

From: [ALEXI PAPALEXOPOULOS](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 11:09:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee:

My name is Alexi Papalexopoulos and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Best,

Alexi
www.apdirector.com
[INSTAGRAM](#)

From: [V. Eristavi](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:46:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment - Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Vadim Victor Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

Vadim Victor Eristavi

From: [Lisa Biasotti](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:46:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee. My name is Lisa Biasotti, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

From: [laura bottero](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Re: Privatization of our SF public golf courses
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 4:32:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Laura Bottero Lewers, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you, and best, Laura

From: [Karen Tarantola](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 2:16:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Karen Tarantola, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Karen Tarantola

From: rharrisjr1@gmail.com
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#); [Lurie, Daniel \(MYR\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Ginsburg, Phil \(REC\)](#); [Madland, Sarah \(REC\)](#); [Ketcham, Dana \(REC\)](#)
Subject: Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee / Budget Hearing June 12, 10 a.m. / Rec & Park Dept / SF Public Golf Alliance Letter, Petition
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 11:53:20 AM
Attachments: [Open.Letter.Petition.Save.SF.Public.Golf.Courses.Names.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Board of Supervisors Budget and Appropriations Committee / Budget Hearing June 12, 10 a.m.
/ Rec & Park Dept / SF Public Golf Alliance Letter, Petition

Dear Mayor Lurie and Mr. Jalipa –

Enclosed above please find the Letter and Petition from the non-profit San Francisco Public Golf Alliance, for filing w/ Mayor's Budget Office and the Supervisors' Budget Committee in connection with its June 12 public hearing on the Recreation and Parks Department Budget for FY 2026-27.

Please circulate to the Committee and Board Members and appropriate City Offices regarding the Budget. And please confirm receipt.

Thank you for your service and courtesy.

Richard Harris, President

San Francisco Public Golf Alliance

826 Stanyan St.

San Francisco, CA. 94117

415-290-5718

From: [Isabella Frost](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 10:00:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Isabella Frost, and I'm a San Francisco resident of 28 years reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Isabella Frost

From: [Jake](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589 Message:
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 8:15:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is Jennifer Jake Ibarra and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Jennifer Jake Ibarra

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [Jake](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: :Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589 Message:
Date: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 8:12:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Jennifer Jake Ibarra

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [Brendan Frost](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Subject line (optional): Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:23:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

As a Transit Operator for SFMTA, I am very opposed to the taking of public lands and amenities and handing them to a for profit company which will restrict access to city residents with costs increases.

Thank you

From: [Monica Maresca](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 4:32:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Monica Maresca and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you in advance.

Best regards,

Monica Maresca

SF resident

415.786.0006

From: [Kevin Reynolds](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Privatization of Golf Courses File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:34:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!

THESE ARE PUBLIC AMENITIES TO BE KEPT FOR THE ETERNITY OF TIME. DO NOT
SQUANDER THEM FOR IMMEDIATE REWARDS!

Kevin Reynolds
70 Aquavista Way
SF, 94131

From: [Jessica Johnson](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File No. 250589- Opposing Privatization of public spaces
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:11:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My name is Jessica Johnson and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thanks!
Jessica

Jessica Jung Johnson

Realtor

DRE# 02084004

Jessica@vanguardsf.com

Direct: 415-828-6224

Jessicasellssf.com

Vanguard Properties



Leading

REAL ESTATE
COMPANIES
OF THE WORLD®



LUXURY
PORTFOLIO
INTERNATIONAL®

Ranked Top 1% of TIC Sales in San Francisco

From: [Robin Hubinsky](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 3:02:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses—Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

Robin Hubinsky
San Francisco, Ca. 94110
415.939.4028 (cell)
rhubinsky@hotmail.com

From: [Rodney Wertz](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 2:59:01 PM
Attachments: [image001\[11\].png](#)
[image002.png](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is [Your Name], and I’m a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department’s proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco’s public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It’s the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city’s public golf courses.

Thank you

Contributing to your Success!

RODNEY WERTZ

Agent Success Manager

Office Manager

415.655.5600

rodney@vanguardsf.com

VANGUARDPROPERTIES.COM



Leading REAL ESTATE
COMPANIES
OF THE WORLD®

LUXURY
PORTFOLIO
INTERNATIONAL®

From: [Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Stop the Privatization of SF's Public Golf Course! File No.250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 1:04:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon,

Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Emilie Biasotti-Nystrom

(510) 703-7032

From: [Stephen Gorski](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses, File#: 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 12:36:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Stephen J Gorski and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. Further, I have held a resident card for golf for about 20 years and often play the referenced golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by

rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Stephen J. Gorski, D4 Resident and voter for over 45 years.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Aidan Downes](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 11:16:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good morning, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Aidan, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you

From: [Kevin Cassidy](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 10:50:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Brent,

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is [Your Name], and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you
Kevin Cassidy

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Valentina Osorio](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File no. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 9:17:46 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Valentina Osorio, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

From: [Jack Calonico](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File no. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 9:15:07 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Jack Calonico, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses. San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate. A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control. I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces. I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses. Thank you

From: [John Calonico](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 8:59:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

HELP STOP THE PRIVATIZATION

: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Message:

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is John Calonico, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you
John Calonico
Sent from my iPhone

4153075131

From: [Gabriel Porter](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 7:02:52 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee, My name is Gabriel, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

I grew up in a low-income household in the Sunset district. The City's public courses allowed me affordable, accessible places to learn the game of golf. But moreover those courses became places to learn life lessons, meet people I otherwise never would have, and grow as a person. And all this was accessible to me (via a MUNI ride) because of affordable green fees and the City's youth golf programs. These experiences were invaluable to myself and my brothers and only existed because of the City's Public Courses.

Golf remains an important part of my life and I'm extremely impressed with the recent improvements at the City's public courses, GGPGC and Lincoln Park GC especially. Whenever I play any of the public courses in the city with visitors, they always remark about how cool it is to have quality PUBLIC courses within the city limits. I agree.

Residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Gabriel

From: [Max Rothstein](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 5:17:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Max Rothstein, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Max

From: [Deirdre Connor](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 5:04:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Mr. Jalipa,

I'm writing to express concern about the proposed city budget that could lead to the privatization of San Francisco's public golf courses, including Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles.

As someone who actively uses and values these public courses, I've seen how vital they are to our city. They provide affordable access to green space, recreation, and a sense of community for people from all walks of life.

I also host a monthly golf group with local professionals, and many of our outings are held at these public courses. If they were to become private, we would likely be priced out or lose access altogether. These spaces are more than places to play—they're part of San Francisco's inclusive fabric.

Public golf courses are just as important as our parks. They offer open space, promote wellness, and bring people together. Programs like First Tee are doing incredible work to make golf more inclusive for underserved youth, and I believe the city should focus on expanding access through initiatives like that—not privatization.

Please consider the long-term consequences on accessibility, equity, and community life. I respectfully urge you and the Budget & Appropriations Committee to oppose any budget measures that would lead to the privatization of our public golf courses (File No. 250589).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Deirdre Connor

From: [Nikolas Eristavi](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 3:16:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,

My name is Nikolas Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you
Regards,

Nikolas Eristavi

From: [Teka Eristavi](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 11:39:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Public Comment – Opposing Privatization of Public Golf Courses (File No. 250589)

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is Téa Eristavi, and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you,

Téa Eristavi
SF resident

From: [Christina Haight](#)
To: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment Opposing Golf Course Privatization – File No. 250589
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 10:31:21 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Budget and Appropriations Committee,
My name is Christina Haight and I'm a San Francisco resident reaching out today to urge you to reject the Recreation and Parks Department's proposed budget, as it pertains to the privatization of our public golf courses.

San Francisco's public golf courses— Sharp Park, Lincoln Park, Harding Park, Golden Gate Park, and Gleneagles—are vital public assets. The residents and the city together find those lands to be important, as they offer affordable recreational opportunities, preserve green space in our dense urban environment, and serve as inclusive community hubs for people of all ages, backgrounds, and skill levels. These courses are not just for golfers; they are open parklands that support wildlife habitats and provide mental and physical health benefits to the public. It's the duty of the city to maintain those lands at an affordable rate.

A private company does not have the same mission as the Recreation and Parks Department. Privatization of management risks raising fees, limiting access, and reducing community oversight. We should not be willing to risk compromising an affordable rate for children, seniors, and low-income individuals or families. The public golf courses are here for the residents of San Francisco, taken care of by the city as an amenity to San Franciscans of any background. Turning over their management to private companies in response to what may be a temporary budget challenge is shortsighted. Once these spaces are privatized, it is extremely difficult to restore them to full public control.

I support exploring alternative revenue solutions—ones that do not compromise the public character and accessibility of these treasured spaces.

I urge this Committee to protect public land and equitable access to recreation by rejecting any budget proposal that includes or enables the privatization of our city's public golf courses.

Thank you