is located in the City of Pacifica, San Mateo County, and bisected by Highway 1. The Park is approximately 410 acres, and includes a golf course, archery range, and open space. Areas of the Park are habitat to the California red-legged frog, listed as a threatened species under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), and the San Francisco garter snake, listed as an endangered species under ESA.

Sharp Park is also within the legislative boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.



Re: Sharp Park Amendments 

Bill Wycko to: John Avalos

12/01/2011 05:39 PM

Cc: Rachel R. Redondiez, Angela Calvillo, Erica Maybaum, Frances Hsieh, Rick Caldeira, John Rahaim, AnMarie Rodgers

I have reviewed the amendments to the Sharp Park legislation that you are proposing as detailed in your communication to me today and have attached my evaluation. I have concluded that this legislation as proposed to be amended would not be a project under CEQA.



Wycko Sharp Park Letter.pdf

John Avalos/BOS/SFGOV



John Avalos/BOS/SFGOV

12/01/2011 04:04 PM

To: Bill Wycko/CTYPLN/SFGOV@SFGOV

cc: Angela Calvillo/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rick Caldeira/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Frances Hsieh/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Erica Maybaum/BOS/SFGOV@SFGOV, Rachel R. Redondiez <amihan33@gmail.com>

Subject: Sharp Park Amendments

Hi Bill-

Enclosed is a memo and revised legislation with amendments I plan to introduce in committee this coming Monday, Dec. 5.
I would appreciate your immediate response.



Sharp Park.pdf

I've also cc'd the Clerk's office and my aides.

John Avalos
Supervisor District 11
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-6975 phone
415-554-6979 fax



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

December 1, 2011

Dear Supervisor Avalos:

I am in receipt of your letter to me dated December 1, 2011, that sets forth the amendments to your proposed Sharp Park ordinance (File #110966) you have indicated that you will introduce at the City Operations and Neighborhood Services Committee on Monday, December 5, 2011. I have thoroughly reviewed these proposed amendments and have determined that the Sharp Park ordinance would not be a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) if this ordinance were revised to incorporate the amendments you are now proposing.

The legislation as proposed to be amended is not considered an approval under CEQA because it does not commit the City to a definite course of action with respect to Sharp Park. It instructs the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department to offer to the NPS the opportunity to create a long-term management agreement, including an option for closure of the golf course. The legislation specifically provides that adoption of the ordinance is a preliminary step in the process of potentially entering into an agreement with the NPS. It does not approve any agreement or grant any entitlements to the NPS, and it acknowledges that approval of any agreement would be contingent upon a number of subsequent steps, including completion of any required environmental review under CEQA and NEPA and the Board of Supervisors' review of the terms of any proposed agreement.

Adoption of the legislation as proposed to be amended itself would not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable change in the environment. Since the legislation does not commit the City to a course of action, any physical changes that may result if an agreement is negotiated will not be known until the terms of the agreement are negotiated and the agreement is subjected to environmental review.

Sincerely,


Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377



Sharp Park Amendments

John Avalos to: Bill Wycko

12/01/2011 04:04 PM

Cc: Angela Calvillo, Rick Caldeira, Frances Hsieh, Erica Maybaum,
Rachel R. Redondiez

Hi Bill-

Enclosed is a memo and revised legislation with amendments I plan to introduce in committee this coming Monday, Dec. 5.

I would appreciate your immediate response.




Sharp Park.pdf

I've also cc'd the Clerk's office and my aides.

John Avalos
Supervisor District 11
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-554-6975 phone
415-554-6979 fax

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 11



City and County of San Francisco

JOHN AVALOS

TO: Bill Wycko, Chief Environmental Officer
FROM: Supervisor John Avalos
RE: Sharp Park Legislation, File #110966

As you know, the City Operations and Neighborhood Services (CONS) will be considering my Sharp Park legislation, File# 110966 this coming Monday, December 5th.

We will be hearing the substitute legislation which I introduced on November 22, 2011 which should have been referred to you for consideration.

At the CONS meeting, I plan to introduce the enclosed amendments to further clarify that the legislation is intended to provide a policy alternative for the Recreation and Parks Department to pursue. The attached legislation shows the substitute legislation that I introduced on November 22, with the amendments I intend to make in committee on Monday, December 5th.

I respectfully request your CEQA determination in writing on this version by the time the CONS committee considers this item on Monday, December 5, 10am.

Thank you very much for your immediate attention to this.

1 [Park Code – Long Term Management Agreement with the National Park Service for Sharp
2 Park]

3 **Ordinance amending the San Francisco Park Code by amending Section 3.20 to 1)**
4 **require requiring the Recreation and Park Department to offer a long term management**
5 **agreement to the National Park Service for certain property under the jurisdiction of the**
6 **Recreation and Park Commission located in San Mateo County that is within the**
7 **Golden Gate National Recreation Area’s legislative boundary (“Sharp Park”); and 2)**
8 **making environmental and other findings.**

9 NOTE: Additions are *single-underline italics Times New Roman*;
10 deletions are *strike-through italics Times New Roman*.
11 Board amendment additions are double-underlined;
Board amendment deletions are ~~strikethrough normal~~.

12 Be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco:

13 Section 1. Environmental Findings.

14 The following determination has been made under the California Environmental Quality
15 Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Sections 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”) with respect to adoption of this
16 ordinance: _____ . Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board
17 of Supervisors in File No. _____ , and is incorporated herein by reference.

18 Section 2. The San Francisco Park Code Section 3.20 is hereby repealed in its
19 entirety.

20 Section 3. The San Francisco Park Code Section 3.20 is hereby replaced, to read as
21 follows:

22 **SEC. 3.20. SHARP PARK LONG TERM MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT.**

23 *(a) Findings.*

24 *(1) Entering into a long-term management agreement with the National Park Service (“NPS”)*
25 *to manage property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission located in San*

1 Mateo County that is within the legislative boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area
2 ("Sharp Park") could provide San Francisco with the opportunity to further the public purposes of:
3 providing recreation opportunities consistent with modern recreation demands, preserving and
4 allowing for the restoration of wildlife habitats, preserving historical resources, protecting coastal
5 resources, and preserving land for park purposes.

6 (2) All Bay Area residents deserve safe, well-maintained, and sustainable parks in which to
7 play, engage in nature exploration, relax, and build community.

8 (3) Moreover, San Franciscans deserve parks that supply, insofar as possible, recreation that is
9 consistent with modern recreation demands.

10 (4) The City and County of San Francisco must also ensure the equitable distribution of
11 recreation dollars among our neighborhoods. In the 2011-12 Recreation and Park Department
12 Operating Budget, the Open Space Fund contribution surpassed the General Fund subsidy for the first
13 time, and the General Fund subsidy has declined 25% over the last 5 years. The decrease in public
14 funding for parks puts pressure on the Recreation and Park Department to meet financial obligations
15 by other means.

16 (5) In 2004, the Recreation and Park Department conducted a Recreation Assessment and
17 released a Recreation Assessment Report detailing the recreational preferences of San Francisco
18 residents. The report found that the number one recreation demand in San Francisco is for more
19 walking and biking trails.

20 (6) In 2010, the Neighborhood Parks Council surveyed 1,443 San Francisco residents, asking
21 dozens of questions about San Francisco's parks. In one question, respondents were asked to list three
22 priorities for park funding. Of the nearly 100 different responses, sustainability came in fifth, behind
23 only general park maintenance, better athletic fields, more programming, and improved safety.

24 (7) Sharp Park is increasingly at risk as the climate warms and the sea level rises. San
25 Francisco can adapt to climate change by protecting viable migratory paths for wetlands, inland and

1 upland from the coast, and by prioritizing the creation and protection of habitat linkages that connect
2 natural areas and parks.

3 (8) San Francisco also has a responsibility to protect sensitive species and their habitats, and
4 encourage their recovery. At Sharp Park, San Francisco has a special opportunity to implement the
5 recovery goals and objectives for the endangered San Francisco garter snake and the threatened
6 California red-legged frog, as established by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's recovery
7 plans for each species.

8 (9) Experts on coastal wetlands restoration have declared that Sharp Park "represents one of
9 the best opportunities in the Central Coast region to improve and restore impaired lagoon wetland
10 habitats for endangered species." (PWA-ESA 2011). Because of the existence and potential for
11 significant restoration for endangered species, of which the "restoration of garter snake habitat at
12 Sharp Park has been identified as a key recovery goal by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service" (USFWS
13 1985), restoration and development of habitat-compatible recreation can attract federal and state
14 endangered species recovery and ecosystem restoration funding."

15 (10) Working in partnership with the NPS, San Francisco has an opportunity to: provide
16 recreational opportunities that are consistent with modern recreational demands, equitably distribute
17 scarce recreation resources in San Francisco, address land management challenges posed by climate
18 change and sea level rise, protect and recover endangered species and create a more sustainable and
19 resilient public park at Sharp Park.

20 (11) Approval of this ordinance is a preliminary step in the process of potentially entering into an
21 agreement with NPS for long-term management of Sharp Park. Approval of such an agreement is
22 contingent upon a number of subsequent steps, including but not limited to NPS agreeing to develop the
23 Agreement, as defined below, the successful development of the Agreement, approval of the Agreement,
24 following the completion of any required environmental analysis by the City and County of San
25 Francisco ("City") under CEQA and by NPS under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

1 Nothing in this Ordinance implements any approvals of the Agreement, or grants any entitlements to
2 the NPS, nor does adoption of this Ordinance foreclose the possibility of considering alternatives or
3 mitigation measures to the Agreement, including a no action alternative or an alternative that includes
4 retention of all or portions of Sharp Park Golf Course, and while this Ordinance sets forth many of the
5 potential terms of a proposed Agreement, it does not set forth all of the material terms and conditions
6 of a project proposal. A transaction of the type contemplated in this ordinance involves many terms
7 and conditions that have not yet been agreed upon, and it is expressly contemplated by the Board of
8 Supervisors that binding agreements will have to be negotiated, agreed and ultimately approved
9 through applicable public processes, including approval by the Board of Supervisors.

10 (12) Changes to the long-term management of Sharp Park that may occur under a proposed
11 agreement with the NPS shall not proceed unless and until the City and NPS negotiate, execute and
12 deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from any required CEQA
13 and NEPA environmental review processes, other public review and hearing processes, and subject to
14 all applicable governmental approvals. The City retains the absolute sole discretion to propose terms,
15 consistent with this ordinance, for inclusion in the Agreement, and as may be necessary to comply with
16 CEQA, if applicable. Approval of this ordinance grants NPS no vested rights, does not authorize or
17 require any construction or other physical alteration of Sharp Park, results in no approved
18 development plan for Sharp Park, and no legal obligations will exist unless and until the City and NPS
19 negotiate, execute and deliver mutually acceptable agreements based upon information produced from
20 applicable environmental review processes, and on other public review and hearing processes, subject
21 to all applicable governmental approvals.

22 (b) In order to provide recreation benefits consistent with the modern recreational needs of all
23 San Franciscans, Bay Area residents, and visitors, no later than March 1, 2012, the General Manager
24 of the Recreation and Park Department ("General Manager") shall offer to close Sharp Park Golf
25 Course and offer to the NPS the opportunity to create a long-term management agreement

1 ("Agreement") with the City for Sharp Park, which shall include the option of closure of the Sharp
2 Park Golf Course, and in a manner that meets the policy objectives, findings, and goals of the City as
3 set forth in this ordinance and consistent with: (i) the National Park Service's Organic Act, 16 U.S.C.
4 §§ 1 et seq., and Management Policies; (ii) Golden Gate National Recreational Area's ("GGNRA")
5 enabling legislation, Public Law 92-589; and (iii) GGNRA's Mori Point, Sweeney Ridge, and Milagra
6 Ridge management plans. If the NPS is willing to consider the opportunity for long-term management
7 of Sharp Park, then the General Manager shall take all actions necessary to negotiate the Agreement in
8 partnership with the NPS consistent with the policy specified in subsection (c) below. The General
9 Manager is authorized to and shall discuss with the NPS, among other options and terms, the closure of
10 Sharp Park Golf Course. During the period between the NPS informing the General Manager of its
11 willingness to negotiate an agreement with the City and either (i) the approval or denial of the
12 Agreement or (ii) NPS informing the General Manager of its intent to cease negotiations with the City,
13 the City shall not enter into any new leases, contracts, or agreements for the operation of the golf
14 course, but may continue to operate existing golf amenities, so long as the City complies with all
15 applicable federal and state environmental regulations and permitting requirements, including, but not
16 limited to, the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq.

17 (c) The General Manager shall consult with the NPS and develop a collaborative plan policy
18 that achieves the following objectives and goals of the City: (i) ensures that Sharp Park remains secure,
19 free of vandalism and incompatible uses, and is properly maintained during the period of negotiations
20 over any Agreement; (ii) identifies actions the Department and NPS will take prior to implementation
21 of an agreement to propose an Agreement with the City for Sharp Park, (iii) creates a schedule and
22 financial strategies ~~road map~~, to be incorporated into any Agreement, for each party to complete those
23 actions specified in subsection (ii); (iv) discusses terms, which may be incorporated into the
24 Agreement, that ensure that the NPS utilizes existing facilities to provide compatible and public-serving
25 uses such as a community and visitor center with appropriate and feasible recreation; (v) discusses

1 terms, which may be incorporated into the Agreement, that provide for trail-based recreation, support
2 stewardship of park lands, enhance nature-based educational opportunities, and provide other public
3 recreation opportunities where appropriate and feasible; (vi) establishes proposed dates, to be
4 incorporated into the Agreement, to end existing uses inconsistent with the Agreement, and to fully
5 transition land management to the NPS as specified in subsection (b) above; and (vii) discusses terms,
6 which may be incorporated into the Agreement, that ensure that the NPS provides public recreation
7 opportunities consistent with the National Park Service's Organic Act, 16 U.S.C. Sections 1 et seq.,
8 GGNRA's enabling legislation, Public Law 92-589, NPS Management Policies, and GGNRA's Mori
9 Point, Sweeney Ridge, and Milagra Ridge management plans.

10 (d) In the course of exploring an agreement with NPS for the long-term management of Sharp
11 Park, the Board of Supervisors shall consider, in addition to the items listed in subsection (c) above,
12 affording all City of Pacifica residents the right to purchase San Francisco resident golf cards and to
13 play at all of San Francisco's municipal courses at San Francisco resident rates for a minimum of five
14 in order to reduce recreational impacts that could result from closure of Sharp Park Golf Course
15 should the Board of Supervisors approve an agreement with NPS which provides for the closure of
16 Sharp Park Golf Course.

17 (e) In the event an agreement between the City and NPS for the long-term management of
18 Sharp Park is approved and Sharp Park Golf Course is closed as a result, the City shall offer positions
19 to all City employees employed at Sharp Park Golf Course, consistent with applicable civil service
20 rules and collective bargaining agreements.

21 (f) This ordinance shall not apply to Sharp Park lands currently operated for archery purposes
22 unless a Memorandum of Agreement is entered into between the organizations operating the archery
23 range and NPS.

24 #

25 #

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

#

1 (g) The General Manager shall provide a written report to the Board of Supervisors on the
2 status of negotiations with NPS regarding a potential agreement for the long-term management of
3 Sharp Park including discussions on the option to close Sharp Park Golf Course.- by June 1, 2012, and
4 quarterly thereafter until such time as negotiations are complete.

5
6 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
7 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

8 By: _____
9 VIRGINIA DARIO ELIZONDO
10 Deputy City Attorney



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

MEA Planner: Jessica Range
Project Address: Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan:
 Sharp Park Golf Course, Pacifica
Block/Lot: N/A
Case No.: 2005.1912E
Date of Review: February 8, 2011
Planning Dept. Reviewer: Shelley Caltagirone
 (415) 558-6625 | shelly.caltagirone@sfgov.org

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is the implementation of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department’s Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. The plan establishes goals and objectives for 32 Natural Areas, including Sharp Park Golf Course located in Pacifica. The specific goals and objectives are listed fully in Chapters 2 and 3 of the Sharp Park Golf Course Historical Resources Evaluation (HRE) report. In summary, the proposed project would convert about 19 acres of the golf course to Natural Area to facilitate restoration of the Laguna Salada and wildlife habitats associated with the property. Both the lagoon and pond would be excavated extensively and the dredge spoils would be used to raise Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18, creating upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Thirteen acres of the golf course would be converted to upland habitat along the east side of the lagoon and would require that Holes 10 and 13 are slightly shortened or narrowed. A dispersal corridor between the lagoon and the pond would be constructed with upland features and would necessitate closing Hole 12 of the golf course. A post and rail fence would also be installed along the seawall to the west of the lagoon, with additional fencing around the wetland complex to discourage human and pet intrusion.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

The golf course and the clubhouse were separately designated as historic landmarks for the City of Pacifica in 2009. The property is not listed on the state or national registries. The property is considered a “Category A” (Known Historic Resource) property for the purposes of the Planning Department’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.

HISTORIC DISTRICT / NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The 411-acre golf course is located in the town of Pacifica in San Mateo County. It borders the Pacific Ocean and is bisected by Highway 1. Thirteen fairways, the clubhouse, and Laguna Salada are located to the west of the highway, and the four remaining fairways are located to the east of the highway.

1. **California Register Criteria of Significance:** A building may be an historical resource if it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make such a determination please specify what information is needed. *(This determination for California Register Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above named preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)*

Event: or Yes No Unable to determine
Persons: or Yes No Unable to determine
Architecture: or Yes No Unable to determine
Information Potential: Further investigation recommended.
District or Context: Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context.
If yes, period of significance: 1929-1932

The Planning Department concurs with Tetra Tech's determination that the subject property appears to be eligible for listing on the California Register for its significance under Criteria 1 (Events) and 3 (Architecture). The golf course's development is associated with the broader event of the golden age of golf in the US and in California. The course is also an important example of a seaside golf course designed by a master landscape architect, Alister Mackenzie. Please refer to Section 5.2 of the HRE report for a full analysis of the resource's historical significance.

2. **Integrity** is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted above:

Location: Retains Lacks Setting: Retains Lacks
Association: Retains Lacks Feeling: Retains Lacks
Design: Retains Lacks Materials: Retains Lacks
Workmanship: Retains Lacks

The resource retains sufficient integrity in all aspects of its character to convey its historical significance. Please refer to Section 5.3 of the HRE report for a full analysis of property's integrity.

3. **Determination** of whether the property is an "historical resource" for purposes of CEQA.

No Resource Present (Go to 6 below.) Historical Resource Present (Continue to 4.)

4. **If the property appears to be an historical resource**, would the proposed project materially impair the resource (i.e. alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics which justify the property's inclusion in any registry to which it belongs)?

- The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired. (*Continue to 5 if the project is an alteration.*)
- The project is a significant impact as proposed. (*Continue to 5 if the project is an alteration.*)

The Planning Department fully concurs with the impacts analysis provided by Tetra Tech in Section 5.4 of the HRE report. In summary:

Project Impacts:

- Raising Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 *would not cause a significant impact* on the character-defining features of the golf course and the holes would remain in their original locations and the visual character of their fairways would only be minimally affected.
- The closure of Hole 12 *would cause a significant impact* to the historic resource as the work would eliminate an original hole and fairway on the west side of the course. Its removal would significantly alter the original golf course design and boundaries.
- The proposed fencing would add a modern element to the golf course but would not harm the character or setting of the resource. This addition to the landscape *would not cause a significant impact* to the historic resource.
- Modifying approximately 13 acres of the golf course to create upland habitat along the east side of the lagoon would require slightly shortening or narrowing Holes 10 and 13. This alteration would significantly alter the character of these original fairways. Therefore, the work *would cause a significant impact* to the historic resource.

Alternative Project Impacts:

- The recreation analysis of the SNRAMP EIR proposes a mitigation measure (Option 1) that would create a new hole on the east side of Highway 1 as a replacement for Hole 12. This would result in a total of 13 holes on the west side of the highway and five holes on the east side. This arrangement would not maintain the historic balance of holes on either side of the highway and would change the historic boundaries of the course. This *would cause a significant impact* to the original design of the historic resource.
- The recreation analysis of the SNRAMP EIR proposes a mitigation measure (Option 2) that would create a new hole on the west side of Highway 1 as a replacement for Hole 12. While the mitigation measure would change the layout of the holes, this alternative mitigation measure would restore some of the elements that Mackenzie had implemented in his original design by placing the new holes in areas of the course where holes were historically placed. The proposed holes would also be in keeping with the historic boundaries of the golf course. Because of the restorative aspect of the work, this mitigation *would cause a less than significant impact* to the resource.

The project would result in significant impacts to several character-defining features of the golf course, including Holes 10, 12, and 13.

Historical Resources Evaluation Report

For the

**Sharp Park Golf Course
Part of the Natural Areas
City and County of San Francisco
Pacifica, San Mateo County**

January 2011

Prepared for:

**City and County of San Francisco Planning Department
Major Environmental Analysis
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103**

Prepared by:

**Tetra Tech, Inc.
555 Market Street, 15th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section | Page |
|---|------------|
| 1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS | 1-1 |
| 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION | 2-1 |
| 2.1 Project Overview | 2-1 |
| 2.2 Project Objectives | 2-1 |
| 2.3 Project Location..... | 2-3 |
| 3. PROPOSED PROJECT | 3-1 |
| 4. RESEARCH AND FIELD METHODOLOGY..... | 4-1 |
| 4.1 Area of Potential Effect..... | 4-2 |
| 4.2 Historical Overview..... | 4-2 |
| 4.3 History of Sharp Park Golf Course | 4-2 |
| 4.3.1 Changes to the Course..... | 4-3 |
| 4.3.2 History of Public Golf in San Francisco | 4-4 |
| 5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 5-1 |
| 5.1 Evaluation Criteria | 5-1 |
| 5.2 Evaluation..... | 5-3 |
| 5.3 Integrity..... | 5-4 |
| 5.4 Impacts Analysis and Mitigation Measures | 5-5 |
| 6. MITIGATION | 6-1 |
| 7. QUALIFICATIONS..... | 7-1 |

FIGURES, ILLUSTRATIONS, AND PHOTOGRAPHS

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Sharp Park Golf Course Project Location..... | 1-2 |
| 2 | Existing Golf Course Layout | 1-3 |
| 3 | Original Design of Sharp Park Golf Course | 4-5 |

(All photographs are by Tetra Tech, Inc., unless otherwise noted.)

APPENDIX

A DPR 523 Forms


CHAPTER 1

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In response to public concerns raised during the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping process for the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan (SNRAMP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR), this Historical Resources Evaluation (HRE) addresses Sharp Park Golf Course as a designed historic landscape. CEQA requires that the lead agency for the project, the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department Major Environmental Analysis (MEA), determine the impact that implementing the SNRAMP may have on historical resources at Sharp Park Golf Course. MEA and the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD) are preparing an EIR for this project, for which this HRE will be a technical background report. Tetra Tech prepared this HRE, in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)-(b) of the CEQA guidelines and using the criteria outlined in Section 5924.1 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA guidelines. The report identifies known or potential historical resources at Sharp Park Golf Course that could be impacted by the project and assesses potential impacts on those resources. The report also proposes measures to mitigate any substantial adverse changes to historical resources. The location of the Golf Course is shown in Figure 1.

Based on the scoping comments from the Initial Study, Tetra Tech and MEA established the project's area of potential effects (APE) as the footprint of the Sharp Park Golf Course¹ (Figure 2). Tetra Tech's historian identified the built environment resources within the APE that could be potentially impacted by this project. These resources constitute the survey population properties for this study, which are Sharp Park Golf Course, including the course itself, maintenance buildings, and clubhouse.

¹The term "area of potential effect" is associated with historic resources studied in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 and its regulation in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 800. APE is used in this document to define the geographical area that the SNRAMP EIR project may directly or indirectly impact. This report is prepared for the project's compliance under CEQA and use of APE should not be taken to imply that the SNRAMP EIR project is a federal undertaking that must comply with Section 106.



R:\NEW\18598\CIS\LAYOUTS\Location Map.mxd - 01/27/11 - YE

Location Map

Legend

 Sharp Park Golf Course Boundary

Pacifica, California



Rifle

Organic waste

15

7

14

18

13

10

11

1

2

3

9

8

7

4

6

5

Tetra Tech inventoried and evaluated the golf course to assess whether it should be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, that is, whether it is listed on, determined eligible for listing on, or appears to meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Tetra Tech concludes that Sharp Park Golf Course appears to meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR and NRHP and should be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Furthermore, the project would cause a substantial adverse change to the Sharp Park Golf Course because some of the project activities would diminish the historic integrity of the property. Therefore, mitigation measures are proposed in this document.

CHAPTER 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

While San Francisco is by and large a densely developed urban area, fragments of unique plant and animal habitats, known as Natural Areas, have been preserved in San Francisco and Pacifica, in the parks that are managed by the SFRPD. In the late 1990s, the SFRPD developed a Natural Areas Program to protect and manage these Natural Areas for the natural and human values they provide. The Natural Areas Program mission is to preserve, restore, and enhance the remnant Natural Areas and to promote environmental stewardship of these areas. On January 19, 1995, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission approved the first SNRAMP.

Over the course of several years, the SFRPD developed a new SNRAMP (SFRPD 2006), with a final draft plan based on the 1995 plan and published in February 2006. This SNRAMP contains detailed information on the biology, geology, and trails within 32 Natural Areas, all of which are in San Francisco except Sharp Park, which is in Pacifica. The SNRAMP is intended to guide natural resource protection, habitat restoration, trail and access improvements, other capital projects, and maintenance activities over the next 20 years. The proposed project is the SFRPD's implementation of the SNRAMP.

2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Summarized below are the goals and objectives of the SNRAMP.

Conservation and Restoration Goals

- To identify existing natural resources;
- To maintain viable populations of all special status species;
- To maintain and enhance native plant and animal communities;
- To maintain and enhance local biodiversity;

- To reestablish native community diversity, structure, and ecosystem function where degraded;
- To improve Natural Area connectivity; and
- To decrease the extent of invasive exotic species cover.

Education Goals

- To provide services that will enable all age groups to better understand the values of the Natural Areas, including ecosystem functions and socioeconomic values;
- To provide opportunities for service learning to students in the San Francisco Unified School District; and
- To provide diverse outdoor classroom opportunities.

Research Goals

- To provide a research framework and research opportunities to schools and universities that will lead to an enhanced understanding of the natural systems and an informed adaptive management approach;
- To contribute to the scientific understanding of local natural systems; and
- To contribute to the field of restoration ecology and other applied sciences.

Stewardship Goals

- To develop and support opportunities for public stewardship of Natural Areas;
- To foster neighborhood stewardship and volunteer groups; and
- To provide diverse opportunities for participation by stewardship groups.

Recreation Goals

- To provide opportunities for passive recreational uses (e.g., hiking and nature observation) that are compatible with conservation and restoration goals and
- To improve and develop a recreational trail system that provides the greatest amount of accessibility while protecting natural resources.

Monitoring Goals

To establish a long-term monitoring program to:

- Identify the species on which monitoring should focus;
- Detect increases and declines in abundance, distribution, or health of special status species;
- Detect significant changes in acreage of native communities, wildlife habitats, and invasive species;
- Detect significant increases and declines in native species richness;

- Assess success of restoration in achieving conservation and restoration goals; and
- Provide an adaptive management framework for evaluating changes (e.g., conceptual model).

Design and Aesthetic Goals

- Where possible, to develop aesthetically pleasing landscapes that are consistent with surrounding landscapes and that create natural transitions, especially where adjacent parklands and traditionally landscaped areas abut Natural Areas;
- To maintain and develop viewpoints and viewsheds to enhance park experiences; and
- Where possible, to design and maintain landscapes to discourage the accumulation of trash and illegal encampments.

Safety Goal

- To design and maintain landscapes that promotes public safety.

2.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The 411-acre Sharp Park is in the town of Pacifica in San Mateo County. The park borders the Pacific Ocean and is bisected by Highway 1. Thirteen fairways, the Sharp Park Golf Course clubhouse, and Laguna Salada are on the western side of Highway 1; the four remaining fairways are on the eastern side of Highway 1. Figure 1 is a map of Sharp Park Golf Course.

CHAPTER 3

PROPOSED PROJECT

Recommended Sharp Park Management Actions that include Sharp Park Golf Course in general are as follows:

- Implement improvements to protect and enhance the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake at Laguna Salada, including the following:
 - Create shallow pools within existing wetlands,
 - Continue monitoring red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes,
 - Remove tires from Horse Stable Pond,
 - Install signs and barriers to keep dogs out of Horse Stable Pond
- Separate the small peninsulas within Laguna Salada from the mainland by small canals,
 - Restore Sanchez Creek by deepening the channel, expanding the creek corridor upstream, and installing buffer zones to limit human disturbance;
- Raise the area directly east of Laguna Salada to prevent flooding and plant with willows and other native vegetation to provide snake and frog basking sites, and to provide nesting habitat for riparian birds;
- Work with golf course staff to minimize use of chemicals;
- Educate golf course staff about the importance of identifying California red-legged frogs, San Francisco garter snakes, and forktail damselflies and their habitats;
- Work with golf course maintenance staff to incorporate native plants within bank stabilization efforts along Sanchez Creek where it flows through the golf course.

The following specific project activities would impact Sharp Park Golf Course:

- The areas that are currently open water within the lagoon and Horse Stable Pond would be deepened by two to three feet, and parts of the eastern portions of the lagoon and pond would be excavated extensively to restore open water habitat and to ensure that ample edge habitat consisting of open water/emergent vegetation interface would persist for the foreseeable future. Excavated dredge spoils appropriate for use as golf course substrate materials would be used on-site to raise Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 and to create the upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. A dispersal corridor between the lagoon and the pond would be constructed with upland features designed to support the San Francisco garter snake; this action would necessitate closing Hole 12 of the Sharp Park Golf Course.
- A post and rail fence would also be installed along the seawall to the west of the lagoon, with additional fencing around the wetland complex to discourage human and pet intrusion into the restored habitat area.

The proposed project would convert about 19 acres of the Sharp Park Golf Course to Natural Area to facilitate Laguna Salada restoration. To restore California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake habitat at Laguna Salada, approximately 13 acres of the golf course would be modified to create upland habitat along the east side of the lagoon to provide critically important San Francisco garter snake upland habitat, to discourage frogs from depositing egg masses in locations where the resulting tadpoles may end up being stranded and to allow for the creation of new wetlands to compensate for those filled during the restoration process. This would primarily affect the layout of the golf course Holes 13 and 14, directly east of Laguna Salada. Holes 10 and 13 would be slightly shortened or narrowed, and Hole 12 would be removed. This habitat corridor would be approximately six acres, bringing the total of modified area at the golf course to about 19 acres. This change would affect the playability of the course.

The EIR for the project identifies mitigation to reduce this recreation impact on Sharp Park Golf Course. In order to create a habitat corridor between Horse Stable Pond and Laguna Salada, one of two potential mitigation measures would be implemented. These measures are detailed below.

Recreation Mitigation Measure, Option 1. The SFRPD would coordinate with a golf course consultant and would restore the playability of the Sharp Park Golf Course. One possible approach is the creation of a new Hole 7 east of Highway 1. Under this option, there would be a total of 13 holes on the west side of the Highway 1 and five holes on the east side. The bunkering and sculptured contouring would be characteristic of the design and strategy aesthetics of Alister Mackenzie, the famous golf-architect who had designed several courses in the US and abroad. The SFRPD would use a professional golf course architect to design the new and reconfigured holes and fairways, while distinguishing the new holes from the original historic holes.

Recreation Mitigation Measure, Option 2. The SFRPD would coordinate with a golf course consultant and would restore the playability of the Sharp Park Golf Course. Under this option, the golf course would be reconfigured to include 15 holes on the west side of Highway 1 and three holes on the east side. Two new holes and fairways would be created on the coast side of the course, to the west of Laguna Salada. The bunkering and sculptured contouring would be characteristic of the design and strategy aesthetics of Alistair Mackenzie, the famous golf-architect who had designed several courses in the US and abroad. The SFRPD would use a professional golf course architect to design the new and reconfigured holes and fairways, while distinguishing the new holes from the original historic holes.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH AND FIELD METHODOLOGY

Tetra Tech conducted preliminary research at the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department and the City of Pacifica Planning Department to determine whether any previous studies or evaluations had been conducted for Sharp Park Golf Course. We also reviewed the NRHP and California Inventory of Historic Resources, as the golf course would automatically be eligible for listing on the CRHR and would be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA if it was listed in the NRHP. None of the state or national registers identified Sharp Park Golf Course as a historical resource.² The golf course and the clubhouse were separately designated as historic landmarks for the City of Pacifica in 2009.³

Tetra Tech inventoried the golf course for recordation on DPR 523 forms and conducted research for this HRE in March and April 2010. We prepared a historic context to address the themes and background for the property, which we evaluated under the CRHR and NRHP criteria on the DPR 523 forms; the latter criteria applied because properties that are listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP are automatically eligible for listing on the CRHR. Historical research was conducted at the San Francisco Public Library History Center and its general collections, California Historical Society, San Mateo County Public Library (various branches), and the City of Pacifica Planning and Economics Department. Research revealed that the relevant themes and context for discussing the significance of the golf course as a designed historic landscape include the growth and development of golf in San Francisco. The relevant period for the themes and context, as they relate to the survey population, is the early to mid-twentieth century.

²National Park Service, National Register Information System, online database <http://www.nr.nps.gov/> and <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com>.

³Elizabeth Claycomb, City of Pacifica Planning and Economic Development Department, personal communication with Julia Mates, Tetra Tech March 8, 2010.

4.1 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT

Tetra Tech and MEA established as the APE for this project the footprint of Sharp Park Golf Course, which has boundaries on both the east and west sides of the Highway 1. This APE includes all of the buildings and structures within the golf course boundaries.

4.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The following overview provides historic background to the project area and historic context for the golf course and includes a discussion of the development of golf in San Francisco. This historic context summarizes the context provided in the inventory and evaluation form in the appendix.

4.3 HISTORY OF SHARP PARK GOLF COURSE

Sharp Park Golf Course is on the former Mexican Rancho land of San Pedro. A portion of this land, 410 acres, was eventually owned by George Sharp, a prominent San Francisco attorney and corporate counsel for the Ocean Shore Railroad in the late 1880s.⁴ When Sharp died in early 1882, the land was left to his wife, Honora. She died in 1905, and the land was left to her trustees, Ruben Lloyd and Adolph Spreckles, both members of the San Francisco Parks Commission. Spreckles sold his share of the property to the City and County of San Francisco in 1916 for 10 dollars in gold, and, after Lloyd passed away in 1917, the remaining shares of the land were bequeathed by the estate to the City of San Francisco.⁵ The property was stipulated to be used for a park and recreation only.

The City and County of San Francisco commissioned Alister Mackenzie to design the course. Having worked on other seaside golf courses in Great Britain, Mackenzie believed that “golf in its early days was always played on commons or links land which bordered the sea. The natural characteristics of this type of land made it easily the most suitable for the game.”⁶ Mackenzie stated that Sharp Park, being constructed on land reclaimed from the sea “now has a great resemblance to real links land.”⁷ Jack Fleming, the City’s golf course overseer appointed by the Parks Commission, was Mackenzie’s assistant during the project. In the mid-1930s, Robert Hunter was appointed to supervise construction of the course.⁸

The location of Sharp Park Golf Course posed a challenge. The parcels of land designated for the course were next to the Pacific Ocean, and the land was composed of barren sand dunes and a lagoon. In order to construct the golf course and build up fairway grades, the Sharp Park site was dredged. The natural lagoon, Laguna Salada, remained within the golf course, and the design incorporated it by surrounding it with

⁴Sharp Park Golf Course occupies only 120 acres of this land.

⁵Sharp Park Golf Course Web site: <http://www.sharpparkgc.com/>.

⁶Alister Mackenzie, *The Spirit of St. Andrews* (1995 Published Posthumously Sleeping Bear Press, Chelsea, Michigan, p. 246).

⁷Mackenzie, *The Spirit of Saint Andrews*, pp. 171-172.

⁸National Golf Foundation Consulting, Inc., *Sharp Park Golf Course* (City of San Francisco, California, no date), p. 84. On file at City and County of San Francisco Park and Recreation Department vertical files, labeled “Miscellaneous Documents, Golf Course History.”

fairways. Construction began on the course in 1929, and it took fourteen months to dredge the area around Laguna Salada marsh. Sharp Park Golf Club opened in 1932, after two delays due to drainage problems on the course from winter rains.⁹

The original layout of the golf course included Holes featuring multiple tees (Holes 2, 5, and 14), double fairways (Holes 5 and 10), cross bunkering (Hole 16), fairways in sand dunes (Holes 3 and 7), and several holes bordering Laguna Salada (Holes 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11). Cypress trees dotted the setting.¹⁰

When constructed, the course used well water for irrigation. In the 1930s, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) installed a water pipeline for the course that extended from the San Bruno County Jail reservoir to a concrete pressure-reducing tank, 20 feet wide by 150 feet long. This pipeline provided water to the course for irrigation and for drinking until it was abandoned in place in 2008. The line extended through the canyon to the east of the course through the Hole 7 fairway.¹¹

Golf courses have been called living things in the sense that they are mostly constructed of living elements, such as grass and trees, which grow and change over time. Soil erodes, changing the pitch of slopes; trees grow or are replanted, and the holes cannot be played as they were originally. Advancements in playing equipment also change the game.¹²

Courses are redesigned, replaced, or remodeled for two reasons; the first is to improve the layout of the course, the second is to adjust the course for advances in golf technology. Redesigning golf courses involves rerouting and adjusting holes. In golf course architecture, restoring courses is considered to be the act of bringing a course back to, or closer to, its original state.¹³ At the same time, there are technological advances in the game of golf (balls, clubs, and mowing techniques) that advance and therefore result in alteration of the course to maintain playability. By the late 1920s, golf course designers accepted the idea that both natural and technological advances are factors, among others, that make it necessary to continuously improve golf courses, in order to maintain the strategy of the game.

4.3.1 Changes to the Course

The layout of Sharp Park Golf Course has undergone several alterations to accommodate natural changes in the landscape because of the course's location along the Pacific Ocean shoreline. The course was also modified to accommodate the anticipated realignment of Highway 1.

⁹Joe Faulkner, *Sharp Park*, 1970, www.sfpublic.golf.com.

¹⁰Daniel Wexler, *The Missing Links: America's Greatest Lost Golf Course & Holes* (Sleeping Bear Press, Chelsea, Michigan, 2000), pp. 114-115.

¹¹Clyde Healy, Assistant City Engineer, *Report of Clyde E. Healy, Assistant City Engineer, City of San Francisco and Coordinator of WPA Projects*, (San Francisco, October 1935-1939), p. 53.

¹²Graves and Cornish, *Golf Course Design* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York, 1998), pp. 127, 131-132.

¹³Graves and Cornish, *Golf Course Design*, pp. 131-132.

The first major alteration was in 1941, when a seawall or berm was constructed to keep the ocean from reaching and flooding the course. To make room for the berm, the two original oceanside Holes 3 and 7 were moved inland. Another alteration was removing the lagoon and the second fairway at original Hole 10 (current Hole 14). Course modifications also included the installation of a 4,000-gallon pump to help with annual flooding of Laguna Salada, rerouting fairways for holes on the east side of Highway 1, and modest alterations, such as renumbering and shortening some of the original fairways. More recent changes involved lengthening fairways and adding and rebuilding tee boxes from 1985 until 1994.

The original design of the course had three holes on the east side of what was a county road, in front (on the west side) of the clubhouse, as shown in Figure 3. Around 1943, the county road was improved and rerouted to become Highway 1, which no longer passed the west side of the club house but was now on the east side. Although Highway 1 was not realigned until sometime after 1940, the designers of the course knew the course would have to be modified to accommodate the road (Figure 3). In 1932, Jack Fleming, in writing about the course in the *San Francisco Call-Bulletin*, described it as being “at present along the edge of the county road which is planned to re-locate.” Other, more minor alterations included changing sand trap shapes, filling in sand traps with grass, and rerouting fairways in 1962 and 1963. Between 1985 and 1994, several tees were lengthened and tee boxes were added or enlarged in order to accommodate female players and to accommodate larger numbers of golfers. Concrete cart paths were constructed along the back nine holes by 1996.


There has been a strong desire to maintain the original design layout of the course to the greatest extent. Many of the alterations have been forced by the natural changes in the landscape, with only a few changes made to accommodate advanced technology in golf clubs and ball construction. The goal has been to make the necessary modifications while preserving Sharp Park’s function as a golf course, laden with elements of challenge and surprise, and to maintain playability.

4.3.2 History of Public Golf in San Francisco

The game of golf came to California in the late 1800s, and the first course was constructed in southern California at the Riverside Country Club in 1891. The first northern California golf course, a three-hole course built in 1893, was at the Burlingame Country Club. The first course to be constructed in San Francisco was the private San Francisco Golf Club in 1895.¹⁴

¹⁴Neal Hotelling, *Pebble Beach Golf Links: The Official History* (Sleeping Bear Press, Chelsea, Michigan, 1999), p. 20.

R:\new\19598\Correll\Sharp Park Plan.cdr - 09/09/10 - YE



Original Plan for Sharp Park Golf Course

Pacifica, California

While golf courses at private country clubs were gaining in popularity, golfers unable to afford the high prices of country clubs had very few places to play. In the early 1900s, avid golfers and wealthy members of private clubs, Jack Neville and Vincent Whitney, approached John McLaren, Supervisor of Golden Gate Park, about constructing a municipal golf course. Neville and Whitney then began designing San Francisco's first municipal golf course, Lincoln Park.¹⁵ Lincoln Park remained the only San Francisco municipal golf course for 23 years, until the construction in 1925 of Harding Park, designed by Sam Whiting and Willie Watson.

The popularity of golf in San Francisco reflected the popularity of the sport within the entire country, and peaked during the 1920s. Often called "the golden age of golf," the sport grew in popularity during the late 1910s through the early 1930s, with many well-designed courses constructed during this period. Within the City of San Francisco, Lincoln Park and Harding Park were the only two public golf courses in San Francisco and, on weekends, they were overrun with golfers. The City decided to use the land in San Mateo County, formerly owned by George Sharp, for a third public golf course, named for the former landowner. Alister Mackenzie was commissioned to design the course, assisted by Jack Fleming, Superintendent of Maintenance for Golf Courses and Bowling Greens in San Francisco. Supervision of construction was given to Chandler Eagan, with whom Mackenzie had worked on Pebble Beach Golf Links in 1929.¹⁶ In 1930, Robert Hunter, Jr., was appointed the superintendent for the remaining ten months of the course's construction. Willis Polk and Company architect Angus McSweeney prepared plans for the golf clubhouse.

Alister Mackenzie

Alister Mackenzie was born in Scotland in 1870. He served as the Alwoodley Golf Club Green Chairman in the early 1900s, assisting golf architect H. S. Colt with the design of the golf course in Leeds.¹⁷ Mackenzie continued to work with Colt on other courses, and, in 1925, he established his own golf architecture firm and designed golf courses in Great Britain, Uruguay, Australia, Argentina, Canada, and the US.¹⁸ Mackenzie's best work in America was done between 1928 and 1933. By the time Mackenzie was commissioned to work on Sharp Park, he was living in the Bay Area. He died in 1934.¹⁹

Mackenzie's concept of an ideal hole in perfect surroundings was one surrounded by sand dunes next to the seashore.²⁰ Mackenzie felt that the success of golf course construction depended entirely on making the best use of natural features and devising

¹⁵Joe Faulkner, 1970, p. 5; although the course was constructed in the early 1900s, it was not expanded to a full 18-hole course until 1917.

¹⁶Bo Links and Richard Harris. *Mackenzie's Sharp Park Under Siege*. Golf Club Atlas Web site: <http://golfclubatlas.com/in-my-opinion/sharp-park>

¹⁷Geoff Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf: the History and Fundamentals of Golf Course Design* (St. Martin's Press, New York, 2003), p. 154.

¹⁸Cornish and Whitten, *The Architects of Golf*, p. 81.

¹⁹Honorable Julie Lancelle, Bo Links, and Jeffrey Phillips, *Sharp Park Golf Course*, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, July 2009.

²⁰Mackenzie, *Golf Architecture*, p. 28.

artificial ones indistinguishable from nature.²¹ He also contended that a golf course must offer adventure in order to hold interest for continuous play. His courses provided interesting challenges for golfers, regardless of their skill level. Mackenzie's firm was also known for its original and distinctive bunkers, with irregular shapes and each with its own design.²² He often had the overall vision for design of his courses and left the details to those who worked with him, such as Eagan. George Shackelford, in his book *Grounds for Golf*, describes Mackenzie as a master designer and offers that Mackenzie's secret to creating unique courses was his talent for routing.²³ Mackenzie designed his hole layout and sequencing on natural ground contours, not on any prescribed sequencing. Distinctive bunkering, the use of small hillocks around greens, and exciting hole locations were Mackenzie's trademark. As Shackelford describes, while many architects try to create a special course, Mackenzie "could figure out how best to fit holes onto a property and situate a golf course to evoke a comfortable, settled, connection to the ground. His course routings are always functional and original but rarely do they fight the contours of the property."

Mackenzie's notable US golf course designs were Cypress Point Golf Club, California (1928), Augusta National Golf Club, Georgia (1932), and Pasatiempo Golf Club, California (1929). Mackenzie was commissioned by the City and County of San Francisco to design Sharp Park Golf Course in 1929.

According to Geoffrey Cornish and Ron Whitten, golf architects and authors of the book, *The Architects of Golf*, post-World War II golf course designers were influenced most by Mackenzie's philosophies.²⁴

Sharp Park Golf Course Clubhouse

The two-story clubhouse was designed the prestigious design firm of Willis Polk and Company, a highly respected architectural firm, responsible for many architectural masterpieces throughout northern California. Examples are the Palace of Fine Arts and the Hobart Building in San Francisco and the Water Temple in Sunol. The firm was also instrumental in rebuilding San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake. After Polk died in 1924, his firm developed the plans for the Sharp Park Golf Course Clubhouse, the chief architect of which was Angus McSweeney. The building was constructed by the Works Progress Administration, and a plaque on the clubhouse states, "Improved by Works Progress Administration 1935-1936." The clubhouse, designed in the Mission style of architecture, has undergone a few alterations over time.

²¹Mackenzie, *Golf Architecture*, p. 29.

²²Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf*, p. 155.

²³"Routing" is a golf term used to describe the path the course follows from the first tee to the 18th hole; Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf*, p. 156.

²⁴Geoffrey S. Cornish and Ronald E Whitten, *The Golf Course* (New York: The Rutledge Press 1981), p. 8.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Tetra Tech prepared this HRE using the criteria outlined in Section 5924.1 of the California Public Resources Code, as well as Section 15126.4 of the CEQA guidelines. The report identifies historical resources that could be impacted by the SNRAMP project and assesses potential impacts on the Sharp Park Golf Course.

5.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria for identifying historical resources under CEQA are in Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the CEQA guidelines, which provide the criteria from Section 20524.1 of the California Public Resources Code. According to the CRHR (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 11.5), properties listed on or formally determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP are automatically eligible for listing on the CRHR. The CRHR criteria are largely based on the NRHP criteria, which are codified in 36 CFR, Part 60, and are explained in guidelines published by the Keeper of the National Register.²⁵ Resources must be at least 50 years old in order to be eligible for listing on the NRHP or the CRHR.

National Parks Service Preservation Brief 36 defines a cultural landscape as “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other values.” There are four general types of cultural landscape, one of which is the historic designed landscape. National Parks Service *National Register Bulletin 18*, “How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes,” defines a historic designed landscape as one that “has significance as a design or work of art; was consciously designed and laid out by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturalist to a design principle, or an owner or other amateur using a recognized style or tradition in response or reaction to a recognized style or tradition; has a historical association with a significant person, trend, or event, etc. in landscape

²⁵The most widely accepted guidelines are contained in the US Department of Interior, National Park Service, “Guidelines for Applying the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,” *National Register Bulletin 15* (US Government Printing, Washington, DC, 1991, revised 1995 through 2002).

gardening or landscape architecture; or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture.” *Bulletin 18* goes on to list golf courses as an example of grounds designed or developed for outdoor recreation or sports that fall under the category of a designed historic landscape. Therefore, Sharp Park Golf Course is being evaluated for its historic significance as a designed historic landscape.

Historic significance is judged by applying NRHP Criteria A through D and CRHR Criteria 1 through 4. The NRHP guidelines state that a historic resource’s “quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture” is determined by meeting at least one of the following, (properties may be significant at the local, state, or national level):

- Criterion A: Association with events or trends significant in the broad patterns of our history;
- Criterion B: Association with the lives of significant individuals;
- Criterion C: A property that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values;
- Criterion D: Has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

In general, Criterion D is used to evaluate historic sites and archaeological resources.

“Integrity” is determined through applying seven factors to the historical resource: location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. All of these aspects must be considered in order to determine whether a landscape retains enough of its important historic characteristics and features to convey its historically significant appearance or associations. Because landscape features change over time, a landscape need not retain all of the original features it had during its period of significance, but it must retain the essential features and characteristics that make its historic character clearly recognizable.²⁶

The CRHR criteria closely parallel those of the NRHP. Each resource must be determined to be significant at the local, state, or national level under one of four criteria (paraphrased below) in order to be determined eligible:

- Criterion 1: Resources associated with important events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Criterion 2: Resources associated with the lives of persons important to our past.

²⁶National Park Service, “How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes,” *National Register Bulletin No. 18*, p. 6, Web site: [www. http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb18.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb18.pdf).

- Criterion 3: Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master.
- Criterion 4: Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.²⁷

As with NRHP Criterion D, Criterion 4 is generally used to evaluate historic sites and archaeological resources.

The CRHR definition of integrity and its special considerations for certain properties are slightly different from those for the NRHP. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.” The CRHR further states that eligible resources must “retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance,” and the CRHR lists the same seven aspects of integrity used for evaluating properties under the NRHP criteria.

5.2 EVALUATION

Tetra Tech concludes that Sharp Park Golf Course appears to meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR and NRHP and should be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

The following provides a summary of Sharp Park Golf Course’s historic significance. It is evaluated on the DPR 523 forms in the appendix.

Sharp Park Golf Course appears to meet the criteria for listing on the NRHP for its significance under Criteria A and C and for listing on the CRHR under Criteria 1 and 3. (See the DPR 523 form for the evaluation of this property under NRHP Criteria B and D, along with the evaluation of the property under CRHR Criteria 2 and 4.)

The property’s period of significance is from 1929 to 1932, which represent the construction dates for the course’s original design.

Sharp Park Golf Course is significant under Criterion A/1 because its construction is associated with the need within San Francisco for a third municipal golf course. The construction and development of Sharp Park Golf Course was a direct result of the overcrowding at Harding and Lincoln Park municipal courses and the City’s desire to build a third course to accommodate San Francisco golfers. The construction of Sharp Park Golf Course represents a development pattern within the City of San Francisco and within the US in general, in which golf was an increasingly popular sport. The years between 1910 and the late 1930s have been called the “golden age of golf” in the US due to the fact that many of the great golf course architects designed courses during

²⁷California Public Resources Code, Sections 4850 through 4858; California Office of Historic Preservation, “Instructions for Nominating Historical Resources to the California Register of Historical Resources,” August 1997.

this period. Many of the courses, like Sharp Park Golf Course, are still in use today. The construction of Sharp Park Golf Course is directly associated with the growing popularity of recreational golf within the US during the early twentieth century.

Sharp Park Golf Course is significant under Criterion C/3 for its architecture and landscape architecture—a public golf course constructed between 1929 and 1932, embodying distinctive characteristics of a seaside golf course. This period is often called “the golden age of golf” because of the popularity of the game and the increase in golf courses constructed in the US. Sharp Park Golf Course contains many distinctive elements of its type, a golf course constructed on the oceanside, on sandy dunes, with original seaside holes that provide water hazards as part of the game. The course was designed by a well-known architect, with nuances, style, and innovation that enhanced golf courses constructed during this period in the US, many of which were private. The original layout of the golf course included holes featuring multiple tees, double fairways, cross bunkering, fairways in sand dunes, and several holes bordering Laguna Salada. Cypress trees dotted the setting. Although the course has been modified, it is common to modify a living landscape, although efforts to keep the fairways’ general original course design were always in effect. Twelve of the original 18 holes are part of the current design, and two fairways are original but without original greens.

The golf course is also the work of a master. While there are other examples of Mackenzie’s work that are more well known, Sharp Park Golf Course is an example of his idea of the perfect surroundings for a golf course—holes surrounded by sand dunes next to the seashore. Although alterations have been made to the course, during the period of significance the course retained Mackenzie’s routing, surprise elements, and hole and fairway locations.

The clubhouse is a good example of an Eclectic architectural style, with Mission and Spanish elements, improved by the Works Progress Administration during the Great Depression. The clubhouse was built to serve the golfers of Sharp Park Golf Course, is directly associated with the golf course, and is considered a historical character-defining feature of the golf course. It is a good representation of its architectural type and period, and its alterations have not diminished its historic integrity, as discussed below. The golf course clubhouse has consistently been used as a clubhouse for Sharp Park golfers, as was its original purpose. The presence of the golf course clubhouse helps to convey the historic character of the entire golf course.

In rare instances, buildings and landscape features themselves can serve as sources of important information about historic construction materials or technologies (Criterion D/4); however, the Sharp Park Golf Course does not appear to be a principal source of information in this regard.

5.3 INTEGRITY

Integrity of a historic resource is measured by applying seven factors: location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. Sharp Park Golf Course, including the clubhouse and maintenance building, has retained a sufficient level of

integrity in all measures. Although the course has been modified over time, the golf course is in its historic location and retains much of its historic appearance, except that the ocean is no longer visible from the course. Still present are the lagoon, the east and west locations of the holes, and the fairway, which were all elements of the original design. Mackenzie designed the course with interesting challenges for golfers, regardless of their skill level, which is still true of the current course. Man-made features that have been added, such as the seawall, do not diminish the historic integrity of the course because the land and its location were important to Mackenzie's design; thus, the course is still authentic to Mackenzie's plan. The course retains its integrity of design, workmanship, and materials, which provide it with a similar sense of feeling and association to its period of significance.

The clubhouse retains most of its historic design features, and original or in-kind materials illustrate the workmanship that went into its design. Modifications, such as additions to the dining area and replaced windows, have not reduced the overall historic character of the building that give it the sense of feeling and association to its period of significance.

Sharp Park Golf Course's character-defining features are the original features and design of the clubhouse, the original permanent maintenance building, and the course's original layout, including the 12 remaining original holes (current holes 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18) and original landscape features. The cypress trees that line the fairways also contribute to its significance, although none of the specific shrubs or trees on the property are considered contributors. The property's noncontributing features are the practice green, the maintenance trailers, the cart paths, the four holes that were moved to the east side of Highway 1, and other alterations that occurred after the period of significance.

The permanent maintenance building is part of the original construction of the golf course and retains its original integrity. The cypress trees that line the fairways also contribute to its significance, although none of the specific shrubs or trees on the property are considered contributors. Together, these features contribute to the golf course's historic significance and must be present to do so. The property's noncontributing features are the practice green, the maintenance trailers, the cart paths, and the four holes that were moved to the east side of Highway 1. These noncontributing features are those that were constructed or added after the period of significance, or, as in the case of the maintenance trailers, are temporary structures.

5.4 IMPACTS ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CEQA guidelines Section 15064.5(b) states that "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." The following provides reference to the project description in Section 2 as it relates to Sharp Park Golf Course and an impacts analysis for the golf course as a historic resource.

The SNRAMP project activities will be situated at and next to the eastern and western part of Sharp Park Golf Course and will not be near either the clubhouse or maintenance building. Therefore, none of the project components or construction will cause a substantial adverse change to these contributing buildings on this property such that they will be materially impaired or unable to continue to convey their significance. Potential impacts on this property would be on the designed historic landscape itself.

As part of the proposed project, some of the activities that will take place when implementing the SNRAMP will have the following direct potential impacts on Sharp Park Golf Course:

Impact HR-1. Excavated dredged spoils appropriate for use as golf course substrate materials would be used on-site to raise Holes 10, 14, 15, and 18 and to create the upland habitat on the east edge of Laguna Salada. Raising Holes 10, 14, and 15 would not have a significant impact on the historical character-defining features of the golf course because the holes would remain in place and alterations would be to elevate the holes, which would not impact the historic integrity of the fairways. There would be a less than significant impact on these holes from this proposed project activity.

Impact HR-2. The closure of Hole 12 (historic Hole 2) would have significant impacts on the historic character-defining features of the golf course because it would eliminate a hole and fairway on the west side of the course, along the ocean. Hole 2 was originally designed as a 262-yard fairway and a par 4. The hole was shortened in the early 1960s and was renumbered. Although Hole 12 has been altered from its original design, its closure and conversion to coastal/shrub habitat is a significant impact on the golf course because the Hole 12 area was included as part of the golf course design since the original construction of the course. The hole had always been at the edge of the lagoon or backed against the seawall. Using the area for habitat conservation and not as part of the golf course changes the boundaries of the golf course and its historic design. Closing Hole 12 would therefore be a significant impact. Implementing Mitigation Measure 1 (Document Historical Resources), as described in Section 5.0, would record the golf course following the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. Because implementing Mitigation Measure 1 would not reduce this impact, there would still be a significant impact on the historic resource.

Impact HR-3. A post and rail fence would also be installed along the seawall, to the west of the lagoon, with additional fencing around the wetland complex to discourage human and pet intrusion into the restored habitat area. This fence would alter the visual appearance of the seawall and would add a modern element to the golf course. The seawall is not an original feature of the golf course but was constructed during the golf course's period of significance and would be a modern element within the historic setting of the course. The construction of a fence would add a modern element to the course but would not alter a historic character-defining feature. Therefore, constructing a fence would not have a significant impact on the golf course.

Impact HR-4. Modifying approximately 13 acres of the golf course to create upland habitat along the east side of the lagoon to provide critically important San Francisco garter snake upland habitat would require slightly shortening or narrowing Holes 10 and 13 (historic Holes 18 and 9). The habitat corridor would be approximately six acres, bringing the total of modified area at the golf course to about 19 acres. This would have a significant impact on the historic character-defining features, historic Holes 18 and 9, because these holes and fairways would be narrowed and shortened. Fairways have been altered in the past at Sharp Park Golf Course. Implementing Mitigation Measure 1 (Document Historical Resources) would record the golf course in its existing condition under the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. It would serve as a record of the changes on the golf course through time, including the alterations on fairways and holes due to varying natural conditions. Implementing this mitigation measure would not reduce this impact to less than significant because modifying the historic character-defining features would still constitute a significant impact on the golf course, a historic resource.

Impact HR-5. The recreation analysis in the SNRAMP EIR proposes a mitigation measure (Recreation Mitigation Measure, Option 1) that would create a new hole on the east side of Highway 1, as a replacement for Hole 12. This reconfiguration would result in a total of 13 holes on the west side of Highway 1 and five holes on the east side. Adding another hole on the east side of the freeway diminishes the historic integrity of the landscape because it changes the balance of holes that were originally on the east and west side of Highway 1 and creates a hole in an area that was not originally planned and not originally part of the Mackenzie-designed course. Adding another hole on the east side of the course, in an area that would change the historic boundaries of the golf course design, would be a significant impact on Sharp Park Golf Course, a historic resource. Implementing Mitigation Measure 1 (Document Historical Resources), as described in Section 5.0, would record the golf course following the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. Because implementing Mitigation Measure 1 would not reduce this impact, there would still be a significant impact on the historic resource.

Impact HR-6. The recreation analysis in the SNRAMP EIR proposes a mitigation measure (Recreation Mitigation Measure, Option 2) that would create a new hole on the west side of Highway 1, as a replacement for Hole 12. This reconfiguration would result in a total of 15 holes on the west side of Highway 1 and three holes on the east side. This alternative mitigation measure would be beneficial to the Sharp Park Golf Course because it would restore some of the elements that Mackenzie had implemented in his original design of this course, such as coast side holes. This mitigation measure would change the layout of the holes, but the new holes would be in areas of the course where Mackenzie situated holes in his original design, and would be in keeping with the historic boundaries of the golf course. Impacts on Sharp Park Golf Course, if this version of the mitigation measure were implemented, would be less than significant.

CHAPTER 6

MITIGATION

Mitigation Measure 1, Document Historical Resources—The SFRPD would document or retain a consultant to document Sharp Park Golf Course before any construction work or modifications to the course. The National Park Service has published some guidance for the preservation of cultural landscapes in *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes, Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* and in the more complete Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. The appropriate level of documentation would be selected by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture (as appropriate) set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, (36 CFR, Part 61). The documentation will consist of the following:

- Full sets of measured drawings depicting existing or historic conditions of the Sharp Park Golf Course;
- Digital photographs (does not have to be large-format negatives) of Sharp Park Golf Course;
- A written history and description of Sharp Park Golf Course and its alterations.

The professional historian will prepare the documentation and will submit it for review and approval by the San Francisco Planning Department's Preservation Specialist. The documentation will be disseminated to the San Francisco Library History Room and the SFRPD Headquarters.²⁸

²⁸Note that in most cases the use of drawings, photographs, and displays does not mitigate the physical impact caused by demolishing or destroying a historical resource (14 CCR, Section 15126.4[b]). However, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation be undertaken even if it does not mitigate below a level of significance. Recordation serves a legitimate archival purpose; Office of Historic Preservation, *How Can Substantial Adverse Change be mitigated?* California State Parks Web site: www.ohp.parks.ca.gov.

CHAPTER 7

QUALIFICATIONS

Julia Mates Historian/Architectural meets the History and Architectural History professional qualifications as outlined by the federal government in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 61. Ms. Mates prepared this HRE with assistance from Cultural Resource Specialists Erin King and Frank Stipe. Ms. Mates reviewed project information, assessed known and potential historical resources, and prepared the text for this report. Ms. Mates has a Masters Degree in History/Public History and ten years of experience conducting historic resource projects.

Ms. King assisted with field recordation of the Sharp Park Golf Course. She has an MA, RPA, and over nine years of experience.

Mr. Stipe assisted with peer review of the designed historic landscape report. Mr. Stipe has an MA, RPA, and over ten years of experience.

APPENDIX A

DPR 523 FORMS

PRIMARY RECORD

Primary # _____

HRI # _____

Trinomial _____

NRHP Status Code 3S

Other Listings _____

Review Code _____ Reviewer _____ Date _____

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Sharp Park Golf Course

P1. Other Identifier: Sharp Park Golf Course

*P2. Location: Not for Publication Unrestricted

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*a. County San Mateo

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad San Francisco South Date 1956 (photorevised 1999) T _____; R _____; _____ 1/4 of Sec _____; _____ B.M.

c. Address Sharp Park Drive / Francisco Boulevard City Pacifica Zip 94404

d. UTM: (give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone _____; _____ mE/ _____ mN

e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)


Intersection of Sharp Park Drive and Francisco Boulevard. Sharp Park Drive, heading west, dead ends at golf course.

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The Sharp Park Golf Course (SPGC) is an 18-hole, 120-acre golf course in the town of Pacifica in San Mateo County. The golf course borders the Pacific Ocean, is bisected by Highway 1, and contains the natural Laguna Salada lagoon, wetlands, and associated vegetation. The course is owned and maintained by the City of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. The clubhouse is at the east side of the property, overlooking the course, as shown in Photograph 1, below. (See Continuation Sheet)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP29: Landscape Architecture; HP13: Clubhouse; HP35: New Deal Public Works Project

*P4. Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.)



P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) Photograph 1: Clubhouse, camera facing southeast, April 9, 2010.

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

Historic Prehistoric Both

1931/ City of San Francisco Historic Records

*P7. Owner and Address:

City and County of San Francisco

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, address)

Julia Mates/Erin King

Tetra Tech, Inc.

555 Market Street, 15th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105

*P9. Date Recorded: March 4, 2010

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)

Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") Tetra Tech, Inc., "Historical Resources Evaluation Report for Sharp Park Golf Course SFRPD Natural Resources Areas," 2011.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Sketch Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record

Other (list) _____

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

Page 2 of 18

*NRHP Status Code 3S

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Sharp Park Golf Course

B1. Historic Name: Sharp Park Golf Course

B2. Common Name: Sharp Park Golf Course

B3. Original Use: Golf course and clubhouse and maintenance building B4. Present Use: Golf course and clubhouse and maintenance building

*B5. Architectural Style: Eclectic with elements of Spanish and Mission Revival

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alteration, and date of alterations) Course: built 1929-1932; alterations 1941, 1962; lengthening some tees 1985-1994 / Clubhouse: built 1932; early improvements 1935-1936; enclosed dining area and additional dining space 1994

*B7. Moved? No Yes Unknown Date: _____ Original Location: _____

*B8. Related Features: _____

B9. Architect: Course: Alister Mackenzie / Clubhouse: Agnus McSweeney b. Builder: Course: Unknown / Clubhouse: Unknown, improvements WPA

*B10. Significance: Theme Golf Area San Francisco

Period of Significance 1929-1932 Property Type Golf Course and Clubhouse Applicable Criteria A / 1 & C / 3

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

Sharp Park Golf Course, including the clubhouse, appears to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for its significance under Criteria A and C. Furthermore, this property has been evaluated in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code, and the property appears to meet the significance criteria as outlined in these guidelines. Therefore, it is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. (See Continuation Sheet.)

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes)

*B12. References: Neal Hotelling, *Pebble Beach Golf Links: The Official History*, (Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press, 1999); *Sharp Park & Pro Shop Plans*, (San Francisco Planning Department 1994); Sharp Park Golf Course Website: <http://www.sharpparkgc.com>; Alister Mackenzie, *The Spirit of St. Andrews*, (Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press, 1995); City and County of San Francisco, Board of Park Commissioners, Map. *Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course, Salada Beach, San Mateo County, California*, on file at City of Pacifica Planning Department; Harris, Richard. Pacifica Planning Commission Meeting correspondence 2009, on file at City of Pacifica Planning Department; San Francisco, California; National Golf Foundation Consulting, Inc. *Sharp Park Golf Course*, City of San Francisco, CA, no date on file at San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department files titled Miscellaneous Documents, Golf Course History; Dr. Michael J. Hurzdan, *Golf Course Architecture: Evolutions in Design, Construction, and Restoration Technology*, Second Edition, (Hoboken, NJ: and see footnotes.

See Continuation Sheet.

B13. Remarks:

*B14. Evaluator: Julia Mates

*Date of Evaluation: March 2010

(This space reserved for official comments.)

P3a. Description (continued)

Along with the 18-hole course, the facility includes a large clubhouse, practice green, and maintenance area. The course and clubhouse were completed in April 1932. Access to the facility is from Sharp Park Road; a chain link fence, trees, and bushes establish the property's boundaries. A parking lot is adjacent to the east side of the clubhouse. The course's front nine holes are on the southern and eastern sides of the course. Some of the front nine holes (holes 4 through 7) are on the east side of Highway 1 and are accessed by a tunnel under the highway. The back nine holes are located on the western and southern sides of the property. Routing of the course is accomplished with fairways running parallel to each other and divided by mature cypress trees. The fairways are surrounded by concrete cart paths. A natural lagoon, Laguna Salada, is located at the western end of the course, and four holes (14 through 17) play around the lagoon. The southern end of the lagoon is traversed by a bridge. A seawall divides the course from the ocean on the west side of the course. **Photograph 2, 3, and 4** are representative photos of the golf course.

The golf course has undergone alterations since its construction, including lengthening, relocating and renumbering fairways, infilling some sand dunes with grass, construction of a seawall/berm dividing the ocean from the course, lengthening tees, adding tee boxes, and re-routing the course to accommodate the alignment changes in Highway 1.

The two-story clubhouse has an irregular footprint with multiple wings. The clubhouse is shown in **Photographs 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10**. It sits on a concrete foundation and is clad in stucco. The building is topped with a cross gable roof with multiple-level, cross-gabled roof wings that run on a north-south axis. The roof is sheathed in red clay tiles and is moderately pitched with no eave overhang. There are two extended entrances on the north axis, one facing east and the other facing west. An extension off the south end of the building is a modest addition, constructed in 1994.¹ The clubhouse was constructed in the Eclectic architectural style with elements of Spanish Revival and Mission styles, popular in California during the 1920s. Architect Agnus McSweeney, an associate at the San Francisco architectural firm started by Willis Polk, designed the building that was constructed by the Works Progress Administration (WPA). A plaque on the clubhouse states, "Improved by Works Progress Administration 1935-1936." Exterior details include a variety of sizes of fixed and vertical hung sliding sashes. Many windows on the building appear to have been replaced with modern sashes, with the exception of the windows on the east façade which are original wood, vertical hung and casement sashes. There are circular vents, some covered with wrought iron bars and others in the form of Mission Style canals in some of the gables. There are four chimneys along the roof line that are sheathed in stucco. A driving range is north of the clubhouse, and maintenance buildings are on the northeast side of the course.

The north wing faces the practice green. There is secondary entrance at the first floor of this north side that contains a set of original double wood doors with fixed center sashes covered by metal security grilles. The windows on this side of the building are comprised of replacement metal sliding sashes and original one-over-one hung wood sashes. There is a small north facing patio at the second story that is accessed through a set of paired, glazed doors, with multiple panes of rectangular glass.

¹ *Sharp Park Restaurant & Pro Shop plans for proposed work*, dated October 1994, on file at City of Pacifica Planning Department, Permit No. 1327994.

The east side of the building faces the parking lot and contains the main entrance to the club from the lot. This side has a projecting first story with a recessed, round arched entrance with a decorative iron work and gates set into the arch. The front doors are a set of original, paired glazed doors with multiple panes of rectangular glass, flanked by sets of fixed, windows with multiple panes of rectangular glass.

The western side of the clubhouse faces the golf course, and serves as the main façade. The main entrance on this side is recessed with an extended arch. Flanking the arch are two piers, sided in smooth stucco. A pair of original, wood doors identical to those at the east side of the building serve as the front doors. Metal security grilles cover the windows of these doors. The remainder of this west side features a ribbon of six large, replacement floor-to-ceiling windows. Each set of three windows flanks a central, wood door with multiple glass panes.

The south side of the building is an extension, constructed in 1994, that faces the current Hole 2 fairway. It has large, modern, fixed windows, and little architectural relief.

A compound of temporary and one permanent building serves as the maintenance area for the golf course and is north of the clubhouse, on the east end of the property, atop a small hill. This maintenance area is surrounded by trees and metal fencing. Most of the structures within the maintenance area are temporary storage containers; the only permanent building is a large, one-story barn that rests on a concrete foundation, and is topped with a front gable roof with shallow eaves with exposed wood roof rafter tails. **(Photograph 11)**. The walls of this building are clad in vertical shiplap redwood. At both the north and south sides of the building are two over-head mounted wood doors. Fenestration along the building consists of original awning sashes with wood muntins. This barn is currently used for storage and is original to the course.

B10. Significance (continued)

History of Sharp Park Golf Course

Sharp Park Golf Course is located on the former Mexican Rancho land of San Pedro. A portion of this land, 410-acres, was eventually owned by George Sharp, prominent San Francisco attorney and corporate counsel for the Ocean Shore Railroad in the late 1880s.² When Sharp passed away in early 1882, the land was left to his wife, Honora. She passed away in 1905 and the estate land was left to her trustees, Ruben Lloyd and Adolph Spreckles, both members of the San Francisco Parks Commission. Spreckles sold his share of the property to the City and County of San Francisco in 1916 for 10 dollars in gold, and, after Lloyd passed away in 1917, the remaining shares of the land were bequeathed by the estate to the San Francisco.³ The property was stipulated to be used for park and recreational purposes only.

Alister Mackenzie was commissioned by the City and County of San Francisco to design the course. Having worked on other seaside golf courses in Great Britain, Mackenzie believed that “golf in its early days was always played on commons or links land which bordered the sea. ...the natural characteristics of this type of land made it easily the most suitable for the game.”⁴ Mackenzie stated that Sharp Park, being constructed on land reclaimed

² Sharp Park Golf Course is located on only 120 acres of this land.

³ Sharp Park Golf Course website: <http://www.sharpparkgc.com/>.

⁴ Alister Mackenzie, *the Spirit of St. Andrews*, (Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press 1995), 246.

B10. Significance (continued)

from the sea “now has a great resemblance to real links land.”⁵ Jack Fleming, who was the Parks Commission-appointed City golf course overseer, served as Mackenzie’s assistant during the project. In the mid-1930s, Robert Hunter was appointed to supervise construction of the course.⁶

The location of Sharp Park Golf Course posed a challenge. The parcels of land designated for the course were adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and the land was composed of barren sand dunes and a lagoon. In order to construct the golf course and build up fairway grades, the Sharp Park site was dredged. The natural lagoon, Laguna Salada, remained within the golf course, and the design incorporated it by surrounding it with fairways. Construction began on the course in 1929, and dredging the area around Laguna Salada marsh took 14 months. Sharp Park Golf Club opened in 1932, after two delays due to drainage problems on the course from winter rains.⁷

The original layout of the golf course included holes featuring multiple tees (holes 2, 5, and 14), double fairways (holes 5 and 10), cross bunkering (hole 16) fairways in sand dunes (holes 3 and 7) and several holes bordering the inland lake (hole 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11). Cypress trees dotted the setting.⁸

When originally constructed, the course used well water for irrigation. In the 1930s, the WPA installed a water pipeline for the course that extended from the San Bruno county jail reservoir to a concrete pressure reducing tank, 20 feet wide by 150 feet long. This pipeline provided water to the course for irrigation and for drinking until it was abandoned in place in 2008. The line extended through the canyon to the east of the course through the current Hole 7 fairway.⁹

Golf courses have been called living things in the sense that they are mostly constructed of living elements, such as grass and trees, which grow and change over time. Soil erodes, changing the pitch of slopes; trees grow or are replanted, and the holes cannot be played as they were originally. Advancements in playing equipment also change the game.

Courses are redesigned, replaced, or remodeled for two reasons; the first is to improve the layout of the course, the second is to adjust the course for advances in golf technology. Redesigning golf courses involves rerouting and adjusting holes. In golf course architecture, restoring courses is considered to be the act of bringing a course back to, or closer to, its original state. At the same time, there are technological advances in the game of golf (balls, clubs, and mowing techniques) that advance and therefore result in alteration of the course to maintain playability. By the late 1920s, golf course designers accepted the idea that both natural and technological advances are factors, among others, that make it necessary to continuously improve golf courses, in order to maintain the strategy of the game.

⁵ Mackenzie, *the Spirit of Saint Andrews*, 171-172.

⁶ National Golf Foundation Consulting, Inc., *Sharp Park Golf Course*, (City of San Francisco, CA, no date), 84, On file at City and County of San Francisco Park and Recreation Department vertical files *Miscellaneous Documents, Golf Course History*.

⁷ Joe Faulkner, *Sharp Park*, 1970, www.sfpublic.golf.com.

⁸ Daniel Wexler, *the Missing Links: America's Greatest Lost Golf Course & Holes*, (Chelsea, Michigan: Sleeping Bear Press 2000) 114-115.

⁹ Clyde Healy, Assistant City Engineer, *Report of Clyde E. Healy, Assistant City Engineer, City of San Francisco and Coordinator of WPA Projects*, (San Francisco: October 1935-1939), 53.

B10. Significance (continued)

Changes to the Course

The layout of Sharp Park Golf Course has undergone several alterations to accommodate natural changes in the landscape because of the course's location along the Pacific Ocean shoreline. The course was also modified to accommodate the anticipated realignment of Highway 1.

The first major alteration was in 1941, when a seawall or berm was constructed to keep the ocean from reaching and flooding the course. To make room for the berm, the two original oceanside Holes 3 and 7 were moved inland. Another alteration was removing the lagoon and the second fairway at original Hole 10 (current Hole 14). Course modifications also included the installation of a 4,000-gallon pump to help with annual flooding of Laguna Salada, rerouting fairways for holes on the east side of Highway 1, and modest alterations, such as renumbering and shortening some of the original fairways. More recent changes involved lengthening fairways and adding and rebuilding tee boxes from 1985 until 1994.

The original design of the course had three holes on the east side of what was a county road, in front (on the west side) of the clubhouse, as shown in Figure 3. Around 1943, the county road was improved and rerouted to become Highway 1, which no longer passed the west side of the club house but was now on the east side. Although Highway 1 was not realigned until sometime after 1940, the designers of the course knew the course would have to be modified to accommodate the road (Figure 3). In 1932, Jack Fleming, in writing about the course in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin, described it as being "at present along the edge of the county road which is planned to re-locate." Other, more minor alterations included changing sand trap

Historic Contexts

Golf Course Design

Modern golf has its roots in Scotland beginning in the mid-fifteenth century on hilly grazing land along the coastline covered with fescues, broom, and other links plants. Early golf courses in the United States were referred to as "golf links" because they were designed in the tradition of Scottish links—the sandy seaside wasteland that links the ocean with the arable soil inland is the location where the Scottish used to construct golf grounds.¹⁰ Holes were placed in an area that afforded interesting play, and aside from removing tall brush, little was done to modify the grounds. By the turn of the century, golf was becoming an important sport and golf course architecture was becoming a respected profession. Several early courses constructed in the United States during the mid to late nineteenth century were designed by professional golfers from Great Britain. Interest in golf evolved in the US during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and increased in popularity during the post-World War II years.¹¹

Prior to the 1920s, golf courses were designed by prominent players, not golf architects. Golf course architecture was a full time profession in the 1920s, and it was a period of growing prosperity for the US, a time when construction costs, real estate values, and interest rates were low. The 1920s have been called the Golden Age of

¹⁰ Graves and Cornish, *Golf Course Design*, 3; Neal Hotelling, *Pebble Beach Golf Links: the Official History* (Michigan: Sleeping Bear Press, 1999), 13.

¹¹ Tom Fazio, *Golf Course Designs*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc. 2000), 98-100.

B10. Significance (continued)

golf course style in America and the 1920s saw the style of golf courses enhance immeasurably.¹² By the mid-1930s, golf construction regained popularity and many municipalities hired course architects to design golf courses. During the Great Depression era, the federal WPA program was used to provide workers to build these public courses.¹³

Because golf courses are both natural and manmade, it is common for golf courses to be redesigned over time. Courses are redesigned, replaced, or remodeled for two primary reasons to accommodate for advances in golf technology and to improve the layout of the course to accommodate the natural changes that occur within a natural landscape such as vegetation growth, soil erosion, and changes in slope pitch.

History of Public Golf in San Francisco

The game of golf came to California in the late 1800s and the first course was constructed in Southern California at the Riverside Country Club in 1891. The first Northern California golf course was at the Burlingame Country Club, a three hole golf course, built in 1893. The first golf course to be constructed in San Francisco was the San Francisco Golf Club in 1895.¹⁴

While golf courses at private country clubs were gaining in popularity, golf courses for golfers unable to afford the high prices of country clubs had very few places to play. In the early 1900s, avid golfers and wealthy members of private clubs, Jack Neville and Vincent Whitney, approached John McLaren, Supervisor of Golden Gate Park, about constructing a municipal golf course. Neville and Whitney then began designing San Francisco's first municipal golf course, Lincoln Park.¹⁵ Lincoln Park remained the only San Francisco municipal golf course for 23 years until the construction of Harding Park. Harding Park, designed by Sam Whiting and Willie Watson, was constructed in 1925.

The popularity of golf in San Francisco peaked during the 1920s. Lincoln Park and Harding Park were the only two golf courses in San Francisco and, on weekends, they were overrun with golfers. The City decided to use the land in San Mateo County, formerly owned by George Sharp, for the location of a third public golf course, named for the former land owner. Alister Mackenzie, the famous golf architect who had designed several courses in the US and abroad, was commissioned to design the course. Mackenzie was assisted by Jack Fleming, Superintendent of Maintenance for Golf Courses and Bowling Greens in San Francisco. Supervision of construction was given to Chandler Eagan, with whom Mackenzie had worked on Pebble Beach Golf Links in 1929.¹⁶ In 1930, Robert Hunter Jr. was appointed the superintendent of construction for the course for the remaining ten months of construction. Willis Polk and Company architect Agnus McSweeney was hired to prepare plans for the construction of the golf clubhouse.

¹² Geoffrey S. Cornish and Ronald E. Whitten, *the Architects of Golf*, (Harper Collins Publishers: New York 1993.), 84.

¹³ Cornish and Whitten, *the Architects of Golf*, 106.

¹⁴ Neal Hotelling, *Pebble Beach Golf Links: The Official History*, (Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press, 1999), 20.

¹⁵ Joe Faulkner, 1970 5; Although the course was constructed in the early 1900s, it did not consist of a full 18 holes until 1917 when the course expanded to a full 18 hole course.

¹⁶ Bo Links and Richard Harris. *Mackenzie's Sharp Park Under Siege*.

B10. Significance (continued)

Alister Mackenzie

Alister Mackenzie was born in Scotland in 1870 and received a medical degree. He served as the Alwoodley Golf Club Green Chairman in the early 1900s, assisting golf architect H.S. Colt with the design of that golf course in Leeds.¹⁷ Mackenzie continued to work with Colt on other courses, and, in 1925, he established his own golf architecture firm and designed golf courses in Great Brittan, Uruguay, Australia, Argentina, Canada, and the US.¹⁸ Mackenzie's best work in America was done between 1928 and 1933 prior to his death in 1934.¹⁹ By the time Mackenzie was commissioned to work on Sharp Park, he was living in the Bay Area.

Mackenzie's concept of an ideal hole in perfect surroundings was a hole surrounded by sand dunes next to the seashore.²⁰ Mackenzie felt that the success of golf course construction depended entirely on making the best use of natural features and the devising of artificial ones indistinguishable from nature.²¹ He also contended that a golf course must offer adventure in order to hold interest for continuous play. His courses provided interesting challenges for golfers, regardless of their skill level. Mackenzie's firm was also known for its original and distinctive bunkers with irregular shapes, each with its own individual design.²² Mackenzie often had the overall vision for design of his courses, and left the details to be created by those who worked with him, such as Eagan.

George Shackelford, in his book *Grounds for Golf*, describes Mackenzie as a master designer and offers that Mackenzie's secret to creating unique courses was his talent for routing.²³ Mackenzie designed his hole layout and sequencing on natural ground contours, not on any prescribed sequencing. Distinctive bunkering, the use of small hillocks around greens and exciting hole locations were Mackenzie's trademark. As Shackelford describes, while many architects try to create a special course, Mackenzie "could figure out how best to fit holes onto a property and situate a golf course to evoke a comfortable, settled, connection to the ground. His course routings are always functional and original but rarely do they fight the contours of the property."

Mackenzie's notable US golf course designs were Cypress Point Golf Club, California (1928), Augusta National Golf Club, Georgia (1932), and Pasatiempo Golf Club, California (1929). Mackenzie was commissioned by the City and County of San Francisco to design Sharp Park Golf Course in 1929. According to Geoffrey Cornish and Ron Whitten, golf architects and authors of the book, *The Architects of Golf*, it was Mackenzie's philosophies that most influenced post-World War II designers.²⁴

¹⁷ Geoff Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf: the History and Fundamentals of Golf Course Design*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003), 154.

¹⁸ Cornish and Whitten, *the Architects of Golf*, 81.

¹⁹ Honorable Julie Lancelle, Bo Links, and Jeffrey Phillips, *Sharp Park Golf Course*, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, July 2009.

²⁰ Mackenzie, *Golf Architecture*, 28.

²¹ Mackenzie, *Golf Architecture*, 29.

²² Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf*, 155.

²³ Shackelford, *Grounds for Golf*, 156.

²⁴ Geoffrey S. Cornish and Ronald E Whitten, *The Golf Course*, (New York: The Rutledge Press 1981), 8.

B10. Significance (continued)

Agnus McSweeney

The prestigious design firm of Willis Polk and Company was chosen as the clubhouse architect at Sharp Park. Willis Polk and Company was a highly respected architectural firm, responsible for many architectural masterpieces throughout Northern California. Willis Polk, the architect credited for such masterpieces as the Palace of Fine Arts, the Hobart Building and the Sunol Water Temple as well as the rebuilding San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake, died in 1924. His architectural firm carried on in his tradition and developed the plans for the Sharp Park Golf Clubhouse. The chief architect in charge of the project was Angus McSweeney.

Evaluation

Significance

The following provides an evaluation of the Sharp Park Golf Course under each NRHP and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) criteria. The property's period of significance is from 1929 to 1932, and represents the period from start of the property's construction to its completion.

Sharp Park Golf Course appears to meet the criteria for listing on the NRHP for its significance under Criteria A and C and for listing on the CRHR under Criteria 1 and 3.

Sharp Park Golf Course is significant under Criterion A/1 because its construction is associated with the "golden age of golf" in the US, during the late 1910s through the 1930s, a time of great popularity for the sport and a period during which golf architects designed many courses throughout the US. The trend in popularity of golf during this period is also reflected in the history of the golf within San Francisco, because during the early 1920s, the City had the need for a third municipal golf course. The construction and development of Sharp Park Golf Course was a direct result of the overcrowding at Harding Park and Lincoln Park municipal courses and the City's desire to build a third course to accommodate San Francisco golfers.

Sharp Park Golf Course is significant under Criterion C/3 for its architecture and landscape architecture—a public golf course constructed between 1929 and 1932, embodying distinctive characteristics of a seaside golf course. This period is often called "the golden age of golf" because of the popularity of the game and the spike in golf courses constructed in the US. Sharp Park Golf Course contains many distinctive elements of its type, a golf course constructed on the oceanside, on sandy dunes, with original seaside holes that provide water hazards as part of the game. The course was designed by a well-known architect, with nuances, style, and innovation that enhanced golf courses constructed during this period in the US, many of which were private. The original layout of the golf course included holes featuring multiple tees, double fairways, cross bunkering, fairways in sand dunes, and several holes bordering Laguna Salada. Cypress trees dotted the setting. Although the course has been modified, it is common to modify a living landscape, although efforts to keep the fairways' general original course design were always in effect. Twelve of the original 18 holes are part of the current design, and two fairways are original but without original greens.

B10. Significance (continued)

The golf course is also the work of a master. While there are other examples of Mackenzie's work that are more well known, Sharp Park Golf Course is an example of his idea of the perfect surroundings for a golf course—holes surrounded by sand dunes next to the seashore. Although alterations have been made to the course, during the period of significance the course retained Mackenzie's routing, surprise elements, and hole and fairway locations.

The clubhouse is a good example of an Eclectic architectural style, with Mission and Spanish elements, improved by the WPA during the Great Depression. The clubhouse is associated with the golf course and is considered a historic character defining feature of the golf course.

Finally, in rare instances, buildings and landscape features themselves can serve as sources of important information about historic construction materials or technologies (Criterion D/4); however, the Sharp Park Golf Course does not appear to be a principal source of information in this regard.

Integrity

Integrity of a historic resource is measured by applying seven factors: location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association. Sharp Park Golf Course, including the club house and maintenance building has retained a sufficient level of integrity in all measures, with the exception of setting, because the seawall now obstructs the view of the ocean from the course. The CRHR definition of integrity is "the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics or historic fabric that existed during the resource's period of significance."

The CRHR goes on to state that eligible resources "must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance," and then it lists the seven aspects of integrity. Although the course has been modified over time, the golf course is in its historic location and retains much of its historic appearance, with the exception of the fact that the ocean is no longer visible from the course. Still present are the lagoon, the east and west locations of the holes, and the freeway bisection, which were all elements of the original design. Mackenzie designed the course with interesting challenges for golfers, regardless of their skill level, which is still true of the current course. Man-made features that have been added, such as the seawall, do not diminish the historic integrity of the course because the land and its location was important to Mackenzie's design; thus, the course is still authentic to Mackenzie's plan. The course retains its integrity of design, workmanship, and materials that provide it with a similar sense of feeling and association to its forty-four years period of significance.

The clubhouse retains most of its historic design features; original or in-kind materials illustrate the workmanship that went into its design. Modifications, such as additions to the dining area and replaced windows, have not reduced the overall historic character of the building that give it the sense of feeling and association to its period of significance.

B10. Significance (continued)

Sharp Park Golf Course's character-defining features are the original features and design of the clubhouse, the original permanent maintenance building, and the course's original layout, including the 12 remaining original holes (current holes 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18) and original landscape features. The cypress trees that line the fairways also contribute to its significance, although none of the specific shrubs or trees on the property are considered contributors. The property's noncontributing features are the practice green, the maintenance trailers, the cart paths, the four holes that were moved to the east side of Highway 1, and other alterations that occurred after the period of significance.

References:

City and County of San Francisco, Board of Park Commissioners, Map. 1932. *Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course, Salada Beach, San Mateo County, California.*

Harris, Richard. Pacifica Planning Commission Meeting correspondence 2009. San Francisco Public Golf Alliance. San Francisco, California.

Hotelling, Neal. 1999. *Pebble Beach Golf Links: the Official History.* Chelsea, MI: Sleeping Bear Press.

National Golf Foundation Consulting, Inc. , No Date, *Sharp Park Golf Course.* City of San Francisco, CA. San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department files titled *Miscellaneous Documents, Golf Course History.*


Daniel Wexler. 2001. *The Missing Links.* Chelsea, MI : Sleeping Bear Press..

Sharp Park Golf Course. 2009. Website: <http://www.sharpparkgc.com/>


Clyde Healy, Assistant City Engineer, *Report of Clyde E. Healy, Assistant City Engineer, City of San Francisco and Coordinator of WPA Projects,* (San Francisco: October 1935-1939), 53.

Sean Sweeny, Sharp Park Golf Course, personal communication with Julia Mates, Tetra Tech, April 28, 2010.


Photographs (continued):



Photograph 2: Southern-most hole and fairway, camera facing north
3/4/2010



Photograph 3: Western portion of golf course, Fairway No. 12,
camera facing east, 3/4/2010




Photograph 4: Fairway No. 3, camera facing south, 3/4/2010




Photograph 5: East side of clubhouse, camera facing northwest
3/4/2010



Photograph 6: Fairway No. 10, camera facing west, 3/4/2010



Photograph 7: East entrance to clubhouse, camera facing west, 3/4/2010



Photograph 8: South side of clubhouse, camera facing northeast
3/4/2010



Photograph 9: North side of clubhouse, camera facing south, 3/4/2010

Photographs (continued):



Photograph 10: West side of clubhouse, camera facing southeast
3/4/2010



Photograph 11: Maintenance building, camera facing southeast, 3/4/2010

Location Map

